

# Facilitating Land Access for the Copperbelt's Peri-Urban Farmers: an Interest-Based Approach

Gail Steckley (CARE Canada) and Mike Muleba (CARE Zambia)

*Paper, slightly edited by RUAF, October 2003 for the Electronic Conference.*

*Original paper presented at the Urban Poverty Conference of CARE International / Urban Insaka, February 2001*

*Henry Loongo, loongo@zamnet.zm, is the current contact person for the CULP-project.*

## 1. Introduction:

Lack of secure access to land is a significant constraint to the ability of peri-urban residents in Zambia's Copperbelt Province to realize the potential of urban agriculture as a livelihood strategy.

This paper explores CARE's role in facilitating the resolution of land disputes affecting poor peri-urban residents using an "**interest-based negotiations**" approach. The Copperbelt Urban Livelihood Project (CULP) is currently operating in seven settlements in peri urban areas of Ndola and Kalulushi districts (see figure 1). By helping farmers to organize into associations that could have a legitimate, credible voice, CULP made a real negotiation process possible. As a third party, the project then facilitated negotiations, based on identifying common interests and potential for mutual gain for both the land-owners and the peri-urban farmers.

## 2. Background to CULP and the Peri-Urban Copperbelt

Zambia is one of the most urbanized countries in Sub-Saharan Africa. The 1990 census indicated that 42% of the total population lives in urban areas. Numerous reports indicate that poverty is deepening in the country as a whole and especially in the crowded urban communities. As a result of the presence of the formerly vibrant mining sector, the Copperbelt is Zambia's most urbanized province. However, since the late 1980s, employment in the mining sector has declined dramatically. Repeated rounds of "retrenchments" have left more Copperbelt households reliant on the informal sector for their income and food production with each passing year.

CARE started the Copperbelt Urban Livelihoods Project (CULP) in the nineties to help alleviate the growing poverty in these peri-urban areas. CULP addresses household livelihood security both through immunity and household needs. It is structured along the following "lines of action":

- \*) Building Institutional Capacity and Enhancing Personal Empowerment Skills;
- \*) Community-Managed Infrastructure and Environmental Health and Sanitation;
- \*) Livelihood Improvement (Agriculture and Small Economic Activities Development (SEAD));

The strategic aim of CULP's activities is to promote the empowerment of individuals and organisations/partners by assisting them in enhancing their capacity to secure their livelihood and to improve their environments. To implement its activities, the project is structured around three sectors which are a set of linked community and household-based strategies intended to contribute towards this goal.



**Figure 1: Zambia's Copperbelt Area where CULP has been active**

CULP's baseline study was conducted in four peri-urban settlements in January 1997. It was found that agricultural production made a significant contribution to household economies, both in terms of generating cash income, and in providing subsistence food production.

Although the survey was not able to measure accurately what proportion of total food consumed, was produced by the household, the poorest households reported spending as much as 90% of their income on food. This suggests that household food production was and is a very important strategy for improving food security. The better-off households, have a highly diverse household economy, and rely on a variety of income generating businesses, and formal and informal employment as well as agricultural production.

Peri-urban farmers in Ndola and other Copperbelt towns are typical for developing country cities as described by Mougeot: "most urban farmers are low-income men and women who grow food largely for self-consumption, on small plots which they do not own, with little if any support or protection." (Mougeot, 1999). The baseline survey clearly showed that peri-urban agriculture in the Copperbelt is responding both to supply-side and to demand-side factors. For the poorer households, however, demand – the need to grow food for home consumption – is particularly pressing. Mougeot gives weakened purchasing power, retrenched public service and formal employment as the main factors that make it more difficult for poorer urban households to purchase all the food they need. This is certainly true of the Copperbelt, where years of decline in the mining sector have displaced thousands from formal employment.

In terms of access to land, The Land Tenure (1998) and the Agricultural baseline (April/May 1999) surveys commissioned by Oxfam Zambia in selected settlements in three urban centres on the Copperbelt, highlighted the following issues:

- There is land pressure in many Districts in the Copperbelt Province because people, including many urban and peri-urban dwellers, see small scale farming as a means of survival. With more and more people being retrenched from formal employment, the problem is getting worse with time;
- A problem of land tenure insecurity for those who have land and lack of access to land for those who want it exists. Many people do not have a clear idea of the land acquisition or de-gazetting process;
- Most of the farmers in the Province are actually "squatters", because they are occupying land that is not legally theirs. Most of the land occupied is Institutional (i.e. ZCCM land), large commercial farms and forests. Many charcoal burners who have turned to agricultural activities after depleting the forests originally continue to occupy these lands. Self-imposed chairmen who have little or no regard for the forest itself normally allocate these "forest farms".

### 3. The Problem: Entrenched Positions: Land-owners versus Peri- Urban “Farmers”, two cases

In each of the settlements in which CULP is operating, a portion of the residents has established informal (illegal) means to access land for farming over many years. The number of peri-urban residents who had actually secured title to land is less than 5% in most settlements – (Hansungule et al. 1998).

One of the priorities identified during participatory needs assessment exercises was to gain more secure access to land, whether through lease-hold or other agreements, or through actual issuance of title. Although most of the farmers with whom CULP was working were farming land that was outside the direct control of municipal authorities, CULP’s approach to trying to facilitate more secure land access included involving municipal, parastatal and other actors in an open negotiation process.

The following section describes two cases in which CULP has helped to facilitate the process of land acquisition for peri-urban farmers.

#### **CASE 1: ZAFFICO (*Zambia Forestry and Forest Industries Corporation*) and the peri-urban farmers of Ndola:**

ZAFFICO is among the most important landowners in the area of Ndola, holding approximately 36,000 hectares. The presence of squatters in the Copperbelt is quite rampant. Among the most affected areas is the land controlled by ZAFFICO. This has been compounded by the fact that at when the forestry company was first initiated, individuals were allocated plots of woodlot to clear and burn charcoal as payment for the job done. After clearing the land, many settled in those areas and started utilizing the land for agricultural purposes. In addition, ZAFFICO controls some land that is unsuitable plantations. Those areas have regularly been encroached by farmers, with tacit acceptance by ZAFFICO. However, population pressure has also forced farmers to enter into areas that are used for plantations. These include open compartments (after trees are cut off it takes seven years before planting seedlings there), those with small seedlings (it takes five years before crops will be affected by the tree shade). Destruction of seedlings in those compartments is costing ZAFFICO considerable time and money (investment on seedlings, labour and machinery depreciation). Apart from direct cutting of seedlings, farmers set fire to clear plots of land, putting the trees at risk. Sometimes they cut grown tree for housing and timber for making furniture.

Realising such destruction, ZAFFICO tried to give permits to some trusted individuals who were then put in charge of a number of farmers as a way of mitigating the devastating effects of uncontrolled land use. The company also established security towers to watch over the plantations and arrest those trespassing, confiscate their tools and bicycles and sometimes prosecute them. These efforts were unsuccessful, and uncontrolled use of plantation land continued to overwhelm the company’s resources. A possible alternative in some cases could have been to de-gazette the land and give some pieces to the squatters. However, this was not feasible because ZAFFICO leases the land from the forestry department under the Ministry of Environment, who in turn holds that land on behalf of the President and the state. Any de-gazetting has to be endorsed by the President.

The Forests Act CAP 311 is the main piece of legislation for setting aside land for the specific purpose of creating forests. This Act, which was under revision two years ago, provides the framework for the conservation and development of forests, which are “owned “ by the President. These forests are vested in him on behalf of the Zambian people. This means then, that the President has power and can actually give specific directives on the use of these forests. Section 8 of the Act provides for the establishment and disestablishment (de-gazetting) by the President of the Republic of Zambia.

In the last few years, perhaps due to the ever increasing need for farming land, the President has been petitioned by many to de-gazette forests. However the process for doing so is a long and complex one, perhaps to ensure that people are discouraged from quick “ fix it “ solutions to land issues which would lead to the depletion of Zambian forests. Below is the de-gazetting process obtained from the Act:

- 1) Local officials in an area prepare and submit their request for de-gazetting a particular portion of the forest to the Local Council and Local Department of Agriculture;
- 2) The Local Council studies this request, in consultation and collaboration with the Local Department of Agriculture, and then passes a Council Resolution;
- 3) This Council Resolution is then submitted to the Provincial Permanent Secretary at the Provincial Headquarters, in this case – Ndola, who studies it with the Provincial Forestry Officer;
- 4) The Council Resolution is then taken to the Department of Forestry in Lusaka who study it and also make recommendations and pass the documents over to the Ministry Permanent Secretary;
- 5) The Ministry Permanent Secretary in turn gives the documents to the Minister to study and prepare the Ministry Position;
- 6) The Ministry Position is then finally given to the President of the Republic of Zambia for action.

Until the President has issued a Statutory Instrument in connection with a particular request for de-gazetting, whatever land in question legally remains in a forest area.

Clearly, gaining access to this complex process is beyond the means of most peri-urban farmers, at least in the short term and if acting alone.

#### **CASE 2: Mindolo Farm College and the Peri-urban farmers of Kalulushi:**

In the settlement of Chibote, agricultural production is a particularly important livelihood strategy (CULP Baseline Survey, 1997). Most of those who were practicing agriculture at the time of the baseline survey were doing so on land belonging to Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Fisheries (MAFF), at the Mindolo Farm College. This land had been expropriated in 1981 from the Mindolo Ecumenical Foundation (MEF), which had owned the land from 1968 and started to operate in 1971. After nationalisation, more and more of this land was unutilised or under utilized by the Farm College. Throughout the period of nationalisation, Chibote and surrounding residents were farming in the Mindolo farmland with no opposition: the government was using it as a training school and were not utilising all the land (4000 hectares). The farmers were practicing both rainfed and irrigated (dambo) agriculture, allowing them to produce both staple crops and vegetables.

In 1997, after sixteen years of legal disputes, MEF once more took over ownership of the Farm College. Immediately after getting the land back the MEF farm manager held a meeting with the Chibote community and advised them to stop farming on the farm. The community did not resist but rather tried to persuade the farm management to give them some time. After protracted debate with the community, the institution proposed to get armed security guards to stop anyone from trespassing on the farm.

Continued meeting with the farm management revealed that they had intentions of intensifying the production and land use on the farm ("to become the bread basket of the Copperbelt"). That intensification plan left no room for further encroachments by the farmers. At this point the community vowed never to leave the farmland but to continue co-existing with MEF.

CARE started to facilitate discussions between the two parties, proposing some kind of partnership for co-existence. The proposal was to allow farmers a small portion of land in exchange for labour, given that the management had no intentions of mechanising the operations. Unfortunately, the proposal was turned down and instead security was tightened.

Seeing that no land solution was in sight for Chibote residents, the community initiated negotiations with the Kalulushi Municipal Council. Council suggested an alternative plot of land but it was not clear whether the land had been allocated to someone or whether it belonged to council, ZCCM or state. To date the records over that land are not clear and it remains unused.

In both cases, the parties involved had strong positions. In the case of the farmers, their positions were based on their basic human right to have access to adequate food. Historically, the mining sector in the Copperbelt had attracted them or their parents or grandparents to give up life in the rural areas for life in the city – or at least on its periphery. Now that the mines could no longer support them, and the ties with the rural areas were broken, they were doing what they needed to do in order to survive. It was difficult for them to negotiate, since the cost of losing all access to the land was so high – if they couldn't continue to grow food and cash crops, they really didn't know how they would feed themselves and their families. Essentially, their "BATNA" (Best Alternative to a Negotiated Agreement) (Fisher et al, 1991) was increased hunger and desperation.

In the case of the landowners, the positions were founded more on economic rights, but their positions were equally strongly held. The landowners essentially felt that there was nothing to negotiate; in their view, the other side had no rights. Patterns of fear and mistrust had evolved over the years, and little effort had been made to talk to or negotiate with the other side. Shortly before CULP became involved, incidents that verged on violence had occurred at the Farm College, and Mindolo had decided to hire armed guards to protect their land. ZAFFICO knew they had a problem, and that illegal, uncontrolled forest-land was out of control. But they believe there was no one to negotiate with who could really represent the farmers and ensure that any agreements would be respected.

#### **4. The Approach: Facilitating Interest-Based Negotiations to Secure Access to Land**

CULP assisted the farmers to establish Farmers Associations, with a legal status, leadership and organisational credibility, and in this way to gain a legitimate voice with which MEF and ZAFFICO could negotiate. The latter two parties realised that the potential now existed for the farmers to organise themselves and use the land in a controlled manner.

Roger Fisher and William Ury, in their book *Getting to Yes* (1991) outline an approach to negotiating agreement without giving in. This approach, described as "principled negotiation", is based on identifying and negotiating for *interests* rather than *positions* and is widely used in teaching conflict resolution and conflict management skills. The key steps of this approach look very similar to those used by CULP, and are:

- Separate the people from the problem.
- Focus on interests, not positions.
- Invent options for mutual gain.
- Insist on using objective criteria.

CARE's role was primarily one of helping to identify those interests, and to develop "wise" solutions that would allow them to be met. As a facilitator, we helped the parties to the negotiation to get beyond the positions they had been espousing for years. In the following the two cases will be analysed following these key steps, both in order to be able to replicate and strengthen the approach, and to teach it more explicitly to CBOs and other partners.

##### **4.1. Separate the People from the Problem**

"Negotiators are people first..." (Fisher et al, 1991).

As a more-or-less disinterested third party, CARE-CULP was able to bring the sides together. Until CULP's involvement, there was a lot of talk on both sides, but little talk to each other. By bringing the parties together, CULP ensured that each side learned more about the other's needs, and developed a shared ownership of the problem. In the case of MEF, although no agreements have yet been reached, it appears that the management is becoming more inclined to take the needs of the farmers seriously. It is becoming increasingly difficult for them to maintain their argument that they would be fully utilizing all their land once they knew the families who would be affected. Although they don't necessarily agree with the

farmers' point of view, they have begun to understand it. The idea of land that could be used to grow food instead lying idle is becoming a problem for them.

For the time being, farmers have found other arrangements at a greater distance from their homes, and at higher cost in terms of both time and, in some cases, land rental payments. Although a few individual farmers have managed to secure agreements with MEF to use small portions of land in exchange for labour, no overall agreement has yet been reached.

In the case of the negotiations with ZAFFICO, CARE-CULP introduced ZAFFICO management to trained, elected and qualified Farmer Association leaders. In this case, by bringing the parties together face-to-face, CARE helped to open a negotiation process that previously had been impossible, precisely because there were no people involved. ZAFFICO had no way to differentiate among the farmers who were using their land, and no way to identify individuals who could present the farmers with any legitimacy, or ensure that agreements made could be respected. Once they met the leaders of the farmers' associations, they had to challenge their perceptions that all the people using their land were disorganized and unreliable. Separating the people from the problem is crucial, but another important role of NGOs in land disputes may be - as in this case - bringing the *right* people together. Emotions were high and were blocking the process in Chibote. Before a negotiation process was established, Mindolo had reacted to the continued presence of the farmers on the land by hiring guards and threatening to arm them. There was a serious risk of personal injury as prominent community leaders were seen to be inciting continued use of the land in the face of Mindolo's insistence that they vacate it. CARE had to act carefully in this instance, as some of the Chibote residents who CARE had trained as community facilitators were taking the lead in trying to ensure continued land access for the community. If CARE had not taken steps to involve Mindolo and the Kalulushi Municipal Council in open negotiations, and had merely, worked with the community members and facilitators, we could have been perceived as taking sides and lost our ability to facilitate the negotiations. However, by facilitating open, multi-party discussions, CARE was able to help the people involved deal with the *problem*, rather than with the people.

#### 4.2. Focus on Interests, Not Positions

*Two sisters argue about an orange. Their positions are the same. They both want the orange. They finally compromise and get half each. One grates the peel for a pie and throws away the pulp; the other presses her half, drinks the juice and throws the peel. Was compromise the best solution? Given the positions, it appeared to be. However, a negotiation on the basis of interests could have found a better result - more juice, more peel, more pulp!*

Both cases bear some similarity to the sisters and the orange. ZAFFICO needs land to plant, grow and harvest trees. The George farmers need land to grow food. Although the farmers tended to believe that ZAFFICO did not need all their land, ZAFFICO in fact needed flexibility to ensure fallow land to plant new seedlings each year, that the land already planted with seedlings would not be burned or planted with crops that would compete with the seedlings for light and nutrients, and that land planted with larger trees would be left undisturbed. MEF intended to use all their land eventually, but at least in the short term, did not have capacity to do so. However, they were afraid to allow the farmers to farm, fearing further entrenchment of their presence.

CULP helped the different sides understand **why** one seemed to be so adamant about their position: the importance of protecting tree seedlings; the lack of alternative land in Kalulushi that is suitable for growing food; the land-owners' fear of uncontrolled use and belief that the farmers were unskilled and disrespectful of the land. This helped to surface the perceptions that the different sides had about each other.

There is no question that when the issue is access to land for poor people, their **basic human needs** are at stake. By making it more difficult for the landowners to ignore this interest, it helps to get beyond the opposed positions. The interests of the farmers become part of the problem that needs to be resolved. Making the different **interests** explicit is a crucial part of the process. The two sides may genuinely not know or understand the other's interests. In the case of ZAFFICO and the George farmers, the farmers had little understanding of the overall impact of uncontrolled cultivation of food crops on ZAFFICO's tree production. In Kalulushi, although Mindolo knew that many people had been farming the land for years, they were not fully aware of the lack of available alternatives, nor did they understand the importance of this farming to the basic needs of very poor and vulnerable households.

By talking about interests, and by presenting the fact that farmers were now organized and representative, accountable leadership, the negotiation process began **looking at new possibilities**. Previously, both ZAFFICO and Mindolo cases had been bogged down in their bad past experiences (burning of trees; uncontrolled use of land); and by perceptions (farmers never do what they say they will do; if we grant access to some, what next?). CARE helped the parties to begin looking ahead at what could be accomplished with interests in mind. They also began assessing alternatives. If things continued as they were, ZAFFICO would continue to be plagued by uncontrolled land use by unknown squatters - this was untenable for them. The alternative of negotiating with an organized group that claimed they could and would adhere to certain conditions was clearly preferable to the status quo. A similar alternative presented itself in Kalulushi.

### 4.3 Invent Options for Mutual Gain

Mutual gain follows from an understanding of each others' interests, and by looking forward at possible new solutions. Any agreement that allowed the members of the farmers' associations to secure to land for a definite period was preferable to the current, highly insecure situation. The associations could in return offer the following benefits to the landowners:

- Organized farmers protect land from encroachment by others and ensure adherence to conditions by their members;
- Farmers weed and care for land where they are farming;
- Farmers learn new techniques that can increase yield with less use of chemicals;
- Farmers improve soil through use of green manure and/or legumes (nitrogen fixer), benefiting both crops and trees;
- Mindolo doesn't need to hire guards/security.

Convincing the land-owners that mutual gain was possible was one of the key steps in this process. On the surface, they had all the power. Ideally, by having your BATNA (Best Alternative to a Negotiated Agreement) clearly in mind at the start of negotiation, one can avoid making an agreement you should reject, and be able to make the most of what strength or assets available. Again, superficially, it would appear that the farmers' really did not have alternatives to fall back on. In fact, though, in the absence of a negotiated agreement, they would most probably continue to do what they had always done: illegal use of the land, despite the edicts of the landowners. Although the cost of doing this was increasing, this was still a feasible solution: neither ZAFFICO nor Mindolo could hope to fully control illegal use of their land. Once the farmers were part of an organized Association with credible leadership, they had a new and valuable asset: their ability to offer controlled land use and thereby reduce the costs and risks to the landowners.

The role of CULP in this process was:

- \* ) Assisting the farmers to organize themselves into associations, that made agreements on controlled land use possible;
- \* ) Training the farmers in improved land use practices that would add to the fertility of the soil instead of depleting it.
- \* ) Working with the two sides to bring this opportunity for mutual gain to their attention and to convince them that agreement was a preferred alternative to no agreement.

Unfortunately, in the case of MEF, no agreement has yet been reached between the Chibote Farmers Association and the management of the Farm College, although the college has recently changed its plan from becoming "the bread basket of the Copperbelt" to focussing on providing training and skills development. They are therefore no longer planning to fully utilize the land, and have admitted that land will continue to lie unused if no other solution is found. For the time being, most of the farmers have moved elsewhere, at considerably greater distance from their homes. Only a few have secured individual agreements with MEF to farm in exchange for labour. However, thanks in large measure to the open negotiation process facilitated by CULP, the search for "options for mutual gain" continues. CULP and the

Farmers Association remain hopeful that they will be able to convince MEF – now that it is clear that they have large tracts of unused land – that controlled, responsible use is preferable to uncontrolled squatting, which is otherwise bound to result.

#### **4.4 Insist on Using Objective Criteria**

In order to ensure that the different interests of the parties are met, and to preclude fruitless arguments in the future about the extent to which they are, it is essential to agree on how to evaluate the success or failure of the agreements. Without agreement on clear indicators, ZAFFICO could easily argue that farmers are still burning and damaging trees, when in fact, those actions could be taking place on land that was not part of the agreement, and is not within the control or responsibility of the Farmers Associations. Together with the community, ZAFFICO developed the following indicators to measure success and ensure renewal of the annual leasehold agreement:

- No construction of shelters, structures or any additions of other activities not agreed upon by both parties;
- Farmers shall not remove, transfer, convert or utilise any plantation timber in the operation area(s);
- No damage to any trees by use of defective tools, ridges, and access roads is tolerated
- Farmers to dispose of debris following the stipulated means directed by the cooperation;
- Farmers nearby should put out any fire starting with a radius of 2 kms.;
- Any farmer who through negligence or carelessness damages standing trees, or access passages shall compensate the corporation and/or have the agreement terminated;
- Any farmer growing crops other than those specified (legumes, green manure, maize) shall have the crops removed, destroyed and/or have the agreement terminated without notice.

## **5. Related Issues**

These two cases show, and several recent cases underline this, that organized and accountable farmers associations can in many cases overcome lack of secure land access, which is a key constraint to the viability of peri-urban agriculture as a livelihood strategy.

The following related areas should be explicitly addressed at the same time in order to ensure that the process is as successful and replicable:

### *Ensuring full participation of women.*

This should particularly be achieved in the farmers associations, in the negotiation of land access, and in securing access to land title. Currently, Farmers Associations formed with CULP's support include over 6,000 members, of which 59% are men and 41% are women. Typically, though, women are even less able than men to negotiate the legal hurdles associated with gaining secure land access or title. Formalization of urban agriculture could lead to increasing commercialisation and subsequent dominance by men (Mougeot, 1999). Women experience greater time constraints, making it very difficult for them to travel the distance to their plots on a daily basis, and may have less access to the resources necessary to scale up to commercial production. This needs to be monitored as the Farmers Associations continue to grow and as their production practices become more sophisticated.

### *Monitoring impact of ZAFFICO conditions on farmers' productivity.*

If increased productivity (in terms of yield and income) can be measured, then there is further incentive for the farmers to respect the conditions. CULP is contributing to this process through the introduction of

various improved agricultural practices, including green manure, and gains are already apparent, but must be thoroughly documented by the Farmers Associations.

#### *Helping CBOs, Councils and others to develop interest-based negotiation skills themselves.*

There is not always a third-party able or willing to facilitate as CBOs lobby for their interests and rights. This capacity is already becoming evident among the Farmers Associations, as they have successfully undertaken negotiation with various local chiefs.

#### *Changing the policy environment.*

To this point, CULP has been promoting Urban Agriculture by helping farmers to organize themselves, to gain access to inputs and land, and to improve agricultural practices. Municipal Councils in both Ndola and Kalulushi have seen the potential benefits of organized urban agriculture, and have started to identify and allocate plots to Farmers Associations. However, this is occurring without an official policy or plan for its continuation or expansion. CULP and others NGOs or urban policy institutes could plan an important in further legitimising urban agriculture in Zambia by assisting Councils to develop such plans and policies.

#### *Taking greater advantage of “backyard gardening” opportunities.*

While land access is a key constraint to extensive agricultural production, most peri-urban settlements in the Copperbelt do provide adequate space for rainfed backyard gardening. Most residents grow small patches of maize and vegetables in close proximity to their homes. However, official Council policy still discourages the growing of maize in urban areas, and to date, CULP has not offered intensification training that would permit farmers to enhance their existing production.

## **6. Conclusion**

Throughout the developing world, urban agriculture is “a sizeable supplier of certain foodstuffs to growing urban sectors, poor and not so poor, and quite a critical factor in poor households’ nutrition (Mougeot, 1999). Reliable and secure access to land often is a major constraint to realizing the potential of urban agriculture as a livelihood strategy. Attempts by poor urban residents to gain access to land are often fraught with conflict and arguments about appropriate land use policy. Land access is a major concern for residents of the Copperbelt’s peri-urban areas, many of who rely on agriculture both to produce food for household consumption and to generate cash income for the purchase of basic necessities. Some farmers have secured access to land through informal agreements with local chiefs or private landowners. In other cases, they have “squatted” over many years on land belonging to various state or parastatal agencies. These arrangements are highly vulnerable to changing circumstances, as was evident when the GRZ returned ownership of Mindolo Farm College back to Mindolo Ecumenical Foundation.

CULP has demonstrated that NGOs can play an important role in improving security of land tenure for peri-urban farmers, by facilitating interest-based negotiations between landowners and aspiring farmers.

At least three components were crucial to the success of this process:

- *Organization of farmers* into groups with responsible leaders who could be held accountable for the actions of their membership;
- *Willingness and ability of the farmers to adopt appropriate land-use practices* that will ensure adequate protection of the land. In this case, the training that CULP provided in improving soil fertility and rational use of pesticides and other inputs greatly improved yields and reduced the depletion of soil nutrients;

- *Credibility of NGO or other third-party facilitator*, who must have a relationship of trust and respect with land-owners, responsible agencies (municipal councils, parastatals, private land-owners) and with the farmers, in order to bring the concerned parties to the table and to help them identify common interests and options for mutual gain that can lead to agreement.

## References

CARE ZAMBIA. *CULP Baseline Study*. January, 1997. Ndola, Zambia (unpublished).

FISHER, ROBERT, WILLIAM URY AND BRUCE PATTON. 1991. *Getting to Yes: Negotiating Agreement Without Giving In*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. New York, New York: Houghton Mifflin.

MOUGEOT, LUC J.A., Ph.D. 1999. *Urban Agriculture: Definition, Presence, Potential and Risks, Main Policy Challenges*, Cities Feeding People, CFP Report Series. Report 31, 1999. Ottawa, Canada: International Development Research Centre. [www.idrc.ca/cfp/rep31\\_e.html](http://www.idrc.ca/cfp/rep31_e.html).

HANSUNGULE, MICHELO, PATRICIA FEENEY AND ROBIN PALMER. *Report on Land Tenure Insecurity on the Zambian Copperbelt*. November 1998. Oxfam GB in Zambia.