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I. INTRODUCTION

1. FAO and IDRC have launched a trust fund project, executed by FAO and funded by IDRC, entitled “Urban and peri-urban agriculture: towards a better understanding of low-income producers’ organizations” (GCP/INT/955/CAN) (hereinafter called “The Project”), in order to generate knowledge that will help to better understand the types and performance of existing formal and informal urban and peri-urban producer organizations in the selected cities of developing countries, strengthen these and promote new organizations which will be more effective and sustainable. Specifically the Project aims at analysing low-income urban and peri-urban producers’ organizations in ten selected cities of the developing countries, in order to prepare ten city case studies, carry out a comparative analysis and identify lessons learned, in terms of the conditions and strategies for their creation and composition, effective functioning and sustenance, and benefits to their membership. The City case study will be prepared by selected Local Institutions (in the country), under the overall supervision of a National Study Coordinator, and with the participation of relevant local stakeholders with experience in the Urban and Peri-Urban Agriculture (UPA) sector.

2. The Project organized a two and a half day launching workshop in FAO headquarters, Rome, Italy (Philippines Room (C-277)), from 17 to 19 October 2005, More specifically the workshop aimed at i) ensuring a common understanding of the project and its goals and ways and means of implementation; ii) developing a common approach and methodology for city case study implementation; iii) finalizing the project workplan and defining respective contributions, roles and responsibilities for its implementation.

3. The Organizers invited the following participants to the workshop: Study Coordinators from selected institutions in the cities selected for case study; Project International Advisory Group Members Project Task Force Members; Priority Areas for Interdisciplinary Action “Food for the Cities” (PAIA-FCIT) members and the Project Focal Point; and resource persons. The participants who attended the meeting were from 10 countries (Cambodia, Canada, Egypt, France, Ghana, India, Italy, Peru, The Netherlands, Zimbabwe). There were representatives of local authorities (MDP-ESA), national NGOs (HUDA, Srer Khmer), international NGOs (AERI, CIRAD, ETC/RUAF, EUFORIC, IPES), Research Institutions (AERI), University of Ghana, Universita' La Sapienza, United Nations (FAO) and bilateral agencies (IDRC). The National Study Coordinators for the case studies in Senegal (IAGU), Caracas (CIARA), Nairobi (KARI) and Kinshasa (SENAHUP) could not attend. The list of participants is presented in annex II.

4. After the closure of the meeting, the Participants were invited to participate to a meeting of the Priority Areas for Interdisciplinary Action “Food for the Cities” (PAIA-FCIT), for which the point to the agenda was the debriefing of The Workshop and the preparation of the video on the project in preparation of the 3rd World Urban Forum (Vancouver, 2006).

5. The list of the background documentation (technical and logistical) is presented in annex II.

6. The working language of the workshop was English.
II. WORKSHOP DEVELOPMENT

7. Mr. Paul Munro Faure (FAO-SDAA), Chairman of the PAIA “Food for the Cities”, opened the meeting on Monday 17 at 9:00 and chaired the Opening Session. He was followed by Mr. Guy Bessette, International Development Research Centre (IDRC), who clarified the background and the objectives of the IDRC/FAO joint project and its expected outcomes.

8. Mr. Emmanuel Chengu (FAO-SDAR), Project Coordinator, added information on the Workshop, specifying its expected outcomes.

9. The agenda adopted is contained in Annex III. All the sessions took place in plenary.

10. All participants introduced themselves briefly, specifying their background, their institution and specific interest in the workshop.

11. During the first session on “City Presentation” the Study Coordinators for Hyderabad, Phnom Penh, Accra, Cairo, and Harare presented the background information relevant to their city case-study, while other resources people presented the results of their on-going work in Latin American and European cities. A 10 minutes debate followed each presentation. The session ended at the end of the first day.

12. Key points that emerged from the debate can be summarized as follows:

a) **Hyderabad (by Reddy Rajasekhar, HUDA):** A specific issue of interest in this city is the one concerning the intermediaries (middlemen), whose main function is to sell in urban markets. In fact producers cannot enter the bazaars to sell their produce without showing a land title, demonstrating that the land they cultivate belong to them. Furthermore scarce manpower is fully committed to work on the farm leaving no capacity for managing the selling of products in the market which is consequently left in the hands of intermediaries. Prices are therefore decided by intermediaries. One result is that there is lack of awareness of business opportunity in the UPA circle/ environment.

b) **Phnom Penh (by Pou Sovann, Srer Khmer):** National agricultural production programs focus on vegetables and biologic production with an emphasis on increasing exports of rice and vegetables. In Phnom Penh an agricultural network has been established, and people are increasingly aware of the national production potential. 20% of the total population in Phnom Penh are squatters and urban poor. Some new locations have been created, where UPA is not encouraged. There is a process whereby people transferred form urban slums to new locations (20-30 km from Phnom Penh) are given a land title. It often happens however that people who moved to new locations are unable to achieve the living standards they expected, in these cases they sell their land and go back to the city, seeking employment in the tertiary sector (city services). In 1993 rural-urban migration was higher than nowadays. At that time rural families (especially ladies) moved to Phnom Penh looking for jobs in the governmental factories, as they felt more vulnerable to natural disasters and had limited capacities for improving their own livelihoods in rural areas. Another problem is that while the number of squatters and urban poor is currently increasing, on the other hand the urban development plans aim at reducing the area available to urban agriculture. Private sector investment on
land is very significant in the city, and makes it even more difficult to grant land to poor groups working in UPA.

c) *Harare (by Takawira Mubvami, MDP-ESA)*: There is no legislation regulating agriculture in urban areas, although at the official level UA is recognized as an activity contributing significantly to urban development. The water system is a major problem. Waste water system is a delicate question, as the experience of Nairobi teaches, where priority was given to factories and poor people are the most negatively affected. Harare City Council (HCC) is trying to deal with the waste water problem and clear penalties already exist in Zimbabwe. Since 80s cooperatives have lost much of their importance. Harare City Council (HCC) created some zones used by cooperatives to cultivate; in some small areas some farmers are legally and illegally producing food products. Action Aid are involved in community gardens projects (nutrition). HCC is now trying to issue some new laws aimed at resolving conflicts. The role of cooperatives is nowadays limited to land claim purposes: in the past we had cases of people without land who came together in cooperatives. Nowadays, as land is granted to individuals, cooperatives usually dissolve immediately after obtaining the land titles.

d) *Accra (by Irene Egyir, College of Agriculture and Consumer Sciences, University of Ghana)*: Different results related to producers’ organization emerged through PRAs, according to gender or geographical segmentation. For example organization efficiency vary according to crops cultivated (rice producers and export-oriented mushrooms producers are very well organized). On the other hand, organization among scattered migrants is loose. It often happens that organization arises around a common goal, such as produce export. According to gender concerns, production is in men’s hands, but usually women are involved in irrigation (now it is possible to use pumps, but as they are so expensive not all people can have access to them); usually women have the duty to take care of their husband’s field. In rural areas there is a huge difference between area populated by indigenous inhabitants and migrants. The use of *recycled urban waste* emerges as a key issue to deal with. Dumping is a common problem in the vegetable market shared with Togo. Farmer mobilization (social movement) is a growing phenomenon, aimed at strengthening their lobby and improving their conditions through a stronger policy advocacy. In this context alliances and networks produce some benefits, (ex. RUAF)

e) *Cairo (by Ahlam Elnaggar, AERI)*: A common program for water and forestry could be useful; project for water use encourage farmers to make associations for the management of water. Cairo and Accra are the cities in the project that are in the desert and have problems concerning rainfed agriculture; only in the cities it is possible to have agriculture. In relation to the role played by municipal authorities in respect to UPA producers, it is specified that only registered producers can get the help of the authorities in relation to marketing (contracts), linkages with buyer, access to the market, and access to public transport.

13. The two following presentations, one on Latin American cities, the other on European cities, aimed at sharing additional experiences to the city case-studies object of the project. Key points emerging from the presentations can be summarized as follows:
a) Latin America (by Cecilia Castro, IPES): Presented advances on an action-oriented research project of organizations of urban farmers co-implemented during 2005 by IPES and ETC and financed by IDRC. Presented the different activities of the project (case studies of (peri)urban producers organizations, development of local agendas, systematization document, a video-DVD, a webpage, among others). Introduced an in-depth analysis of the “action oriented research” highlighting its capacity to involve producers in research implementation in a participatory approach; to identify partners and alliances to get new ideas; and to strengthen the capacity to pursue projects in the future. After the preparation and validation of the local agenda and the implementation of an inter-regional exchange of urban farmers, an “inter-actor agreement” should be pursued, through which various actors involved define their own responsibilities. They will finally develop guidelines for strengthening current organizations and farmers capacities for accessing existing resources, policy lobbying and advocacy.

b) Europe (by Marielle Dubbeling, ETC-RUAF): This presentation highlighted the point that where producer organizations are well organized and are efficient it is possible to achieve high results even with relatively little financial resources which is the common constraint of most developing countries. A multiplicity of goals can be achieved thanks to the conversion of public land into UPA land: reduction of criminality, wastes reduction (due to organic production); cheaper access to recreational opportunities, additional value. The experience of the producers’ exchange promoted by IPES/ETC RUAF gives an opportunity to participants to go back to their countries with an “action agenda” to be implemented in their own organizations.

14. The morning of the 2nd day was dedicated to the fourth session entitled *Urban and peri-urban initiatives, projects and programmes*. Advisory Group Members presented 5 presentations on their own institution’s initiatives and experiences regarding UPA. The presentations were:
   i) Millennium Project Task Force on Improving the Lives of Slum Dwellers;
   ii) International Development Research Centre;
   iii) ETC/ Resource centre on Urban Agriculture and Forestry;
   iv) Horticulture Crops Department, Agricultural Research Centre for International Development (CIRAD); European Urban Forestry Research & Information Centre and FAO-FORC .

15. The *Urban and peri-urban initiatives, projects and programmes* session was closed with the projection of a 35 minutes FAO video on “Food for Cities”.

16. The afternoon of the 2nd day was dedicated to the second *Urban and peri-urban initiatives, projects and programmes session*. It consisted of 5 presentations by the following FAO departments and services: Food and Nutrition Division (FAO-ESN), Water Resources Development and Management Service (FAO-AGLW), Animal Production and Health Division (FAO-AGAP), Food Safety and Quality Service (ESNS), Rural Institutions and Participation Service(FAO-SDAR).

17. The last session of the 2nd day provided the possibility to share methodological concerns related to case study objective and contents.
18. The 3rd day morning session, was dedicated to i) the finalization of the case study framework, through the further discussion of methodological concerns regarding the case study implementation; and ii) to the definition of a draft workplan for each city case-study by each of the Study Coordinators. More specifically, the participants were asked to:
   i) Present provisional workplan for case study implementation (with main milestones)
   ii) Specify methodological tools to be used
   iii) Identify the main operational difficulties to be faced when implementing the contract of the preparation of the Case Study
   iv) Identify points of clarification (terminology and concepts)
   v) Identify gaps in the Project Document

19. A PAIA-FC meeting followed, starting at 14:30, in order to discuss on some aspects of the Project. Some important proposals were suggested on additional cities to be included in the Projects. Henk De Zeeuw gave some important considerations regarding the project and the overall collaboration between PAIA-FC and RUAF. Minutes of the meeting are available on request to the PAIA Secretariat.

20. At 15:30 in the afternoon a telephone conference was held, with the overall aim to raise comments on the draft outcomes of the workshop with invited participants unable to attend the event. Telephone call participants were:
   • Study Coordinators: Luzayadio Kanda (SENAHUP, Kinshasa); Festus Murithi (KARI, Nairobi); Moussa SY (IAGU, Dakar);
   • Advisory Group Members: Gordon Prain (CGIAR-Urban Harvest); Fabio Salbitano (EUFORIC);
   • Task Force Members and Project Staff: Michelle Gauthier (FORC); Florence Egal (ESNP); Clarissa Ruggieri (SDAR); Francesca Gianfelici (ESNP); Aurelie Vuillermoz (FORC)

21. On Monday 24th in the morning a telephone conference call was held, with the overall aim to share the Workshop outcomes with Study Coordinator in Caracas. Participants to the telephone conference call were: Florence Egal (FAO-ESNP), Francesca Gianfelici (FAO-ENSP), Clarissa Ruggieri (FAO-ESNP), Ing. Jose´ Gregorio Martinez (Fundacion CIARA, Caracas); Luca Fe D’Ostiani (FAO-TCOS)

III. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

22. The main conclusions of the workshop are the following:

   a) The concept of UPA and Low Income Producers Organizations (LIPOs) includes food and agriculture (forestry, fishery, crop production), and includes different activities (production, processing, commercialization). Based on paragraph 1.2 of project document (p. 2), for the purpose of the present project, the term small “producers” includes low-income people whose livelihood depends on UPA-related activities or the food chain, including people involved in crop, livestock, fish and forestry production or exploitation, small-scale processing, marketing and preparation (such as hawking, street food vending, community-based catering systems).
b) Low Income Producers Organizations go beyond food production, including small scale UPA producers/forestry/processing/marketing. Only organized Low Income Producers Organizations should be considered in the study, excluding unorganised UPA individuals.

c) Critical assumptions: participation and establishment of a Local Task Force. The discussion clarified the participatory process goals, the need to identify actors to be involved in the process, and actors to be involved in ad hoc city task forces. A contact mechanism was established based on a project e-mail list to be established immediately after the workshop. Advisory Group Members will provide contact and source of information for study preparation and for the establishment of the Local Task Force.

d) Once going back to their own countries, Study Coordinators are supposed to act as Local Focal Point for case study preparation. They will facilitate the documentation process and will make use of existing literature and expert opinions, identifying information gaps. They will establish a City Task Force, and will facilitate interaction and synergies among its members.

23. The workshop recommended the following:

a) **Case Study Content**: flexibility will be adopted in the definition of case study contents, moving from a common basic framework, to be detailed according to city specificities.

i) **City profile**:
Essential indicators, possibly a map indicating the location of low-income settlements, major land uses inc. urban agriculture, unused land potentially suitable for productive uses (public and private), major master plan constraints/provision/regulations.

ii) **Convening** of an informal, open-ended get-together of all associations and groups of low-income urban and peri-urban dwellers drawing sources of livelihood from agriculture and forestry-related resources; identification of representative groups/associations to be associated to the case study.

iii) **UPA Profile**:
- Literary review
- Interviews and recording
- Stakeholders inventory
- Case Study Task Force

iv) **Collection of "stories"** (successful stories, good practices, etc.) from Low Income Producers Organizations’ experiences, accomplishments, constraints, etc.

v) **Guidelines**
Note that it is not only the scientific content of the case study that is relevant to the project, but also the process through which a city network can be established, gathering different stakeholders.
b) *Methodological tools*: draft tools for case study preparation will be provided by Study Coordinators by December 15; tools and expertise will be shared by participants.

c) *Video*: Ruijgrok will be in charge of preparing the video and for its overall direction. FAO will contact study coordinators for city selection, and information will be provided in due time. Study Coordinators will be contacted regarding Local consultants or institutions will be contracted for shooting.

d) *Project Workplan*: According to proposals provided by Study Coordinators, activities identified for case study preparation differ from one city to another. By adopting a flexible approach, each city case study workplan will consist of a number of common actions, together with specific activities explicitly referring to the city context.

i) *Common activities* are listed below:

1) Initial Debriefing meeting (flexibility in the choice if the venue place – FAO library, municipality, etc. - according to the local political context; FAO Field Representations should be involved from the beginning.

2) Identification of personnel for the study.

3) Case Study Workplan.

4) Establishment of the Local Task Force: identification of stakeholders and their tasks, promotion of synergies by linking the research work to various institutions and initiatives currently implemented in the cities selected: FAO SPFS and Telefood initiatives; other FAO Project dealing with urban issues; The "millennium city" initiative; CIRAD initiatives on UPA; RUAF initiatives on UPA; IDRC initiatives on UPA, even if not available in Hyderabad, Phnom Penh, Harare and Accra.

5) Local Workshop, to get the local political authorities, visibility, and to discuss some major methodological issues (research design, selection of appropriate tools to be employed, feedbacks on methodology and other key issues of the study).

6) Preparation and submission to the Project Focal Point of suitable methodological tools identified for Case Study preparation (process documentation, collection of "stories" from their experiences and story format, logical framework, rapid rural appraisal, etc.).

**Deadline for checklist submission: January 30**

7) Review of existing literature and collection of expert opinions: study preparation will require literary review, field research, interviews and meetings: the principal goal is to gather all existing information (databases, studies, analysis, reports, laws, policies etc.) regarding UPA and related activities; and to highlight information and policy gaps.

8) Preparation of “City profile” research and analysis: essential indicators, possibly a map indicating the location of low-income settlements, major land uses including urban agriculture, unused land potentially suitable for
productive uses (public and private), major master plan constraints/provision/regulations.

9) Convening of an informal, open-ended get-together of all associations and groups of low-income urban and peri-urban dwellers drawing sources of livelihood from agriculture and forestry-related resources.

10) Training: depending on tools adopted, skill strengthening (data and info collection and analysis) could be required.

11) Identification of groups/associations to be associated to the case study;

12) UPA Profile and Institutional profile.

13) Compilation of draft Case Study Report: various institutions contributing to the preparation of the City Case Study (with already existing reports, database, analysis etc.) will appear in the front cover of the study.

**Deadline for submission: May 2006.** The date was established in consideration of the opportunity to take part to the World urban Forum 2006 (Vancouver).

14) Compilation of Final Case Study Report and its validation.

**Deadline for submission: October 2006**

15) Participation to the International Workshop to be held in Rome priori to the end of the Project, tentatively on December 2006.

**ii) Specific activities** Study Coordinators are expected to implement are listed below:

- Study Coordinator in Phnom Penh will take contacts with CIRAD Regional Office, MPP, UN-Habitat.
- Study Coordinator in Cairo will:
  - Take contact with: Wilfried Baudoin (FAO HQs-AGCP), working on a Project on women horticulture in the city; Community Development Service, working on participation of urban and peri-urban producers in Cairo.
  - Adopt a geographical focus, selecting 7 poor areas falling within the metropolitan region: in each one of these areas a number of representative Low Income Producers Organizations will be identified and analysed.
  - Organize a training on participatory approaches; Emmanuel Chengu will provide his own contacts.

  e) **Contract:** The Project Staff in FAO HQs will take necessary action to finalize contracting procedures through FAO representations in the selected cities.

24. Final products of the workshop:

- Case Study Framework was agreed by participants, including contents, methodological approach and analytical tools specified at paragraph 23 a) and b).
b. Project Methodological guidelines: the workshop decided to work on methodological guidelines on the basis of the toolbox established starting from Study Coordinators' suggestions, IPES/ETC-RUAF toolbox and Advisory group comments.

c. An agreed workplan for project implementation was established, as specified at paragraph 23 d).

d. Participants agreed on the establishment of a contact mechanism for follow up and exchange, based on e-mail contacts (e-mail list).

25. The CD-ROM containing the Power Point slides presented during the Workshop can be requested to the Project Focal Point, Ms. Clarissa Ruggieri (+39.06.57056496; clarissa.ruggieri@fao.org), or to the Lead Technical Officer, Mr. Emmanuel Chengu (+39.06.57054803; emmanuel.chengu@fao.org).
ANNEXES
ANNEX I

PROGRAMME

Monday 17 October (Philippines Room – C277)

Opening session – Chair: Paul Munro Faure

9:30 hrs.   Welcome and opening remarks:
- Mr. Paul Munro-Faure, Chairman PAIA Food for Cities
- Mr. Guy Bessette, International Development Research Centre (IDRC)

9:50 hrs.   Rapid introduction to the project: Mr. Emmanuel Chengu, Project Coordinator

10:00 hrs.  Participants’ self-introduction

10:20 hrs.  Administrative information: Ms. Clarissa Ruggieri, Project Focal Point

Coffee break

City Presentations - Chair: Emmanuel Chengu

(20 min. presentation/10 min. questions)

11:00 hrs.  Hyderabad - Mr. Reddy Rajasekhar, consultant Hyderabad Urban Development Authority (HUDA)

11:30 hrs.  Phnom Penh - Mr. Pou Sovann, Executive Director Srer Khmer

12:00 hrs.  Harare - Mr. Takawira Mubvami, Urban Agriculture Programme, Municipal Development Programme for Eastern and Southern Africa (MDP-ESA)

13:00 – 14:30 Lunch break

City Presentations - Chair: Michelle Gauthier

14:30 hrs.  Accra - Ms. Irene Egyir, College of Agriculture and Consumer Sciences, University of Ghana

15:00 hrs.  Cairo - Ms. Ahlam Elnaggar - Director of Agriculture Economic Research Institute (AERI)

Coffee break


17:00 hrs.  Experience from European cities, Ms. Marielle Dubbeling, Urban Agriculture Adviser ETC/ Resource centre on Urban Agriculture and Forestry (RUAF).

17:30 hrs.  Welcome Cocktail – Aventino Room
Tuesday 18 October (Philippines Room – C227)

Urban and peri-urban initiatives, projects and programmes - Chair: Florence Egal
(20 min. presentation/10 min. questions)

9:00 hrs.    *Millennium Cities as a framework for achieving all Millennium development Goals* - Mr. Pietro Garau, Coordinator of the Millennium Project Task Force on Improving the Lives of Slum Dwellers

9:30 hrs.    *IDRC’s experience with UA, with emphasis on strategies and experiences* - Mr. Guy Bessette, Senior Program Specialist, International Development Research Centre (IDRC)

10:00 hrs.   *RUAF: an international network of resource centres on urban agriculture and food security* - Ms. Marielle Dubbeling, Urban Agriculture Adviser, ETC/Resource centre on Urban Agriculture and Forestry (RUAF)

Coffee break

11:00 hrs.   *Différentes fonctions de l’agriculture périurbaine: Yaoundé, Dakar, Phnom Penh, Hanoi, Vientiane* - Mr. Hubert De Bon, Director of Fruit and Horticulture Crops Department, French Agricultural Research Centre for International Development (CIRAD).

11:30 hrs.   *Forestry, agroforestry and greening: key element of the urban and peri-urban ecosystems for better livelihood?* - Mr. Fabio Salbitano, European Urban Forestry Research & Information Centre (EUFORIC) and Ms. Michelle Gauthier, FAO-FORC.

12:00 hrs.   Projection of “*Food for Cities*” (FAO video)

12:30 –14:00 Lunch break

Urban and peri-urban initiatives, projects and programmes - Chair: Guy Bessette

14:00 hrs.   *Food security, nutrition and livelihoods in urban and peri-urban areas: issues for consideration* - Ms. Florence Egal, ESN

14:20 hrs.   *Meeting Resource-Poor People’s Basic Needs for Water* - Ms. Sasha Koo-Oshima, AGLW

14:40 hrs.   *Livestock production in and around the cities; opportunities and challenges* - Ms. Emmanuelle Guerne Bleich, AGAP

15:00 hrs.   *Addressing hygiene considerations in the street food sector* - Ms. Renata Clarke, ESNS

15:20 hrs.   *Capacity building of municipalities and community participation* - Mr. Tomás Lindemann, SDAR

Coffee break

“Towards a common methodology and workplan for case study preparation” Working Sessions

16:00 hrs.   *Initiating “UPA profile”* - Chair: Marielle Dubbeling
• identification and review of secondary information
• inventory of partner institutions and constitution of case study task force
• institutional analysis and regulatory framework
• local workshop

**Wednesday 19 October (B504)**

9:00 hrs.  **Focussing on representative organisations – Chair: Florence Egal**

- Typology of low income producer’s organisations (LIPOs)
- Selection of representative LIPOs
- Organisational profiles (Annex I)
- Interaction with local institutions
- Best practices
- Budgetary/timeline constraints and opportunities

10:30 Coffee break

**Finalising the case study: summing up of constraints and recommendations  - Chair: Florence Egal**

11:00 hrs. Work plan and timetable
11:30 hrs. Establishment of the Contact Mechanism
12:00 hrs. Expected project outcomes, monitoring and reporting mechanisms
12:40-14:00 hrs.  **Special event: lunch time seminar on Participatory research and communication strategy by Guy Bessette (Lebanon Room, D-209)**
## ANNEX II

### LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

#### A. Study Coordinators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ORGANISATION</th>
<th>E-MAIL</th>
<th>TELEPHONE AND POSTAL ADDRESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Irene Susana Egyir</td>
<td>University of Ghana College of Agriculture and Consumer Sciences Accra, Ghana</td>
<td><a href="mailto:afuaegyir@yahoo.com">afuaegyir@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>Dept. of Agric. Economics &amp; Agribusiness P.O. Box 68 Legon – Accra Ghana Tel. 233 244681384</td>
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CITY PRESENTATIONS
Presentation 1

HYDERABAD

By Reddy Rajasekhar
HUDA

- Major UPA activities in the city: Fodder cultivation; Horticulture – Vegetables&fruits crops; Urban forestry; Dairy & Milk production; Other associated activities.
- Green Hyderabad Enviornment Programme (GHEP): To achieve sustainable improvement of living environment with active stakeholder participation and focus on gender and poverty alleviation
- GHEP Relevant Initiatives:
  - Urban Greening in the Hyderabad Development Area in 13400 Ha
  - Lake treatment and Conservation in 87 lakes in the HDA
- Focus of the Urban Peri–Urban Agriculture under GHEP:
  - Providing sustainable livelihood and income to the urban poor.
  - Providing employment to the unemployed / under employed
  - Efficient use of urban and peri-urban land.
  - Creation of lung space and recreational areas.
  - Improved urban Environment
- Various Activities for under GHEP:
  - Nursery rising activity,
  - Vermi compost,
  - Vegetable cultivation,
  - Floriculture,
  - Land scaping,
  - Plant propagation and maintenance,
  - Fodder cultivation,
  - Daiering
  - Horticulture.
  - Fish cultivation
- Strengths of UPA activities.
  - Demand for fruits, vegetables, milk, meat, floriculture and greenery particularly land scaping and lawns in urban areas.
  - Increased purchasing power of the urban community
  - Cash and carry activity, Short duration ,..Income & Employment generation
  - Value addition will be more beneficial.
  - Food security to all including low income group of urban community.
  - Demand can be assessed based on the nutritious value of the food products.
  - Rytu Bazars, specified market places for the urban community convenience.
  - Diversity of crops and grown according to demand unlike rural agriculture.
- Areas need to be concerned:
  - No direct contact of producer – consumer – middle men exploitation is still existing
  - Lack of institutional support unlike in rural areas (supporting prices, Lack of support services /Research & extension back up etc.)
  - UPA is unorganized in urban areas, unlike rural agriculture (Government agencies are buying FCI.)
• Issue of Urban Land Ceiling made way for land fragmentation
  o Low productivity due to not using of advanced technology, due to small holdings
  o Less shelf life and low holding capacity of UPA products as well as lack of sufficient storage & processing facilities for the UPA products.

• Issues in UPA:
  o Unorganized sector
  o Need to be enterprise status
  o Lack of Institutional support
  o Lack of accesses to UPA related information.
  o Most of the UPA taking place with sewage water as a source of Irrigation.
  o Not remunerative due to middlemen
  o Lack of accesses to quality inputs.
  o Modern tools and technology, affordability, accessibility and availability.

• Constraints to UPA activities:
  o Fast expansion of City and Infrastructure by converting urban and peri urban Agricultural land into real estates.
  o Due to urbanization natural terrain has been getting disturbed for want of construction materials through quarries may results in to low productivity.
  o Allocation of Large areas of land for theme parks, IT parks, Conservation Zone and industrial parks, Amusement parks.
  o Increase in land prices in urban and peri urban areas, the UPA farmers diverting in to other businesses.
  o Ground water exploitation.
  o Using sewage water as irrigation for UPA may lead to Health hazards.

• Areas need in-depth understanding? (Research Questions)
  o Which activities of UPA will be more meaningful both in terms of agro climatic, income increase & food security to the point of Low income producers.?
  o Understanding the different stakeholders and their roles / responsibilities in enhancing /sustaining UPA.
  o What impact does the UPA on the lives of the low-income Group producers, how it is different from the rural Agriculture?
  o What type of Policies and support activities required for UPA? And to bring more available land in urban –peri-urban areas under UPA.
  o What kind of Institutional mechanisms is working at present and what type of mechanisms required supporting the UPA.
  o Documentation Of different activities of UPA with its costeffectiveness (success stories with reasons for successes)
Penh, urban development has been perceived essentially as the physical modernisation and expansion of the city through the installation of infrastructure and the construction of housing, commercial buildings, industrial zones, schools, hospitals, government offices and other facilities.

- The resulting buildings, infrastructure, facilities and services are mainly intended to serve the better off sections of the city's population, particularly the business sector.
- The city was expanded by using the central point of Wat Phnom with the distance of 30 Kilometres surrounding

- Draf Master Plan of Expanded Phnom Penh for 2020

- Urban Agricultural production:
  - Production inside Phnom Penh municipality, the boundaries of which extend from 15 to 20 Km of Phnom Penh Center (Paule Moustier, 2002).
  - Total area cultivated vegetable in Phnom Penh municipality in 2001: 765 hectares (MAFF).
  - In rainy season: 465 ha (122 ha for leafy vegetable, 83 ha for water melon, 71 ha for cucumber, 12 for tomato.

- Relevant Initiatives
  - SUSPER (Sustainable Development of Peri-Urban Agriculture in SEA project (CIRAD, AVRDC, French MOFA)--- Srer Khmer and DOAI
  - UNDP –Support MPP on PR
  - SUPF (Solidarity of Urban Poor Federation)
  - UME/AIT/USG-- Conducted several studies issues related urban poor and marketing
  - Asia Foundation- support for some studies in Phnom Penh

- Urban poverty reduction strategy consisted in:
  - Improving access to basic services for the urban poor – by securing affordable land and housing, enabling the delivery of physical infrastructure (water supply, drainage, roads, sanitation, electricity, transport, solid waste collection), of social infrastructure (education, health care, family planning) and the implementation of disaster management (against fire and floods);
  - Enhancing local economic potentials (especially for women) – by providing education, vocational and business skills, credit and savings, industrial employment, marketing information, and space for small businesses and marketing
  - Strengthening participatory urban governance mechanisms – by facilitating community organisation and leadership, setting community development management committees, creating land and housing policies for the urban poor, simplifying procedures for government services, eliminating corruption, and securing tenure
The issues raised:
1. What is the nature of Urban and Peri-urban agriculture in the GAR?
2. Who are the Stakeholders in?
3. What is the extent of UPA contribution?
4. What are the concerns/constraints?
5. How are concerns being tackled?

Stakeholders in UPA:
– Public regulators
  - MOFA: Animal production, Crop Services, DAES, PPRSD, IDA, SRID
  - MOF: Aquaculture, inland water
  - MES: CSIR (FRIARI, STEPRI), EPA, FDB, GSB
  - MOLF: Survey Dept. TCP, P&G, FC
  - MMYE: Dept. of Coop
– Intermediate (not-for profit services)
  - NGOs, international technical and aid agencies (purely service)
  - FBOs/TBOs (cooperative societies, loose groups: membership and service).
– Private (special skills and for profit):
  - local traders (inputs and output)
  - exporters (assorted foods)
  - Transporters
  - Growers (UPA producers)

UPA is using recycled urban organic waste; health risks associated with re-use of urban waste and wastewater without treatment

Concerns:
- Possible health risk associated with re-use of urban waste and wastewater without treatment
- Stray animals
- Incidence of vector borne diseases (malaria)
- Contamination from the use of agrochemicals
- Zoonotic diseases
  - Customers behaviour (unwillingness to pay premium prices)
  - Seasonality of food flow tend to dampen prices of UPA products
  - Lack of clear-cut policy on UPA

Constraints
  Internal:
  – Manager motive: just a coping strategy during transition period
  – Resource base: low levels and access to suitable land and water
  – Competence: low technical and managerial expertise and food handling techniques
  – Competitive edge: low competitiveness, conflict with more attractive activities and land use systems
  External:
Customers behaviour (unwillingness to pay premium prices)
Seasonality of food flow tend to dampen prices of UPA products
Lack of clear-cut policy on UPA
Economic: high cost of inputs and low output prices; high interest rates
Social: treats of eviction by land owners, theft, crop damage by stray animals, the spread of farmers sometimes hinders sustained cooperation
Technological: rapid change in technology results in low motivation for innovation and investment

- Research: IWMI, UG, STEPRI, CSIR
- Farmer Mobilisation
- Learning Alliances – e.g RUAF
  - WASPA – *(Wastewater Agriculture and Sanitation for Poverty Alleviation)* on decentralized, household-centred sanitation approaches for wastewater collection, treatment and re-use in peri-urban agriculture - IRC, TREND, CREPA, IWMI
  - SWITCH *(Sustainable water management improves tomorrow’s cities Health, EU funded to start in Jan 06)*
  - RUAF (City team)
- Actions towards better understanding of producer organization in the GAR
  - Have a well defined local institutions (LI) in UPA
  - Study how to strengthen linkages between various stakeholders at the macro, meso and micro levels
  - Study organisational dynamics of producer groups
  - Study how to strongly link producer organisations with other LI emphasising participation rather than control
Agricultural activities exist in the peri-urban areas of Cairo city, where farmers cultivate crops, vegetables, fruits. Some own livestock, others work as fishermen. However, Cairo depends on the adjacent Governorates for vegetable and fruit providing. A lot of those farmers and other poor people, who live in Urban and Peri-urban area, are small-scale producers with low-income and have no much access to resources, inputs, services and markets.

Relevant Actors in the UPA chain: There are three Agricultural Departments and 30 agricultural Cooperatives provide services to the agricultural holders in three major Agriculture areas (UPA),

- Agricultural and Credit Development Bank and its branches which provide credits and agricultural inputs,
- Chain of consumption cooperatives, street vending and hawking formal and informal which sell commodities to public at fair prices.
- Wholesale Market (al Oboor) and food processing factories; cheese, butter, yogurt etc.
- Social Fund for Development
- Ministry of Social Affaire (MSA)
- Local Development Fund (LDF)

UPA Constraints:

- Lack of health, education and nutrition services
- There is no much fund available nor credits and or financial information to the small scale producers
- Marketing problems, especially for low-income producers
- Illiteracy problems in UPA areas
- Lack of information about the poor people and/or the small scale producers, to be understudied or classified.
- Lack of organization deprives the low-income producers of the institutional and organizational means for bargaining or negotiating with the authorities.

Most of the UPA producers are producing under insecure land- and other resources – tenure conditions.

Most of the graduates who had credits from Social Fund for Development (SFD) for small scale production projects are being put out of the business, because of the routine and/or failed to pay back the credits.

Examples of assistance: small factories for yogurt
• Urban agriculture in Harare:
  o Harare has witnessed enormous growth in urban agriculture over time
  o Poverty studies indicate increasing poverty
  o City sits on its catchment
    Environmental Consequences Immediately Felt
  o Historically-hostile authorities and legislation
  o Insignificant, trivial activity
  o Practised by people in different social and economic groups
  o Various purposes – subsistence, economic, hobby
  o Official attitude towards Urban Agriculture has changed: positive recognition

• Land use in Harare: Harare has always had farms as part of the city; waterfalls and hatfield were deliberately allocated to poor whites for subsistence purposes.

• Agriculture has gradually given way to urban development. City expansion has led to the acquisition and incorporation of land in the peri-urban areas. The trend has continuously favoured urban development with little or no regard for agriculture.

• UPA major characteristics can be summarised as follow:
  o Largely in open spaces and peri-urban areas
  o Mostly rain fed
  o Shortage of water one of major problems
  o Reclaimed water sometimes used
  o Produce: crops, e.g. maize, vegetables, fruit, feeder crops, poultry, piggery, goats, sheep, dairy cows – however very little livestock.
  o Marketing in the city

• 1992 Harare Master Plan
  o Overall land use planning policy document
  o Defines expansion routes & agriculture zones
  o Proposes densification as a strategy

• 1996 Several farms incorporated: About 80% land zoned urban dev 20% agric

• Current initiatives:
  o Musikavanhu
  o Kintre Lake County
  o Peri-urban sub-divisions
  o Access to land project
  o Actors: Harare City Council, FAO, Central Government, IDRC, Input suppliers, NGOs – e.g. Environment Africa, Action Aid, MDP

• UPA objectives:
  o Improving food security and nutrition
  o Improving access to land and other resources for UPA
  o Income generation for the urban poor and marginalized.
  o To empower the urban voiceless, especially women.
  o To organize and reorganize urban farmers
  o Economic empowerment through exports
  o Environmental management
• UPA producers:
  o Exist but largely in an informal manner
  o This has affected their ability to effectively operate – sustainability issues
  o Management and organizational structures are very weak
  o They have no offices
  o Financial base is very weak
  o Access to land is still very limited – members join with their informal pieces of land
  o As a result they have limited access to credit and inputs – tenure regime is still a problem
  o However not much work has been done on these associations

• Conflicts:
  o Competition for land through urban expansion
  o City council enforcing their by-laws.
  o Men often take land from women by force
  o Boundary disputes

• UPA constraints and problems:
  o Lack of suitable fertile land
  o Inadequate water
  o Lack of credit facilities
  o Lack of inputs
  o Institutional framework is still weak
  o Land use conflict
  o Poor extension services
  o Lack of resources/equipment
  o Negative attitude (trivialised)
  o Consequences – environmental degradation

• UPA strategies:
  o Need to develop proper policy frameworks for UPA that involve all stakeholders, including producer associations
  o Understanding the needs and roles of producer associations in urban food security, market gardening etc
  o The need to understand equity and sustainability issues for user associations – how can they be self sufficient
Presentation 6

LATIN AMERICA CITIES

By Cecilia Castro
IPES

- Action-oriented research
  - Characterization of urban producers organisations
  - Analysis of organisations’ strategies and innovative alliances established
  - Focus on: Organisation and functioning; Access to local resources; Policy lobbying
- Coordination: IPES (global and Latin America), ETC (Europe)
- Producers led-organisations and others encouraged by local or State government.
- Members: mainly poor people
- Some have to permanently deal with political issues and it is not an easy task (different priorities)
- Women are not active participants in mixed organisations, but their presence is very high
- Commercialization is taken by themselves, sometimes use middlemen but they prefer to go directly to the consumers
- Processing add value and allow better income… nevertheless is a challenge due to existing regulations for agro-industry conditions, size sanitary topics, difficulties to access financial resources
- Urban Planning is definitely a topic to deal with (ownership, access to land and deal with urbanization pressure)
- Strengthening producers’ organizations:
  - Organizations have to promote the defence of certain principles (organic production, social inclusion, enhancement of livelihood conditions in the community, empowerment of poor producers, etc.)
  - Empowerment has to go together with a literacy process (necessary) and capacity building of the members
  - Producers’ organisations must promote participation and be decentralized
  - Organizations have to look for proper communication strategies (internal and external) and self-financing
  - Alliances can be specific or strategic and respond to the association objectives and principles: for inputs/resources access, policy lobbying
  - Among alliances, organizations must look for consumers
  - In supporting of producers’ organizations it is important to look for added value and policy institutionalization
Association of Gardeners BVV Amsterdam
- BVV is an example of producers organising themselves to negotiate and allow better access to resources (land), services (training and input supply) and resolution of conflicts, and bring their interests and perspectives to bear on policy design.
- Permanent information on goals, activities and success is crucial to retain credibility of management and increase members involvement (spec. youth, migrants)
- Policy lobbying successful as a result of: application of divers and complementary strategies: permanent information flow, direct participation, increasing added value, organisation of open meetings – involving press (b) strategic alliances (office workers, artists, environmental organisations, building companies, health care institutes)

Duinboeren Brabant
- This case shows the importance of organising producers to become valued urban actors, be listened to and be supported. In doing so, they must not only to defend their own interests, but also speak “an urban language” and show they can help other urban actors solve their problems (a learning process).
- The organisation can only be sustained by continuously strengthening and diversifying sources of financial revenues: combining production with other income sources (agro-tourism network, health care), looking for niche markets, and project formulation on “no-cure, no-pay” basis: be innovative!

Biokultura Central Hungarian Association, Budapest
- Organisations need to be flexible enough to change and adapt to new circumstances: from information exchange, to organic certification, while now the challenge is to respond to new demands like supporting marketing and search for funds
- Need to strengthen the “middle cadre” in management to respond to diverse interests of different member groups, either supporting informal groups (for ex. by providing info on members, exchanges) or setting up more formal committees

Lessons learned
- Organisation is critical to get better access to resources, services and markets and be invited, heard and valued as legitimate partners in urban decision-making
- Partnerships among urban producers and other urban actors renders U(P)A more multi-functional and enables it to connect usefully with the rest of the city (food production, health care, recreational opportunities): a precondition for the longer-term survival of U(P)A
- Strategic alliances and partnerships are essential to influence public policy making
- Permanent innovation is necessary (to adapt to changing circumstances and sustain financial basis), but possible without large financial resources
- More research and support is needed to improve the functioning of existing organisations and create new ones, or affiliate poor urban producers to existing organisations.