

CITIES FEEDING PEOPLE

A Review of the CFP Program Initiative of IDRC

Review Team

Anne Whyte
Fiona Mackenzie

2 July 1999

CITIES FEEDING PEOPLE

Review of the CFP Program Initiative of IDRC

1997-2000

Review Team

Anne Whyte
Fiona Mackenzie

2 July 1999

Report Outline

Summary and overall comment

- 1 Program goal and objectives**
 - 1.1 Relevance of CFP's objective to the development issue
 - 1.2 IDRC's niche

- 2 CFP Program Strategy**
 - 2.1 Relevance and overall balance
 - 2.2 Involvement of researchers and stakeholders
 - 2.3 Regional strategy
 - 2.4 Cross cutting issues

- 3 Results and achievements**
 - 3.1 Major accomplishments
 - 3.2 Outputs
 - 3.3 Reach
 - 3.4 Impacts

References

Summary and overall comment

First and foremost, the reviewers want to record their admiration for the achievements of this Program Initiative and its small but dedicated team. It is truly remarkable what has been produced in three years by such a small group. The publications alone would seem to require the full attention of the program staff but they have been active in project development, leadership of the international donor group on urban agriculture, and establishing effective regional networks. Not everything is in place, but a great deal has been achieved.

The report documents our conclusions on the implementation of the Program Initiative in the light of the objectives set in the *Prospectus*, and our views on the outputs, reach and impacts of the program based primarily on our readings of the five projects that we reviewed in greater depth. Two of our recommendations are that CFP needs to better integrate gender and social relations into its conceptual framework, and it needs to make the political economy of conflict both more integral and more explicit in that framework.

Here we want to draw attention to some challenges that we see as the Program Initiative develops its strategy for the coming three years. The program team have signalled that more strength is needed within the team in economics, public health and nutrition. We are sympathetic to this. We also believe that there are some more basic questions facing CFP. A critical one was posed by the Management response to the Annual Report for 1997-98. It asked: "Given that the PI has moved the recognition of the importance of urban agriculture toward something that might be called maturity, should we "claim victory" in this field and move on to more strategic issues more clearly seen as research?"

The reading of the review team is that a withdrawal of IDRC from the urban agriculture field now would be premature. Our reasons for this are that the battle has not been won. It is still being fought on at least three fronts: in the urban areas, within the research community and within the international donor community. Despite a "softening" in the hard line attitudes of urban authorities, particularly in Africa, towards a more conciliatory and supportive policy towards urban agriculture, they do not have the tools to move from attitude change to policy development based on sound science. The inherently multi-disciplinary nature of research on urban agriculture which cuts across natural and social science research and engineering, means that it is an uphill task to attract and involve the best and most experienced researchers in any field to work on urban agricultural problems. The research community is therefore still relatively weak. At the international level, IDRC has been a steadfast and almost lone voice for almost a decade. The biggest challenge is that urban agriculture, cutting across agriculture and urban management, is not central to any agency's mandate and is vulnerable in all. The fact that CFP is still struggling to put together joint funding for Agropolis, an international research awards program that was recommended by the international donor support group for urban agriculture (SGUA), indicates that IDRC's leadership is still needed.

Having said this, the reviewers do see the opportunity to rethink a part of the strategy of CFP. The PI team have demonstrated that they are remarkably involved in the process of research synthesis above and beyond project development and program management. The reviewers see as needed and timely, the development of research and policy tools which synthesise current knowledge, provide guidelines and models, and are made widely available to enable the authorities and researchers in urban areas to undertake their own policy directed research. This would be an additional way to multiply the effectiveness of CFP and build on the knowledge and considerable credibility and international recognition that it has already gained.

1 Program goal and objectives

Cities Feeding People (CFP) has as its goal: *to support development research that seeks to remove constraints and enhance the potential for urban agriculture interventions to improve household food security, income generation, public health, and waste and land management for the benefit of the urban poor.*

CFP has set out three objectives which will form the framework for this review:

- 1 To strengthen capacity and generate information on urban agriculture at the household and community level so that cities can formulate and implement policy and technology options primarily for the benefit of the urban poor.
- 2 To mobilise and enhance regional capacities to share experiences in urban agriculture, identify common policy and technology obstacles, and share and adapt solutions through training and networking.
- 3 To influence governments, policy-makers and international agencies to effectively incorporate urban agriculture into their development programs.

The review team were provided with a great deal of documentation on the CFP program and projects. They also held several discussions with PI team members and would like to thank them for their time and effort in helping us. Key documents were the *Three Year Prospectus 1997-2000*, and the two Annual Reports produced so far, together with review papers referred to in this report. The review team selected five projects for more in-depth examination, particularly with respect to their comments on the outputs, reach and impacts of CFP. These projects are:

Urban agriculture in Dar es Salaam (Tanzania) 93-0037

Socio-Economic and Ecological Impacts of Urban Agriculture (Harare) 95-0007

Urban Horticultural Technologies, Port-au-Prince (Haiti) 96-0035

International Research Awards in Urban Agriculture: Grants and Management 97-0026

Wastewater treatment using water lettuce for reuse in market gardens (Dakar) 98-0214

1.1 Relevance of CFP's objectives to the development issue

The facts are stark. Rapid urban growth is directly related to increasing poverty in many developing countries. In the world's largest cities, families spend between one half and one third of their income on food. For the poorest families, it is more like 80%. Malnutrition in urban areas is as prevalent as in many rural areas. Over half the world's total population and more than half of the world's poor

now live in urban areas.

Where do they get their food? Despite the harassments and insecurities, the poorest among them grow as much of their own food as they can. Between 1993 and 2005, urban agriculture is likely to increase its share of world food production from 15% to 33% and its share of vegetables, meat, fish and dairy consumed in cities from 33% to 50%. Urban food production is a major employer in urban areas in developing countries. In Sub-Saharan Africa, there is substantial evidence to suggest that food security has become more problematic and the need for income greater for many urban poor with the implementation of structural adjustment programs. With the shift in rural areas to export crop production, the case for supporting urban agriculture is even stronger. The Urban Agriculture Network estimates that about 800 million people are now working in urban agriculture worldwide.

The response of the development community has been generally myopic. Food production is still seen as a rural occupation and until recently FAO, the development community, the CGIAR and academia focussed their attention on increasing production in rural agricultural systems. Even today, urban agriculture is seen in most agencies as “marginal” to the main development problems to be tackled. It has definitely not been on their main agenda, although there are now important signals that this is beginning to change. IDRC, and particularly the team and its leader for Cities Feeding People (CFP) can take considerable credit, first for influencing the donor community to recognise the importance of urban agriculture to the livelihoods of poor urban families and, secondly, for coordinating and helping to shape their response.

The CFP Prospectus describes the development problematique in terms of two major driving forces which cause the urban poor to seek to grow their own food within and around the city. These are the need for food security and the need for income. Urban poor families suffer from high unemployment and high malnutrition. They lack the cash to buy their food and are forced to grow crops and graze animals on land that is largely not their own, using waste water and soil that are often contaminated. They thus face multiple risks: poor nutrition, poor environmental health and insecurity of tenure and rights to their crops and animals.

The urban poor are fending for themselves as best they can. Their lot would be dramatically improved if urban authorities would adopt policies to support urban agriculture while ensuring food quality and environmental sanitation standards are improved. This is because helping the urban poor to grow their own food is one of the best and most direct ways to improve their nutrition, especially that of women and children, as well as generating some income for them. It is the case that women form the majority of urban farmers. This, in essence, is the rationale for the CFP approach to the development problem of malnutrition and poor environmental quality suffered by the urban poor.

The reviewers believe that CFP has got its entry point absolutely right. The main obstacles to improved nutrition and security for the urban poor lie in the control of urban and national governments. Changing urban management policies is the first task. The second is to provide technical solutions to improve production and the environmental quality where production takes

place. Some of the main solutions will be achieved through local authorities working together with NGOs and CBOs representing urban farmers on local improvements to waste management, agricultural production systems and security of *usufruct* within urban areas. In terms of the overall goal, three main objectives and target groups, the review team is fully supportive of CFP's analysis of, and approach to, the development problematique.

There are two aspects of the problematique that CFP has not emphasised in its *Prospectus* which may be worth paying some attention to in the future. The first is the question of urban-rural linkages and how urban agricultural production fits into a wider ecological, economic and social system encompassing urban areas and their rural hinterlands and resource base. There are two main components to this system:

- 1 physical resource flows from rural to urban areas (about 75% of natural resources taken from the earth are redirected to cities and urban areas); and
- 2 social, economic and information flows, including urban in-migration between urban and rural areas. Most urban farmers are recent migrants with close ties to their rural roots and people and ideas move frequently between cities and their hinterlands.

The second aspect that deserves more discussion is the political economy conceptualisation of urban agriculture. The reviewers were surprised that the PI was not more firmly and explicitly placed within political economy theory and that the particular issues of conflict, corruption and competition were not highlighted in the *Prospectus*. Rapidly expanding urban areas plagued by poverty and unemployment are surely places where competition and conflicts abound: whether between individual farmers and the landlords of the vacant land being farmed or grazed, or within different farming groups or between poor farmers and urban officials. Although these issues are addressed in several of the projects reviewed, they scarcely get a mention in the PI rationale and how conceptually and practically they are to be treated. In practical terms, the issues of inequity and competition are central to CFP but in the *Prospectus*, one gets the impression that CFP is studying issues that are academic and neutral rather than the highly charged and potentially explosive conflict situations on the ground. Beyond the specific projects, the reviewers would like to know more about how the potential for conflict in particular, and urban politics in general, have influenced CFP's approach to achieving its objectives.

1.2 IDRC's niche

Since its early years in the 1970's, IDRC has a long history of research support in two fields relevant to CFP's program: food security and nutrition among the urban poor (including work on street food) and environmental quality (especially water and sanitation) in urban areas. Not until the 1990's did some of this work crystallise into a program on urban agriculture, and in 1997 the urban agriculture work became integrated with the work on environmental water and waste management. CFP, while a new program, is not starting *de novo*.

This is important to note because one of CFP's main achievements has been to become an international champion for the importance of urban agriculture as a development problem to which the major international donors should be paying more attention. CFP could not have done this without drawing on a long track record of IDRC work and leadership in urban agriculture and related fields. Building on past success, CFP has not only positioned itself well with respect to the development problem: it has helped significantly to shape the way that the problem is understood and approached by other agencies. CFP is a successful example of IDRC using its comparative advantage to carve out a focussed niche for itself which is widely respected among agencies. This has meant that CFP could, and does, play a leadership role.

Leadership usually means that one is ahead of the pack. We note that, despite its influence on other donors, CFP has generally not met its co-funding targets (although the parallel funding is on target) and that its major project, Agropolis, has not yet secured the financial collaboration of other donors that it anticipated. This may indicate that for the next round, CFP needs to rethink its implementation strategy *vis à vis* its international partners. We will return to this issue.

2 CFP Program strategy

CFP has defined three research areas for reaching its program goal and objectives. These are:

- A appropriate space-intensive production systems for low income urban farmers;
- B safe and affordable use of organic wastes by small scale urban farmers to reduce human health and environmental risks;
- C tools that support policy development to enhance low-income urban farming.

The review team agrees that research in these three areas is needed, will help to achieve the CFP objectives and is complementary. An important condition for reaching CFP's objectives is that some of the projects supported cuts across more than one research area; that is, work on production systems (A) includes the recycling of waste (B) and that work on policy instruments (C) is firmly rooted in the needs of the production and waste management systems. We note positively that while some of the research projects are in only one of the research areas, there are a number of research support activities which integrate findings in all three areas, notably the capacity building project, Agropolis.

To complement the three research areas, CFP has highlighted in its *Prospectus* several cross-cutting approaches and modalities that it will use in implementing its program: these are multi-disciplinarity; Canadian partnerships, gender analysis and networking (regional and international).

2.1 Relevance to the prospectus and overall balance

The review team has some comments about CFP's activities in the context of its objectives and research areas, cross-cutting issues, and its plan of action as laid out in the *Prospectus*. These comments are qualitative as the reporting format for the annual reports did not follow the structure of the *Prospectus*. Particularly missing are financial breakdowns by objective and financial and project breakdowns by research area. We recognise that projects do not fall into neat categories, and that CFP, in particular, has a small budget which severely restricts the size and numbers of its projects which in turn affects the balance across research areas etc. Our comments on relevance and overall balance rely on the extensive tables in Appendix 1 in the annual report for 1998-99 (Prospectus performance targets and activities), on our reading of individual projects and our discussions with the PI team.

The *Prospectus* proposes an allocation of expenditures over the three year period that is 60% for research; 10% for networking; 20% for global partnerships and 10% for program development, dissemination and evaluation. Without knowing which activities are seen as research and which as networking, it is hard to judge if these allocations are appropriate or have been achieved. They seem to us to be in the "ballpark" for this three year phase but CFP might consider adjusting these proportions towards higher allocations towards networking for the next three years. This is because more international agencies are proposing to put resources into urban agriculture research, including FAO and the CGIAR. The prospectus also envisages approximately equal funding targetted towards reaching its three objectives (\$1,510; \$1,204; \$1,617). Again, on the evidence available, this seems not unreasonable.

2.2 Involvement of researchers and stakeholders

CFP has been extremely diligent in involving researchers and other stakeholders in developing and implementing its program strategy. Indeed, its attention to this process in its first year was commented on by IDRC management as exceptional and perhaps at the expense of getting new research underway on the ground. Even prior to the PI establishment, a series of workshops and papers had been supported to map out regional priorities and identify key institutions that would form part of the eventual CFP regional networks.

CFP has also involved its research networks in a collaborative process to examine the results of the projects and to collectively assess their outputs and impacts. The value of this process cannot be overestimated: it allows each of the researchers to see their results in a wider, regional context and to learn from one another how to do better next time. The meeting for urban agriculture projects in Africa was held in June 1998 and for the Latin American projects in May 1999. At both meetings, project leaders followed a group process of filling in a matrix in which each project was assessed for its impact on human resource development, institutional capacity building, the effectiveness of local partnerships, gender sensitive analysis, multi-disciplinary approaches, scientific and methodological advances, utilisation of results and leverage of funds. The reviewers commend this

initiative.

At the international level, CFP has acted as the coordinator of the Support Group on Urban Agriculture (SGUA): a group of donors which includes FAO, UNDP, the Netherlands Development Agency (NEDA) and French cooperation. In a number of CFP projects, other donors have been involved in the process and in discussing the results through the SGUA and in other fora. This has been important for a topic that has been neglected by international agencies and which falls between stools in terms of their mandates, since it cuts across agriculture (FAO, CGIAR) and urban management (UNCHS, WB, UNDP) but sits centrally in no agency's sights.

The projects reviewed also provide strong evidence of involving stakeholders at the city management and local organisation levels in their design and implementation. For example, in Harare, there was effective development of research linkages by ENDA in the process of carrying out the research with a number of key departments for urban management.. These include the following: Department of Housing and Community Services, Office of the Town Clerk, Department of Works, Urban Councils Association, Ministry of Local Government, Ministry of Land and Agriculture, Ministry of Environment and Tourism, Ministry of Health Officials, University of Zimbabwe and University of Keele. Similar important links were made by ENDA (which has considerable expertise in participatory conflict resolution) with urban officials in the project in Dar es Salaam, where the urban authorities were partners in the research process and their own committees were built into the structure of the research project.

In the waste water treatment project in Dakar (98-0214), undertaken by ENDA which has been working in the community for some time, the National Water Board (ONAS) is involved directly as a partner in the research and is responsible for approving the technology in terms of public health. This phase of the project has wisely involved local authorities in the project following some difficulties in the past, prior to IDRC's involvement. The *Agropolis* research awards project has delegated responsibility for selecting awardees to an advisory committee composed of experts from different regions. The reviewers feel very positively about the process implemented by CFP to involve stakeholders and researchers in the design of the PI, in its implementation and in its follow-up.

2.3 Regional strategy

The *Prospectus* does not lay out a regional strategy other than saying that the CFP will concentrate in Africa and the Middle East which are the fastest urbanising regions in the world, and in Latin America because there are more urban than rural poor. Some more discussion is warranted about how to link the CFP work in Africa and Latin America to the research knowledge base in Asia, when Asia has perhaps the longest experience in cities feeding people, and what the implications are for networking and sharing experiences when an important region is effectively missing from the analysis and the search for solutions.

The reviewers calculate that almost 50% of CFP allocations over the three year period will have gone to sub-Saharan Africa; with an additional 17% to North Africa and the Middle East. Latin America and the Caribbean have received 25% and Asia only 2%. International projects and activities with Canadian partners accounted for just under 5%, but this figure is misleading because the \$485,200 budget of the largest project funded by the PI in the three year period (the international research awards project *Agropolis*) has been included in the regional allocations.

At the same time as expressing concern about the lack of a clear program rationale behind the regional strategy, the review team applauds CFP for having the courage not to spread itself too thinly. In the circumstances of small budget and limited core staff, CFP had to make some hard choices. A regional concentration is a reasonable one to make.

2.4 Cross-cutting issues

Multi-disciplinarity

The Prospectus emphasises that CFP will require multi-disciplinary approaches and expertise in fields such as geography, urban planning, agronomy, engineering, veterinary sciences, public health and economics. Multi-disciplinarity is important for successful implementation of CFP at project level and also for the conceptualisation of the overall approach and monitoring of its results.

The PI team includes at least five of these disciplines and plans to add economic expertise soon. This is impressive but still leaves important disciplinary gaps within the team and stretches the skills and knowledge of the existing members. It is a problem inherent in CFP being a small PI. Given the small team implementing the CFP PI, they have made significant efforts to develop projects which are multi-disciplinary and multi-faceted.

One outstanding example is *Urban Agriculture in Dar es Salaam (Tanzania) 93-0037* which, in addition to the use of integrating tools such as GIS, undertook studies of land use planning and urban policy, reviewed legal frameworks and instruments; examined food production systems and the socio-economic aspects of production, marketing and consumption. These social science inputs were matched with natural science components which undertook soil analysis, water quality analysis and laboratory chemical analyses of pesticide residues and heavy metals in food grown in urban areas. The later project in Harare (95-0007) had a similar multi-disciplinary structure involving natural and social science disciplines brought together within a common policy-oriented and problem solving framework. The advisory team for the *Agropolis* project (97-0026) was carefully selected with respect to regional expertise and disciplinary background.

To conclude, the reviewers find that multi-disciplinarity is not only essential to any work in urban agriculture that will have policy uptake but has been effectively practised at the level of the PI conceptualisation and at project level.

Canadian partnerships

The *Prospectus* includes a proposal to review Canadian experience in urban agriculture and to develop collaboration between Canadian and southern institutions. A number of important achievements are reported at different levels. Canadian institutions are included in the Support group for Urban Agriculture, including Agri-Canada and a Canadian expert sits on the *Agropolis* Advisory Committee. CFP has undertaken an inventory and review of capacities and experience in municipalities, research institutions and NGOs in Canada (CFP Reports 16,19,25). Support has been provided to Canadian researchers to develop research components in CFP and to support graduate student field research on urban agriculture in developing countries, as well as to provide awards to foreign students enrolled in Canadian universities. The PI team has been active in disseminating information about urban agriculture within Canada, from developing four IDRC North-South Development Fora in four different cities, to giving lectures at Canadian universities and providing expert advice to Canadian delegations to FAO and to the National Roundtable for Environment and Economy. These all attest to considerable effort to promote Canadian partnerships.

Gender analysis

The record with respect to gender analysis in the design and implementation of CFP seems to be mixed. The *Prospectus* rightly flags gender as an important issue because many urban farmers are women, especially those who are directly feeding their own families rather than selling produce, and yet women have an even more difficult time when it comes to access to land and other resources. The reviewers recognise that analysis within the program is at an early stage, and note the challenge that the PI faces in integrating gender and social analysis at all stages of project design, implementation and evaluation. They are impressed with the valuable source book on gender by Hovorka (1998) and with other efforts to include gender sensitivity within the PI activities such as including gender expertise on the *Agropolis* Advisory Committee and requiring gender impact reporting by grant recipients.

However, at the project level, well designed gender analysis does not always appear to be successfully achieved even though IDRC has pioneered this for over a decade. For example, in the project: Socio-Economic and Ecological Impacts of Urban Agriculture (Harare) 95-0007 gender is not even identified as an issue in urban agriculture. The project proposal is silent here and omits key questions relating to gender. This inadequate attention to gender in projects on urban agriculture in Sub-Saharan Africa must at least partly be attributed to CFP, which only emphasised a gender dimension in projects since 1997; that is, since a number of the projects reviewed for this report were designed (Mougeot, 1999).

Even where gender issues are central to project design and methodology, as in the project Urban Horticultural Technologies, Port-au-Prince (Haiti), the project documents are unclear with respect to what gender issues are significant. A baseline survey was carried out at the beginning of the project - making evident women's and men's different responsibilities for food security, among other issues. Both individual and group interviews were held, including some group sessions attended by women alone. Given the concern to address issues faced by 'under-privileged women', preference was to be given to a woman candidate for the position of Haitian deputy project manager by CARE.

It is unfortunate, however, that three of the four very interesting case studies provided in the Appendix to the Project Proposal focus on men's activities. The fourth case study concerns an initiative of the Episcopal Church in the high-density *bidonville*, Brustout, but no gender-disaggregated information is given. The project appraisal suggests that urban agriculture in Haiti has 'gender characteristics comparable to those shown in African cities, with men farming market crops and women buying and selling them, while most household production for consumption remains largely in women's hands'. It continues: 'Appropriate horticultural technologies for profit and spin-off employment will target women in order to improve women's and children's nutritional status' (1997:iv).

In Haiti, local 'solidarity groups' or savings groups, *sols*, are 'small, tight-knit groups of people from similar geographic, social and economic backgrounds' which engage in rotating savings and are critical to the credit component of the project. Unfortunately, no information is on file with respect to the gender composition of these groups, although the reviewers are told that such data are being recorded. The issue is, however, broader than keeping gender disaggregated data or highlighting gender in project design. What is important is how gender and social relations affect the practice of urban agriculture; and this is not clear from the information given. Even though food production is home based, is it the case that there are no gender based struggles around tenure, or between production for home consumption versus for the market?

Networking

CFP set out to develop regional networks and specifically to include in them very different stakeholders such as researchers, urban farmers and municipal authorities. In this they have made good progress. The Latin American (AGUILA) network is already up and running and networks for West and East Africa, and for the Middle East and North Africa are under development with initial workshops taking place in Burkina Faso, Nairobi and Palestine. The value of the networks for sharing experiences and collaborating in project assessment has already been discussed and is expanded upon in section 3.4. This is a major achievement for CFP, although it will be important that maintaining these complex networks does not overburden the resources of CFP.

3 Results and achievements

3.1 Major accomplishments

The CFP team cite among their major accomplishments, their effectiveness in raising awareness of urban agriculture among international organisations, donors and national and urban governments. The reviewers agree. CFP has clearly had important influence both through its role as coordinator of the Support Group on Urban Agriculture (SGUA) and in its funding of a few important projects which have had impact on urban governments and stand as examples for others. CFP has also been

productive in supporting and disseminating review documents on urban agriculture, both by project leaders and by PI team members. Within the international community, CFP played a catalytic role in the recent decision of FAO to include urban agriculture as a policy thrust, and in the decision of UNDP to include a new component on urban agriculture in Latin America. Through the SGUA, CFP also influenced Sida (Sweden) to support policy-oriented research on urban food production in East Africa. CFP and its regional network in Latin America (AGUILA) were consulted on the development of a new initiative on urban food production in the CGIAR. All these are important achievements for a small PI and testify to the quality of its leadership and staff.

3.2 Outputs

Contributions to knowledge

CFP projects have made some important contributions to knowledge, especially at the level of the city. Multi-disciplinary projects such as those in Dar es Salaam and Harare have produced the basis for new urban management policies by providing the first city maps on the use of open spaces, field data on the amount of urban agricultural production, the contribution of urban agricultural production to the income and nutrition of poor families and the amount of environmental pollution and contamination of food grown within the city. Similarly, the project on urban horticulture in Haiti provided valuable information for policy.

The project in Dakar (98-0214) on waste water treatment is a follow-up project to one which tested and adapted an innovative technology (the use of water lettuce in a series of lagoons) suitable for replication elsewhere in Africa. At a different level, the regional reviews of urban agriculture and state-of-the-art reports on technologies such as hydroponics and gender have been useful contributions to scientific knowledge and policy uptake.

Publications

One of the areas in which the reviewers find CFP very strong is in the quality and quantity of its publications and their dissemination. It has been very effective in pulling together results from different projects and producing regional and global overviews or position papers. A recent example is the special issue on urban agriculture of *The Urban Age* published by the World Bank in 1998 which originated from a proposal from CFP and drew on CFP supported projects for its material. This journal targets local authorities around the world and has a large circulation. In particular, the latest Spanish version (*La Era Urbana*) published in 1999 includes a section on Latin America and the Caribbean which has several papers written by CFP supported project leaders.

Other important examples to note are a state-of-the-art publication in 1997 on hydroponics in Latin America supported by IDRC and FAO; and a book produced in 1997 by AGUILA documenting the experiences of urban agriculture in ten countries in Latin America. Topics included appropriate hydroponics, organic solid and liquid waste reuse, high-valued crops and animal husbandry. This is a testament to the energy and commitment of the CFP team and their project and network leaders.

The PI team are now considering whether to produce publications such as course syllabi, films, manuals and international readers. These would be useful but should probably be undertaken in partnership with other organisations, as they could easily absorb the resources and energies of the entire PI.

CFP project leaders are also active in disseminating the results of their individual projects. They have done so in ways that ensure a wide audience with respect to academics and policy makers. In general the publications are of very good quality, accessible and delivered in appropriate contexts. For example, the reviewers would like to pay tribute to the outputs of the project Urban Horticultural Technologies, Port-au-Prince (Haiti) 96-0035. These have spanned academic publications to more popular forms of written material, as well as using television, the radio and the Internet. There has been imaginative use of the media available. Another project which is exceptionally strong with respect to its outputs is Socio-Economic and Ecological Impacts of Urban Agriculture (Harare) 95-0007. There have been numerous technical progress reports which have been associated with the holding of workshops to report to stakeholders and to plan the next steps in the research. There is also an article on the project in African Urban Quarterly, March 1999, and a final technical report in the form of a book is currently being revised for publication.

Training and capacity building

CFP has incorporated training elements within many of its projects. The second annual report documents these (Appendix 1). Training has been provided for researchers and research assistants, and graduate students in research techniques and to community members in agricultural techniques, waste management, pisciculture and managing micro-enterprises. In the Haiti project (96-0035) *training of trainers* is provided on a continuous basis for senior staff, 'local moderators' and extension workers who, in turn, will train community participants and junior staff. In this way, the capacity of community structures for urban agriculture are developed as an integral component and outcome of the project. The project leader considers this aspect of human resource development to be one of the strengths of the project.

In the Harare project (95-0007) one of the important outputs is the training for local authority officers in environmental issues and environmental monitoring in urban areas. The training is to be provided by a multi-disciplinary team from the University of Zimbabwe and ENDA. Mougeot (1999: 19-20, 21, 22) notes the strength of this project with respect to human resource development through formal training and GIS, on the job training in data management and training in research techniques. ENDA, through collaboration with the University of Zimbabwe, was responsible for this training using formal and informal channels. A note of caution is sounded by CFP concerning the retention by the NGO of expertise developed during the project. The training received by team members has, because of 'the limited financial capacity of ENDA', led to individuals leaving for training or better jobs. For example, the original project coordinator left for post-graduate training at Clark University and a woman environmental scientist left to work for a private company (CFP, 1999).

CFP have also put resources into institutional capacity building although this does not seem to have

been a major component of its support, which is understandable given its limited resources. However, the inclusion of laboratory and computer equipment in project support to African universities has been noted positively by the research leaders.

The major training initiative for CFP is the international research awards project, *Agropolis*. These awards support graduate field research in urban agriculture within a supporting framework of networking, support to publish and disseminate results and the provision of short courses. The steering committee is composed of the members of the SGUA which has designated a group of international experts as the selection committee for the awards. The first round generated 38 applications from 30 countries and 9 awards were made. A short course is also under development to be delivered in Senegal. It is too early to assess the outputs of this initiative.

3.3 Reach

The reach of CFP is first and foremost the decision makers in urban areas. Without effectively reaching those responsible for managing and regulating urban areas, CFP would fail in one of its major objectives. The evidence from the projects reviewed is that show that urban planners and authorities are reached in terms of project outputs and are often involved directly in the projects themselves. This is the case in Dar es Salaam (93-0037), Harare (95-0035), Dakar (98-0214) and Haiti (96-0035). In Haiti the project partners include church led organisations and other CBOs in addition to the Ministries of the Environment and Agriculture and City Councils.

Other projects, such as the one in Haiti (96-0035) directly reach the urban agriculturalists themselves as participants and beneficiaries in the project. This is an important project with respect to stakeholder participation at different levels. At the level of local community, the intention is that there will be 'a clear bottom-up approach to allow community members to develop their own ideas and initiatives to allow them to carry on with minimal assistance in the future' (Project Proposal 1996:10). The project works with community organisations and facilitates participation of community members through regular workshops and discussion meetings, assuring 'a demand-led approach' and reducing unrealistic expectations of future assistance (Project Proposal 1996:12). These groups appear to be fully operational in the two *bidonvilles* selected and ensure that participation and extension are 'inextricably linked'. The Port-au-Prince project has involved the signing of formal agreements with five local organizations working with women who are participating in the project.

The reach of CFP has been extended beyond individual projects and city limits through CFP's support to regional networks, its leadership internationally in the SGUA and its prolific research output. It has also extended its reach through the work and reputation of its partners. For example, CFP considers that the Harare project has led to ENDA becoming a focal point for urban agriculture research in Zimbabwe, and cites the links being made with a UK funded project on urban agriculture

research in Zimbabwe and with the Netherlands-based ETC International. Through a paper commissioned by Sida, the project has participated in an East African workshop to develop a research agenda for improving policy on urban agriculture, and the project has been cited in several international publications. Maps produced by the project have been requested by the Urban Management Program manager at UNDP.

3.4 Impacts

Several of the projects reviewed are in too early a stage to evaluate their impacts so the reviewers comments are also based on pre-PI projects funded by IDRC and some general thoughts about how CFP might increase its impact beyond the sites of its projects. First, we refer to the highly successful impact of CFP on other development agencies and donors at the international level, through the SGUA.

Second, we believe that CFP has made important impacts on policy and action at the local level through many of its projects with which we are familiar. For example, in Socio-Economic and Ecological Impacts of Urban Agriculture (Harare) 95-0007, the project seems to be outstanding in achieving a change in attitudes of planners in three departments of the City Council. In 1997, the Harare City Council (HCC) established an Urban Agriculture Committee, whose responsibilities included keeping an update of urban agriculture in open spaces for enforcement and management purposes. An ENDA representative sits on this Committee at its monthly meetings as also does a representative from *Environment 2000*, an environmental pressure group (Mougeot, 1999 and Mawoneke and King, 1998). This outcome clearly demonstrates the effectiveness of including the stakeholders in the research process and is an immensely important success.

CFP has often worked with partners in its projects and this helps to increase their impacts. For example, in Urban Horticultural Technologies, Port-au-Prince (Haiti) the partner is CARE Haiti, which has extensive contacts at the international level with respect to small scale agriculture - with UNICEF, with Cuba, OXFAM *inter alia*. IDRC has put CARE Haiti in contact with people in UNDP and FAO and notes the potential to expand contacts through AQUILA. The CFP team (1999) note the current active networking with Cuban, Peruvian, and Brazilian members of AQUILA. Activities have been broadcast on TV, on the radio and through an article on the Internet. This partnership approach combined with emphasis on dissemination of results, has been critical to the success of CFP project impacts.

A important question facing CFP now that it has demonstrated what information is needed as a basis for policy and how to collect it, is how to stimulate the replication of its integrated "model" projects such as Dar es Salaam and Harare to other cities in Africa and elsewhere without providing IDRC or other external funding in each case. To effectively develop new policies which address the needs of the urban poor to have access to unused urban land, to be protected from harmful contamination, and to produce their own food, requires basic data collection and analyses which can be presented to city authorities. These data can be collected and analysed using fairly standard environmental,

and social science research methods and instruments. It is innovative and integrated but it is not beyond the skills of partnerships which could be forged between research institutions and city departments found in many urban areas, especially with the support of national institutions.

Both the “reach” and impact of CFP might be dramatically increased if the initial projects were used as the basis for guideline documents which could be used by other cities and urban areas to research their own situations and to develop appropriate policies based on methodologically sound and locally relevant research. This guideline approach might be more useful than simply replicating the projects themselves in a relatively limited number of other urban areas. The “reach” question is therefore: do we know enough to identify what information is needed and what policy and regulatory options have worked to spread the word, or do we still need to do more case studies?

Another factor is that CFP has helped to establish regional research networks which can in the future play important roles regionally to support CFP. As the Annual Report 1999 (page 4) notes, this is networking ‘with a difference’ as very different stakeholders are brought together - researchers, producers and municipal authorities. The network in Latin America (AQUILA) is functioning and has its own secretariat, and the foundations for similar networks have been laid in West Africa and East Africa and in the MENA region. Since 1995, ETC Andes, part of ETC International based in the Netherlands, became the local host for AQUILA. ETC is a ‘community-oriented agricultural development organization that promotes appropriate technologies in rural areas and, more recently, in urban areas’ (Annual Report 1999:6). It has proved to be an effective host. AQUILA’s network activities include information and publications, research into inter-institutional cooperation, training and education, institutional capacity building, policy and strategy development.

There is evidence that such an approach to upscaling would be timely. The experience of African CFP projects was used to design the jointly funded IDRC/UNDP/UNCHS/WB project Urban Agriculture and Feeding the Latin American and Caribbean Cities: Best Practices (98-0009). The intention is for project cities to provide guidance to other cities in the region about best practice in managing urban agriculture. Similarly, the project Participatory Impact Evaluation Methodologies for urban agriculture in LAC countries (98-0028) is designed to develop and implement an approach that is based on local projects of AQUILA members supported by IDRC and others; one output of which will be a manual for wider use. The members of the East and Southern Africa and West/Central African CFP networks have recommended that model approaches be promoted for urban policies towards urban agriculture.

Given these developments and supportive partners at the international and regional levels, and the project results already achieved, perhaps the time is ripe for CFP to explore further how its impact on urban policies might be multiplied by redirecting some of its attention to developing guideline documents for research and policy options for urban managers in Africa and Latin America, using the same participatory approach that has exemplified the first round of its project implementation and program development.

References

[in addition to internal IDRC project documents, CFP Prospectus and CFP Annual Reports]

CFP, 1999, Cities Feeding People : Input to questions from external reviewers; June 4 1999, mimeo., 22p.

Hovoka, A, 1998, Gender Resources for Urban Agricultural Research: Methodology, Directory and Annotated Bibliography; IDRC, Ottawa

Mawoneke,S and B. King, 1998, Impacts of urban agriculture research study in Zimbabwe: paper presented to the Cities Feeding People Workshop: “Lessons learnt from Projects in African Cities; June 21-25 1998, Nairobi, Kenya.

Mougeot, L, 1999, Urban Agriculture Research in Africa: reviewing and enhancing project impacts: paper presented to Third Symposium of the International Urban Planning and Environmental Management Association; Pretoria, South Africa, April 1999.

