

Ward profile
map drawing
for monitoring
UA activities
and land use
changes in
Dar Es Salaam



Petra Jacobi

Appropriate Methods

research, planning, implementation and evaluation
for Urban Agriculture

Agricultural activities within the city limits have existed since the first urban populations were established thousands of years ago. Yet only recently has urban agriculture become a systematic focus of research and development attention as its scale and importance in the urbanising world we live in become increasingly recognised.

Editorial

Urban agriculture has been recognised as a cross-sectoral issue that requires a multi-sectoral and multi-actor approach and active participation of the direct and indirect stakeholders in the planning and implementation of policies and action programmes. This requires the adaptation of the methods used in rural agricultural research and development for the specific urban conditions and to realise an innovative integration of these methods with the methods applied by urban managers and planners and other relevant disciplines.

Urban farmers and urban farming conditions differ from those in rural areas. One should ask the question whether there currently is a gap that needs to be bridged between agricultural methods oriented towards rural conditions and urban planning and management methods? The urban farming population is more heterogeneous. A proportion of the

urban farmers are former rural farmers (whose traditional technical and social knowledge may be of limited value in the urban conditions). One also encounters urban people farming out of need (the urban poor) or by choice (citizens with more resources that see in agriculture a good income earning or investment opportunity, see Fall and de Zeeuw, this issue). Whereas for rural farmers agriculture is their only occupation, for urban households agriculture may be just one of many livelihood strategies. Urban agriculture is further characterised by high levels of land tenure insecurity and space limitations. However, it has the advan-

Urban farming conditions differ from rural areas

tages of being close to markets and having access to resources (including urban wastes and waste water) not available to their rural counterparts (Campilan et al., Martin et al. in this issue).

Rapid change is characteristic of many urban environments hence there is a need for practical methodologies capable of capturing ongoing trends in intra-

René van Veenhuizen
Gordon Prain, CIP-SIUPA
Henk de Zeeuw, ETC- RUAF

urban and periurban agriculture as well as the dynamics of the urban environment at different levels of influence (intra-household, group/neighbourhood, city) urban agriculture. Another difference between rural and urban farming is the more complex relations between a wider range of stakeholders operating at different levels in the urban setting.

Understanding the variety and dynamism of livelihood strategies and farming styles is a prerequisite for improving agriculture in the city, how city governments can incorporate and support agriculture, whilst addressing potentially conflicting interests and responsibilities. Appropriate methods to aid both these requirements are certainly necessary and that perceived need lay behind the workshop on which this UA-Magazine is based.

THE RUAF-SIUPA WORKSHOP IN NAIROBI

In view of the above The Resource Centre on Urban Agriculture and Forestry (ETC-RUAF) and the CGIAR Strategic Initiative on Urban and Periurban Agriculture (SIUPA) took the initiative to organise an

Understanding how city governments can support and incorporate agriculture

expert workshop “Appropriate Methodologies for Urban Agriculture”. Discussion on methodological development for urban agriculture was divided into six key thematic areas:

- 1) Situation analysis in urban agriculture
- 2) Policy development and action planning in urban agriculture
- 3) Land use planning that integrates urban agriculture
- 4) Participatory technology development and dissemination in urban agriculture

The objectives of the Nairobi workshop were:

- ❖ To bring together, exchange and discuss field experiences within a variety of methodologies related to (intra- and peri-) urban agriculture research, policy formulation and planning, implementation and monitoring/evaluation.
- ❖ To assess the appropriateness of the methodologies actually in use in UPA-activities and to identify adaptations needed.
- ❖ To identify additional methods for participatory, inter-institutional and inter-disciplinary research, planning, etc. that are used with success in other areas of work and could be of importance for UPA.
- ❖ To suggest improvements in the approach, methods and instruments used in UPA and to indicate ways to introduce such improvements.



E-MAIL CONFERENCE

From 14 to 16 February ETC-RUAF and CIP-SIUPA will organise a Conference by Email on the subject of “Appropriate Methods for Urban Agriculture, for Research, Policy Development, Planning, Implementation and Evaluation”.

The topic (key) papers and a selection of the case studies, mostly shortened version, are given in this Magazine. The longer versions and the other papers can be downloaded from www.ruaf.org/conference. For more information on the conference, see the back side of this magazine.

- 5) Evaluation and monitoring of policies and interventions in urban agriculture.
- 6) Enterprise development and marketing in urban agriculture

This issue of the *Urban Agriculture Magazine* contains the synthesis papers produced by the six topic co-ordinators and selected contributions submitted to the editor and written for the workshop. Nearly all fifty papers that were produced in the context of this Workshop are available on the RUAF website.

Inevitably the thematic areas have overlaps and these became apparent in the papers and during the discussions. This was not perceived as a problem, rather it resulted in an enrichment of particular thematic areas, as a wider range of different experiences – use of situation analysis for example in the assessment of technological or market needs – helps to pool a larger number of methods. Neither the workshop nor this issue of the *UA-Magazine* claim to give a comprehensive coverage of all the methods that can be of use in research into, and further development of, urban agriculture. The discussions in Nairobi and this Magazine form the basis of an E-mail conference (see the back side of this Magazine).

ADAPTING METHODS TO THE URBAN SETTING

Most authors agree that the urban setting does indeed require adaptations of existing methods, and/or the development of new ones. Learning from experiences existing within the field of urban agriculture as well as from experiences in related fields (like the Agenda 21 methodology, Healthy Cities approach, up to date Urban Planning Approaches, Participative Research and Extension Approaches, Farmer Field Schools, or Participatory Natural Resource Management) is of prime importance.

Martin et al. argue in this issue that the definition and use of concepts, needs attention: the terms ‘urban’, ‘periurban’ and ‘rural’ agriculture are sometimes used as broad descriptions of a continuum and sometimes as discrete categories. Conceptual clarity is especially important as urban agriculture is marked by the diversity of actors and plurality of countries involved. Similarly, it was found important to clarify basic assumptions underlying particular methods. This was particularly clear in the case of methods applied to situation analysis.

Among new paradigms developed over the last few years, which seem likely to be very important for application to urban agriculture is the concept of livelihoods. This is used to clarify the diverse ways individual and household assets and capacities are deployed in different spatial, temporal and institutional contexts and the implications of this for different kinds of development interventions (Vazquez and Anderson, page 4). Other fruitful methodological approaches include studies which have looked at eco-

IN THIS ISSUE

conomic tools to address assets without a clear monetary value (see for instance under topic 5, the paper by Henn and Henning), and approaches that focus on multifunctional land use, in which different functions to society can be combined, amongst which urban agriculture (Deelstra et al., 2001).

The participation of farm households as well as other actors involved in the production – consumption chain in research and development activities has been increasingly recognised as an important pre-condition for sustainable agricultural development. Discussions continue how-

- 1 *Appropriate Methodologies for research, planning, implementation and evaluation*
- 4 *The Contribution of Research - a Methodological Review*
- 7 *Gender Considerations for urban agriculture research*

Topic 1

- 10 *Methodologies for Situation Analysis*
- 13 *Rapid Visual Diagnosis Applied in Montevideo - a rapid, low cost, participatory methodology*
- 15 *Commercial Horticulture - appraising the potential*
- 17 *Women's Involvement in Cape Town - a social development perspective*

Topic 2

- 19 *A Framework for Facilitating Planning and Policy*
- 23 *Participatory Planning - in the city of Havana, Cuba*
- 25 *Pollution Effects on Urban Agriculture - social and economic implications in India*

Topic 3

- 27 *Technical Tools for Urban Land Use Planning*
- 29 *Actor's Interplay in Mexico City - the Compatibility Matrix applied*
- 31 *Community Resources Management - in Central Mindanao, Philippines*

Topic 4

- 33 *Appropriate Methods for Technology Development*
- 36 *The Network Approach - the Production – Consumption Chain in Senegal*
- 37 *Farmer Field Schools - an ideal method for urban agriculture*
- 38 *Identifying Priorities for Technology Development*

Topic 5

- 40 *Monitoring and Evaluation*
- 43 *Ways to Monitor and Evaluate - urban and periurban agriculture in Dar Es Salaam, Tanzania*
- 45 *Improving Food and Nutrition Security - homestead gardening in Bangladesh*
- 47 *Assessing the Socio-Economic Impact*
- 49 *The Value of Urban Agriculture - the Contingent Valuation Method applied in Havana, Cuba*

Topic 6

- 51 *Appropriate Methods for Micro Enterprise Development*
- 54 *PROVE - Small Agricultural Production Verticalization Programme*
- 56 *Quality and Quantity Demand for Vegetables - survey in a Philippine urban setting*

Accessible methods are required to foster participation

ever about the type of participation, and on effective combinations and sequencing of more participatory and more conventional methods (see for instance the paper on Tanzania on page 43). There are some interesting examples of the use of participatory approaches in analysis of urban agriculture. Despite the growing incorporation of participatory approaches in rural agriculture referred to above, their adaptation to the urban context is in the early stages, and a number of challenges remain (as described on page 33 by Fall and de Zeeuw). Accessible methods are required to foster the participation of urban agricultural producers.

Gender has been addressed in most of the projects (and is specifically addressed by Hvorka on page 7), but there may still be a lack of a systematic consideration of gender analysis in the context of urban agriculture, especially in the operationalisation of tools. Of particular importance will be the likely differences in power relations between the sexes in the urban context, the different types of social networks present and perhaps different educational opportunities.

Another important area for exploration is the development of appropriate methods for institutional co-operation in urban agriculture. Urban agriculture is a cross-sectoral issue requiring inter-institutional co-operation and co-ordination, of which some hopeful examples are available (Dubbeling in this issue). The develop-

ment of an adequate framework for participatory and multi-actor development of policy and action plans on urban agriculture will facilitate inter-institutional co-operation and improve the communication between the urban farmers and other direct stakeholders and the local decision makers, and link the different levels of analysis and intervention.

Although there is strong support for seeing urban agriculture as part of poor people's livelihood strategies capable of producing positive impacts on their quality

of life (including ecological, economic, socio-political and socio-cultural aspects) it was pointed out at the Nairobi workshop that urban agriculture also offers opportunities for economic benefits to different sectors of the population and these should not be ignored. This issue deserves further attention.

Please help continue the discussion on these and many other emergent issues by joining the Email Conference in February, or by sending your comments to the Editor.