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1. A facilitating framework for urban agriculture policy development and planning

1.1 The need for a facilitating framework for policy and planning

Urban Agriculture (UA) is not a new phenomenon in cities, and is more and more being considered an integral part of urban management (as a strategy for poverty alleviation, income and employment generation, and environmental management). However, only in a few cases has UA been integrated into policy-making and planning.

While prohibitive UA policies are bound to be ineffective, several constraints and risks are clearly associated with unregulated UA (for example, environmental pollution). Also, conflict, corruption and competition for scarce resources exclude those who stand to benefit most from legal UA – the urban poor. A facilitating policy and planning framework (including legislation, normative and financial aspects, and institutionalisation of processes) can promote and support UA development in the context of sustainable development (de Zeeuw et al., 2000; UMP-LAC et al., 2001).

More specifically, the LAC City Working Group on Urban Agriculture and Food Security, bringing together 40 municipalities in Latin America and the Caribbean, has recommended that UA be regarded as an urban activity, and that it be recognised, incorporated into and regulated under specific municipal policies and programmes. The municipalities urge “local governments to become strongly committed to the development of UA, mobilising existing local resources, institutionalising UA and procuring its extension at national level; and to allocate municipal budget items to the execution of UA practices”. They affirm the need for “inclusion of UA within territorial planning processes as an element for the multiple use of land and environmental protection and the development of credit and financial policies and instruments for UA, with special emphasis on the most vulnerable producers, to supplement technical assistance programs” (Quito Declaration, April 2000).

1.2 Experience with the development and implementation of a facilitating framework

This paper describes the experience of three municipalities in developing a facilitating framework for urban agriculture. The case-studies are the cities of Cuenca (Ecuador), Santiago de los Caballeros (Dominican Republic) and Dar es Salaam (Tanzania). The three cases started from different thematic entry points and have developed in very different political and institutional contexts.

---
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2. Local economic development and investment in Urban Agriculture: the case of Cuenca (Ecuador)

2.1. Background

The city of Cuenca, Ecuador (population: 350,000) has struggled over the last years with an alarming rate of emigration to Europe and the United States. The year 2000 elections consolidated a municipal political project to promote participatory citizenship and achieve economic development. Between September 2000 and August 2001, the city developed the “Strategic Investment Plan for Local Development in Cuenca” (SIP) as part of the World Bank’s City Alliance programme. SIP sought to “generate a participatory process that would identify, formulate and implement one or various strategic programmes and projects for local economic development, and that would require the reorientation, investment and combination of available local (public, private and community) or external, national, regional and international funding mechanisms”. SIP was implemented by a team of six regional advisers, which developed the methodology and particular instruments for its implementation in collaboration with the Cuenca authorities and civil society, represented by the public-private platform Cuenca Agency for Regional Development and Integration (ACUDIR). The entire process was co-ordinated by the Urban Management Programme – Regional Office for Latin America and the Caribbean (UMP-LAC/UNCHS-HABITAT).

Urban agriculture was only an informal economic activity in Cuenca until 1998, when a UA programme began to be implemented at the municipal level. The programme focuses strongly on traditional practices such as horticulture, fruit-farming and forestry. It brings together 28 organisations, which try to link their activities and make efficient use of the resources available for increasing the scale of activities and political lobbying.

2.2. Step-by-step development of SIP

SIP was implemented in five phases:

a) Initial Agreement (September 2000)

During this phase, a formal agreement for implementation of the SIP was signed between the Municipality of Cuenca, ACUDIR and UMP-LAC. The agreement specified SIP's objectives and targeted four areas for economic development: the formal economy, the informal sector, environmental management, and the role of the municipality as a motor of economic development. Gender equity and citizen participation were identified as transversal themes. The Terms of Reference for each of the actors were also developed, and a working team was formed by regional advisers and representatives of ACUDIR and the municipality.

b) Methodological design (October 2000)

During this phase, the working team members met several times to design the methodology for implementing and systematising SIP. Through discussions with ACUDIR and the municipality, the actors in each of the development areas were identified; guidelines were developed for interviewing them to determine their current activities; and proposals for further local economic development and formats for project development were elaborated.

The aim of systematisation was to facilitate monitoring of progress related to project objectives, and monitoring of activities and fieldwork. It was implemented during the field-work by the representative of the Mexican NGO COPEVI, and during the feedback process by the representative of the Ecuadorian NGO CIUDAD.

c) Field-work (October 2000)

The “field-work” included compilation of basic information on the development areas identified through field visits; a literature review; interviews with local actors; and meetings with
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2 This section is based on the paper by Andrea Carrion (UMP-LAC, Ecuador) titled “El Plan Estratégico de Inversiones: una estrategia para la planificación y la formulación de políticas. Lectura a partir del proceso desarrollado en Cuenca – Ecuador”, prepared for the October 2001 workshop in Nairobi.
institutions, local authorities, universities, private enterprises, NGOs and community-based organisations. These activities enabled the SIP partners to determine the current level of development in Cuenca, in order to identify initiatives and experiences that could be built upon, as well as to make a preliminary identification of projects to support local economic development. The capacities and expertise available for project implementation were also identified.

d) Project elaboration (November 2000- June 2001)
The fourth phase comprised the elaboration of 15 project proposals for each of the areas targeted for economic development: seven investment projects and eight municipal policy proposals and instruments.

e) Feed-back (July-August 2001)
The fifth phase comprised the formal presentation of the projects to the Cuenca authorities, the local partner institute ACUDIR, the Provincial Council, the organised private sector, and community representatives. SIP will be used as an input to the Cuenca Strategic Local Development Plan that is currently being developed.

2.3. Actors involved
- The Municipality of Cuenca (promoter of the project; logistical, technical, human and political support).
- The public-private platform ACUDIR, representing various civil society groups (played a key role in facilitating dialogue between local actors during the process).
- Other local civil society representatives involved in the process (NGOs, academic centres, women’s groups, and the private sector).
- The Urban Management Programme and its Regional Anchoring Institutes responsible for programme co-ordination, financial management, technical and methodological advice and elaboration of the final programme report.

2.4. Results
- Multisectoral UA working group established
- Municipal action plan for UA approved
- Financial allocation institutionalised.

A total of 15 projects for local economic development were elaborated and articulated with municipal strategies and intervention instruments. Among them were two projects related to UA; one for promotion of commercial urban agriculture (technical assistance, a commercialisation programme for 40 enterprises, and establishment of a credit fund); and two for employment generation through environmental services (setting up of micro-enterprises for waste collection and recycling). The projects will be financed partly through the municipalities’ own funds (US$ 70,000 has been set aside to support the UA project in 2001) partly by the actors involved and partly through external financing.

2.5. Lessons learned
The integration of regional advisers into the SIP working team enriched the programme by ensuring an international, interdisciplinary and inter-institutional team. However, working within such a diverse group requires an intensive period of preparation, prior exchange of experiences and visions, and common methodology development.

The interaction of local actors in a collective effort to define and plan strategic investment for local development requires careful management of conflicts of interest. Private enterprises, being local agents for investment, play a very important role in this process, and care should be taken to ensure that their involvement is based on the “common good” and not defence of their economic interests.
3. Territorial planning processes: the case of Santiago de los Caballeros (Dominican Republic)

3.1. Background
The last two municipal administrations have accepted that the municipality’s strategic planning process should be a participatory exercise. They have established a strategic management unit which has channelled important international support, oriented primarily towards poverty reduction programmes.

Since a large percentage (57%) of the Santiago de los Caballeros population are poor and do not have food security, the municipality decided to set up a food security programme. It contacted local institutions (NGOs, University) and international organisations (FAO, HABITAT) to analyse the situation and support the elaboration of a programme that would develop an adequate institutional structure, make more efficient use of local resources (land, organic wastes) for food production, and support the marketing and distribution of food. In this context, the Catholic University and its Centre for Urban and Regional Studies researched the practice of urban agriculture in Santiago (1999), using Geographic Information Systems (GIS) to map land areas under agriculture and identifying vacant land with agricultural potential. Through field observation and interviews, the study also collected information on production practices, actors involved, problems encountered and potential for future development.

3.2. Step-by-step development of the programme

a) General Discussion and Planning Workshops
Two workshops were held. The first was attended by the various municipal departments involved (Parks and Gardens, Public Works, Urban Planning, the Juridical Department, Community Development, and Public Relations), and the second by 10 neighbourhood groups and other civil society actors. In both workshops regional experiences with UA were shared, existing projects in Santiago discussed, and strategies for UA development identified. The role each actor could play was defined through questions and answers (What should be the principal working areas for a UA programme? What results are expected? What role could each of you play?).

b) Follow-up meetings
Follow-up meetings with representatives of the municipal departments and civil society institutions were arranged to define their role in the UA programme more precisely and identify the human and financial resources available to support such a programme. During the meetings the Parks and Gardens Department was selected to co-ordinate the UA programme and a technical support team was formed. A work-plan for both the short term (six months) and the longer term were developed under this general co-ordination.

Representatives of the University, NGOs, the private sector and communication media were invited to become part of and contribute to the process. Planning mainly involved the municipality, while the community and civil society organisations participated basically in programme implementation.

c) Formal approval of Action Plan
The action plan was formally accepted at a meeting of the municipal council. The council functions as co-ordinator and facilitator of the UA programme and will also execute various projects through the municipal departments. This will be done in close collaboration with the community and under specific co-operation agreements with other institutions and organisations.
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3 This section is based on the paper by Maria Caridad Cruz (FUNAT, Cuba) titled “La planificación participativa en la agricultura urbana: experiencias de trabajo – el caso de Santiago de los Caballeros”, prepared for the October 2001 workshop in Nairobi.
d) Implementation of activities
The activities were developed in accordance with the work-plan, basically following the logic of a territorial planning process, simultaneously with elaboration of the necessary facilitating normative framework:

1. All green, agricultural and vacant areas in the city were mapped, making use of satellite images, aerial photos, land maps and visual observations (transects), and they were classified according to their location and tenancy (public or private lands) (Urban Planning Department).
2. Several of these areas were selected to function as demonstration sites, where information and training events were held.
3. The Juridical Department developed proposals for legal use of public land areas for UA. A resolution that allowed the municipality to rent private lands and hand them over to the community for UA use under certain co-operation agreements was also elaborated. Agreements were made with private institutions (hospital, airport), defining the use of their lands for UA.
4. Areas for agricultural and ecological preservation were defined and specific management plans for river and road areas were elaborated by the Urban Planning and Parks and Gardens Departments.
5. The Planning Department also identified areas where organic waste material that could be used to produce compost was generated (markets, households, restaurants and parks). A collection system (through co-operation agreements with market directors and the Parks and Gardens Department) and composting scheme were initiated and compost plants were constructed in the municipal nursery as well as in home gardens. Training and resources (bags, construction material) were provided to the population (Parks and Gardens Department).

3.3. Actors involved
- The municipality (formal approval of action plan, monitoring of its implementation, provision of human and financial resources for its implementation, signing of co-operation agreements, co-ordination of work meetings and support in developing the normative framework).
- Urban Planning Department (land-use mapping, identification of markets and fairs)
- Parks and Gardens Department (formulation of management plans for public land areas, arrangements for transport and composting, provision of training and technical assistance)
- Juridical Department (elaboration of normative framework)
- Public Relations Department (dissemination and promotion of the UA programme and its results through publication of information materials and visuals)
- Civil society and neighbourhood groups: involvement in defining project objectives and activities; composting, production and commercialisation; management of public areas; monitoring; support)
- Media: dissemination of programme results through radio, television and press articles.

3.4 Results
- Action plan defined and formally approved
- UA recognised as legal urban land use and specific regulations and norms developed.
- Pilot projects set up (for example, demonstration gardens)
- Waste collection and recycling scheme set up and functioning
- Parks and Gardens Department designated as the co-ordinating institution
- Proposal to create a municipal department for food security under discussion.

3.5 Lessons learned
To implement a municipal urban agriculture programme, a municipality has to optimise the use of locally available human and material resources through motivation, organisation and institutional collaboration. Also, a proper financial basis has to be assured from the start, as this makes it possible to involve institutions and communities in activities without a direct economic return, such as training and promotion.
Although various regulations and norms for UA have been elaborated, UA has not been fully integrated into overall city development plans (such as the Territorial Development Plan, Strategic Development Plan, housing plans, or economic development plans). It is important to create, from the start, a Programme co-ordination unit that would be officially integrated into the municipal structure and would induce permanent incorporation of Programme activities into urban regulation and planning. Institutional and financial consolidation has to be incorporated into the Programme’s activities from the beginning to assure its continuity even after a change of government.

4. Environmental planning and management: the case of Dar es Salaam (Tanzania)\(^4\)

4.1. Background
The city of Dar es Salaam (population: 3 million) reoriented a classic master planning process to a more participatory planning approach in 1992. Previously, urban development plans were generally prepared without taking into account the real needs and aspirations of communities in particular areas. Local cultural, social and economic dynamics were often ignored. While the Dar es Salaam master plans provided a useful spatial framework to guide development and growth, their implementation was limited by a number of issues. These included inadequate institutional mechanisms to co-ordinate the various public-sector, private-sector and civil society actors involved in managing growth or investing resources; insufficient stakeholder input and contribution; and over-dependency upon rigid enforcement strategies without clear policy guidelines.

The Dar es Salaam City Council adopted a participatory planning approach called the Environmental Planning and Management Approach (EPM) in 1992 and implemented it under the umbrella of the Sustainable Dar es Salaam Project (SDP).

In contrast to traditional urban planning, EPM introduced a bottom-up process of environmental planning and management, which emphasizes participation and the building of partnerships between the city authorities and stakeholders. The approach permits stakeholders to discuss their problems, negotiate strategies and seek collective solutions to priority environmental issues of common concern. Dar es Salaam was one of nine cities to adopt and apply the EPM processes in urban planning.

Agricultural activities have grown in Dar es Salaam over the last decades, some of it in areas with a high environmental risk. Legislation limits these activities in urban areas.

4.2. Step-by-step development of EPM
The project adopted a four-stage approach to achieve its long-term and short-term objectives.

a) Preparation of City Environmental Profile (1992)
First, the Project prepared a city environmental profile highlighting the geographical, climatic and socio-economic setting, environmental problems, natural resources available to support development, and management arrangements influencing growth and development.

b) General City Consultation (1992)
In the second phase, the city's most pressing environmental issues were prioritised by public-sector, private-sector and civil society representatives during the “City Consultation”. A rapid assessment of the environmental issues was conducted, key actors were drawn in, political commitment achieved, and nine key environmental issues identified and prioritised. One of these issues was “the management of open spaces, recreational areas, hazard lands, green belts and urban agriculture potential”.
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\(^4\) This section is based on the paper by Asteria Mlambo (Sustainable Dar es Salaam Project, Dar es Salaam City Council) titled “Institutionalising urban agriculture in Dar es Salaam City through the EPM processes”, prepared for the October 2001 workshop in Nairobi.

In the third phase, a series of mini-consultations were held on each of the nine issues identified, in order to prioritise the most important problems, agree on strategies and actions, and formulate, mobilise and launch cross-sectoral and multi-institutional working groups to prepare detailed spatial, financial and institutional actions plans for each strategy. As a result of the mini-consultation, a UA Working group was formed, which designed strategies to prepare action plans for the development and management of UA in relation to recreational areas, open spaces, hazard areas and greenbelts.

During the 1993-1997 period, the working group achieved the following:

- Issues to be addressed were clarified;
- Actors whose co-operation was required were involved in the EPM process;
- Priorities were set;
- Management strategies were negotiated;
- Agreement was reached on action plans that were environmental issue-oriented (cutting across the concerns of various actors) and actor-specific (cutting across various issues);
- Demonstration projects were initiated and implemented in collaboration with various institutions;
- Progress was monitored and evaluated, and the working group’s work-plan was periodically adjusted; and
- The working group provided input to the Strategic Urban Development Plan.

d) Preparation of the Strategic Urban Development Plan for Dar es Salaam

The city’s Strategic Urban Development Plan combined and integrated the separate action plans and strategies developed by each of the thematic working groups and provided the co-ordinating mechanism to replicate successful demonstration projects throughout the city.

4.3 Actors involved

The working groups were multidisciplinary and included actors affected by the problems to be tackled, those who had created the problems and those with institutional responsibilities, tools, instruments and resources to manage the problems. Various segments of the urban population (the poor, the young, men, and women’s groups) were involved. They included:

- Village governments (especially in the peri-urban areas)
- Government ministries: Agriculture and Co-operatives; Lands and Human Settlements Development; Natural Resources, Tourism and Environment; Water, Energy and Minerals
- The Dar es Salaam City Council/ Dar es Salaam City Commission,
- Civil society groups (NGOs and CBOs) within the city and in the urban villages
- National Urban Water Authority
- Ministry of Agriculture and Co-operative Development
- Urban farmers, in relation to legislation, land tenure issues, availability or non-availability of land for UA, etc.

The Dar es Salaam City Council was the co-ordinating institution and custodian of laws and by-laws guiding operations in an urban context. Other working group members provided information and ideas from their respective localities. Differences of opinion were resolved through discussion under the guidance of the “neutral” co-ordinator. Since each participant knew that failure to address a section of the city residents would be detrimental to the entire process, conflicts were kept to a minimum.

4.4 Results

- Inclusion of UA in the Strategic Urban Development Plan
- Multisectoral UA working group established
- City action plan for UA approved and city council defined as the co-ordinating institution
- Proposals for revising municipal by-laws and regulations (some of which were approved by the national government, asBox 1 shows)
Overall, the EPM process contributed to sustainable development of the city region by:
- Strengthening the local capacity of partners to jointly plan, co-ordinate and manage environmental and development activities;
- Preparing a long-term strategic and integrated investment and urban development plan through policy formulation and implementation.

Dar es Salaam’s Environmental Planning and Management Approach has been accepted by the Ministry for Land Development and the challenge now is to replicate the EPM process in the other eight Tanzanian municipalities and assure its integration at national policy level.

4.5 Lessons learned
In the past, public participation in policy formulation and implementation was low. The EPM process has shown that communities are capable of developing their own priorities, working out solutions and arranging for implementation. Strategies that relate project support to priorities developed by the communities themselves stand a better chance of success.

Effective adaptation of the EPM process calls for new institutional relationships and compatible political and social norms. For example, managing cultivated lands in the flood-prone areas of the city should involve co-ordination between ministries (Agriculture, Lands, Natural Resources), city departments, the Environmental Council, NGOs, CBOs, and the cultivators themselves.

The EPM process in Dar es Salaam has demonstrated that, starting from an environmental management perspective, UA can be effectively integrated into urban (land use) planning. However, monitoring and evaluation are essential elements for monitoring and minimising negative impacts (for example, environmental pollution) and for informing decision-making.

Some institutional conflicts remain, mainly over issues such as the use of water and allocation of land.

5. A transversal analysis: general conceptual and methodological guidelines
A transversal analysis of the cases presents us with various methodological aspects that need to be considered when developing a facilitating policy and planning framework (see Table 1).
### Table 1 Comparison of the three case-studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASPECTS</th>
<th>CUENCA (ECUADOR)</th>
<th>SANTIAGO (DOMINICAN REP.)</th>
<th>DAR ES SALAAM (TANZANIA)</th>
<th>COMPARATIVE CONCLUSIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City Size:</td>
<td>Intermediate City 350,000 inhabitants</td>
<td>Intermediate City 500,000 inhabitants</td>
<td>Big City: 3 million inhabitants</td>
<td>Two intermediate cities and one big city (a metropolitan area)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political and Institutional Context</td>
<td>• The electoral process of the year 2000 consolidated a political project at municipal level, which was aimed at participatory citizenship and economic development. • This process was merged with a proposal from the UMP-HABITAT and Cities Alliance to develop the strategic investment plan.</td>
<td>• The last two municipal administrations have accepted that the strategic planning process should be participatory exercise. • They have established a strategic management unit, which has channelled important international support. • Priority oriented towards poverty reduction programmes</td>
<td>• Reorientation of classic master planning process to a more participatory planning approach. • City consultation on Environmental Planning and Management (1992) with international support. • Mini-consultation on urban agriculture (1995). • Creation of a UA working group at municipal level.</td>
<td>In all cases, local politics has been favourable to participatory processes, and the municipalities have looked for innovative alternatives to solve traditional urban problems, involving key actors at a local level. These local dynamics have coincided with the technical support provided through international co-operation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional Urban Agricultural Practices</td>
<td>Since 1998 an urban agriculture programme has been implemented at the municipal level. It builds strongly on traditional practices such as horticulture, fruit-farming and forestry.</td>
<td>Spontaneous urban agriculture activities can be found. These were detected and documented in a study conducted in 1999 with the help of GIS-based soil maps.</td>
<td>Over the last decades there has been a growth in agricultural activities, some in areas with a high environmental risk. Legislation limits these activities in urban areas.</td>
<td>Traditional practices and spontaneous urban agriculture are important in all the cases. The municipal programmes have provided visibility and generated awareness of the need to incorporate such activities at the planning stage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thematic Entry Point for UA Programme</td>
<td>Local economic development with a poor emphasis, into a city development strategy</td>
<td>Food security oriented to poverty reduction, into the city’s priority programmes</td>
<td>Environmental sustainability and poverty reduction, into the city planning process</td>
<td>The entry point varies, but strategies for poverty reduction are common to the three cities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Elements of the Programme Adopted</td>
<td>Motivation strategy. Directed towards city residents, to support UA and disseminate its socio-economic and environmental potential. Commercialisation strategy: Technical assistance to micro-enterprises dedicated to urban agriculture and establishment of a credit fund.</td>
<td>Land use plan: Plan for the productive use of vacant urban land, based on a map of green, agricultural and vacant areas and their classification in accordance with ownership and location. Demonstration projects: Pilot projects to promote UA on available land.</td>
<td>Demonstration projects: Pilot projects for further integration of UA into the city plans. Access to Land: Special lands designated for UA in the Strategic Development Plan. Revision of Legal Frameworks: Revision of municipal by-laws and regulations promoted</td>
<td>Different aspects were supported in the three programmes. Santiago and Dar es Salaam started with identification and assignment of land and with demonstration projects, while Cuenca supported existing projects with commercialisation and credit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholders</td>
<td>• Municipality • Urban farmers • Public-private platform (ACUDIR) • NGOs, women’s groups, universities • International agencies: UMP-LAC</td>
<td>• Municipality (various departments) • Neighbourhood groups involved in urban agriculture • NGOs, University • International agencies: FAO and HABITAT</td>
<td>• City council • Village governments • Urban farmers and CBOs • NGOs, other social groups • Various government ministries</td>
<td>In all cases, a wide spectrum of local actors are involved and the municipalities always play an important role as facilitators. Only in Dar es Salaam is there an important link with the national government.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

5 Elaborated by Fernando Patiño – Regional Office of HABITAT (Rio de Janeiro, Brazil)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASPECTS</th>
<th>CUENCA (ECUADOR)</th>
<th>SANTIAGO (DOMINICAN REP.)</th>
<th>DAR ES SALAAM (TANZANIA)</th>
<th>COMPARATIVE CONCLUSIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main Advances in Institutionalisation</strong></td>
<td>• Multisectoral UA working group established</td>
<td>• UA recognised as legal urban land use and specific regulations and norms developed.</td>
<td>• Inclusion of UA in Strategic Urban Development Plan</td>
<td>In all cases, UA was officially acknowledged and this recognition was expressed in institutional plans and commitments. The founding of inter-actor or inter-institutional working groups has been of fundamental importance. Santiago and Dar es Salaam have advanced more in the legislative and regulatory aspects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Municipal action plan for UA approved</td>
<td>• Parks and Gardens Department identified as co-ordinating institution</td>
<td>• Multi-sectoral UA working group established</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Institutionalisation of Programme fund allocation</td>
<td>• Proposal to create a municipal department for food security under discussion.</td>
<td>• City action plan for UA approved and city council defined as co-ordinating institution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Awareness-raising and Incidence Methods</strong></td>
<td>• The working group of the urban agriculture programme, consisting of 28 institutions, including NGOs, community organisations and municipal management, has been the engine of the initiative, promoting its incorporation into municipal management and legislation</td>
<td>• Support of an international expert (to update the classification and identification of available land, using maps and GIS).</td>
<td>• The Environmental Planning and Management (EPM) process, adopted since 1992 advocates dialogue and participatory city planning.</td>
<td>The diverse membership of the multi-actor bodies has been a key factor in generating awareness among institutions and communities. The motivation and/or dissemination strategies, together with the demonstration projects, are important in raising citizen and institutional awareness of UA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Community motivation and dissemination of strategy to the city residents has been one of the key pieces of the UA programme.</td>
<td>• Agricultural use of available land has been stimulated through a communication strategy (workshops, seminars, press articles, and radio and television appearances).</td>
<td>• The Inter-Sectoral Working Group was formed to develop strategies for placing urban agriculture on the city agenda. Differences of opinion were managed in a participatory way.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Demonstration projects in selected areas of the city, with the support of different actors.</td>
<td>• Demonstration projects in selected areas.</td>
<td>• Demonstration projects in selected areas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Increases in Scale</strong></td>
<td>Horizontal: increasing the number of farmers and micro-enterprises in the city and its surroundings.</td>
<td>Horizontal: increasing the number of farmers and micro-enterprises in the city and its surroundings.</td>
<td>Vertical: The on-going process to use EPM for preparing Strategic Urban Development Plans in nine municipalities is evidence of its integration at national policy level.</td>
<td>Except in Dar es Salaam, where steps are being taken for nation-wide projection of EPM, the scale increase is mainly horizontal. Vertical scale increase requires favourable political conditions in the relevant national bodies (ministries, etc.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main Constraints</strong></td>
<td>The different municipal bodies work randomly, creating several co-ordination problems. A municipal unit to take up the co-ordination more formally has yet to be established. There are no resources for better projection of the programme.</td>
<td>Despite acknowledgement of UA, the regulations developed by the municipality have not yet been integrated into several city instruments, such as the Territorial Development Plan, housing plans and economic development plans.</td>
<td>Some institutional conflicts remain, mainly over issues such as water use and land allocation. It is necessary for several ministries to acknowledge the importance and potential of UA.</td>
<td>Inter-institutional co-ordination problems and availability of resources emerge as the most important constraints to increasing scale and sustainability.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.1 Urban agriculture planning and policy require multi-themed, multilevel and multi-actor approaches

The entry point varies from city to city, but poverty reduction is common to all three. In Cuenca the thematic entry point for the UA programme was local economic development with a pro-poor emphasis as part of a city development strategy. In Santiago, food security oriented to poverty reduction guided the programme, while in Dar es Salaam environmental sustainability and poverty reduction as part of city planning process oriented the development of a UA.
programme. In all the three cases, the existence of traditional practices and spontaneous urban agriculture are important. The municipal programmes have provided visibility and generated awareness of the need to incorporate these activities at the planning stage. In all situations the city was open to participatory processes and obtained external support.

The case-studies show that, although the entry point for policy development and intervention might have been restricted to one development concept (investment versus environmental management or territorial planning), all processes ended up dealing with several concepts, such as land use management, food security systems, survival strategies (income and employment generation), environmental management (waste recycling and green spaces, among others) and participatory governance (community development and involvement). They show us that UA interacts with multiple facets of, and has the potential to diversify and strengthen strategies for, sustainable municipal development. However, for that integration to occur, information on and general awareness of the concept and role of UA are required. None of the case-studies details how this awareness-raising and lobbying process was carried out.

In all the cases, a wide spectrum of local actors are involved and the municipalities play an important role as facilitators. Even though national policies can greatly influence municipal ones, only the Dar es Salaam project is starting to have an influence at the national government level. The case-studies do not specify the roles played by the actors at various stages of the process. However, to ensure the participation and involvement of these actors, who do not necessarily share common goals and visions, municipal policy and planning interventions should be linked with specific development objectives for different urban groups. UA is expected to make a significant contribution to this, and to be based on participatory and multi-stakeholder analysis and planning processes.

5.2 A common set-up for development of a facilitating policy and planning framework

The three city programmes described above followed a similar logic and process although they were developed independently. Five distinct phases can be defined in each process, and they are summarised in Table 2. It should be understood that the process is not linear and that the various phases overlap in time.

Table 2. Main phases and activities in developing a facilitating policy and planning framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PHASES</th>
<th>ACTIVITIES/STRATEGIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Phase 1: Awareness raising and lobbying** | Preparing systematic, focused information  
Issue and city profiling  
Beginning identification of key issues  
Raising awareness and understanding  
Identifying and mobilising stakeholders  
Facilitating dialogue  
Forging partnerships and organising core consultative groups |
| **Outcomes:** fact-sheets, involvement of relevant partners, consensus on key issues leading to framework agreement. |                                                                                     |
| **Phase 2: Diagnosis and stakeholder commitment** | Building on profiling and other information  
Preparing focused and systematic overviews  
Generating enthusiasm among and co-operation between stakeholders  
Building collaboration and consensus  
Formulating agreements on priority issues and concrete responsibilities of the various actors involved, including institutional mechanisms and operational activities  
Formalising agreements and responsibilities defined through inter-actor agreements |
| **Outcomes:** focused base-line information, formal political and stakeholder commitment, strategy outlines, agreement on specific steps to be taken next |                                                                                     |
| **Phase 3: Strategy formulation and action planning** | Clarifying issues  
Identifying, elaborating and evaluating general strategies and translating them into actor- or issue-specific and time-bound targets and commitments with results that can be monitored  
Negotiating and reconciling action plans |
| **Outcomes:** agreed strategy frameworks, negotiated detailed action plans, formal approval |                                                                                     |
Confirming strategies and plans (issue oriented or actor oriented)  
Formal adoption of action plans

| Phase 4: Implementation | Designing and implementing demonstration projects  
Policy formulation  
Integrating projects and plans with strategic approaches  
Developing new financial tools |
|-------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|
| Outcomes: demonstration projects, policy formulation, new financial tools, | Developing and maintaining a monitoring process to ensure information about progress in implementation  
Using evaluation to capture experiential lessons  
On the basis of the lessons, beginning to replicate and increase the scale of activities  
Continuing with activities designed to build/embed the process in city institutions and among stakeholders |
| Phase 5: Follow-up and consolidation, institutionalisation and anchoring |---------------------------------------------------------------|
| Outcomes: continuous monitoring of process and results, evaluation of outcomes, feedback and adjustment, replication and increasing the scale of interventions, institutionalisation of the process |---------------------------------------------------------------|

a) Awareness raising and lobbying

In all three cases, the diverse membership of the multi-actor bodies has been a key factor in generating awareness among the institutions and communities.

A critical condition for improved urban governance and participatory development is local ownership and commitment, which requires consensus-building and consultation with the full range of actors involved. While the initial focus will be on key or lead stakeholders, all relevant stakeholders should ultimately be involved in the process needed for strategy formulation and implementation, including:

- Actors who are affected by, or affect, a priority issue
- Actors who possess information, resources and expertise
- Actors who control implementation instruments

It is important to start by assessing local conditions in relation to participatory processes and development in order to define the strategies for intervention by various actors. This can be done by, for example, using a municipal checklist (See Annex 1). A major challenge during this phase is to make the process truly inclusive by finding ways to identify and involve vulnerable and marginalised sectors of the population, especially the poor and women. Tools such as stakeholder analysis and gender analysis (see paper by A. Martin) can be used to respond to questions such as: Whom do we want to address? How should we address them? Who are the urban poor and socially vulnerable groups (women, migrants, elderly, indigenous people)? What interventions are needed to reach them?

None of the case-studies describes how the different stakeholders were identified or why they were selected to participate. Also, none of them seems to address/identify specific needs and problems, or operative solutions tailored to the different stakeholder groups (the community or civil society is viewed as a more or less homogeneous group). Perhaps the lack of detailed reflection on the specific target groups of the programmes explains why no emphasis is (or seems to be) given to social inclusion or gender analysis, and why the case-studies do not clarify the role of specific actors such as the private sector.

The motivation and/or dissemination strategies, together with the demonstration projects, are important in raising citizen and institutional awareness.

In Cuenca, the UA working group, consisting of 28 institutions, including NGOs, community organisations and municipal management, has been the engine of the initiative, promoting its incorporation into the municipal management and legislation.

In Santiago, lobbying was supported by situation analysis and visuals of the role and impact of UA, with the aid of of an international research expert (to update the classification and identification of land available for agriculture, using maps, databases and GIS). Other lobbying tools could include fact-sheets or policy briefs (See Annex 2). Agricultural use of land has been stimulated through a communication strategy (workshops, seminars, press articles, radio and television appearances, and personal lobbying), and demonstration projects in selected areas of the city, with the support of different actors.
In Dar es Salaam, the EPM process advocates dialogue and participatory city planning. The Inter-Sectoral Working Group was formed to develop strategies for placing urban agriculture on the city agenda. Differences of opinion were managed in a participatory way. Demonstration projects were established in selected areas.

b) Analysis and stakeholder commitment
The second phase in the participatory development of a facilitating framework is Analysis and Stakeholder Commitment. This has three main stages:

- Participatory analysis
- Building collaboration and forging consensus
- Formalising commitments

Issues are usually elaborated through the process of developing base-line studies or position papers (See Annex 3) (Santiago, Dar es Salaam), field visits and interviews (Cuenca, Dar es Salaam). The aim is to get a better idea of the current state of the thematic area under study within the local socio-economic, cultural and political-institutional context, its current impacts on urban management, the actors involved, and their roles, needs and visions. These papers or interviews are carefully structured and highly focused, specifically to highlight issues, show how they are manifested and perceived, and set the stage for reflection and debate.

With the participation of various actors (local government, civil society, community), through discussion meetings (Santiago, Cuenca) or consultations (See Annex 4) and stakeholder working group workshops (See Annex 5) (Dar es Salaam), key issues are debated, needs and visions analysed, a consensus reached on issues to be addressed and institutional arrangements to implement actions are agreed upon. Facilitation (See Annex 6) of these processes by a neutral party might be important in reaching consensus. Relationships between various actors are thus established or strengthened (additional actors might be mobilised and involved) and general elements and commitments for further action programming and co-ordination are defined and formalised through inter-actor agreements (See Annex 7).

c) Strategy formulation and action planning
In this phase the actors involved further identify, review and expand upon priority issues, evaluate various options, and elaborate approaches and activities. This is done in multi-actor platforms (Cuenca) or working groups (Dar es Salaam, Santiago). The process can be aided by further spatial, economic and social analysis.

Conflicting interests are resolved (See Annex 8), and through negotiation lead to agreement to pool resources for the co-ordinated implementation of strategies and activities, and to define responsibilities and time-lines (Action Planning, See Annex 9). This is often the most difficult stage in the process.

The results of the first phase lead to an action plan formulated by consensus. The general aim is not only to identify operative solutions to local needs and problems, but also to strengthen the capacities of local actors. The action plans are operational tools designed by local actors, identifying local or (inter)national resources for its implementation. Social and political support is sought for their implementation and validation within the system of municipal management.

Action strategies are defined and adopted in concert. Formal adoption of the action plan by local authorities (signing of agreements) is found in all three cases.

d) Implementation
The action plan represents the turning point between problem analysis and definition of strategies to solve those problems, and programming and implementation of activities. The implementation can take different forms and can include:

- Implementation of specific pilot or demonstration projects (See Annex 10) (Santiago and Dares Salaam)
- Elaboration and adoption of new (more sustainable or appropriate) technologies or facilitation of normative and legal framework/municipal policies (Santiago and Dares Salaam)
Inclusion of UA in sectoral policies
- Establishment of new financial management and fund allocation models (Cuenca)
- Development of new institutional tools that facilitate participation (Santiago, Dares Salaam)

Pilot or demonstration projects are usually small-scale, locally oriented capital investment or technical assistance projects, and are designed to demonstrate a new approach. Being small, they can be implemented rapidly, assure early visible results, and thus strengthen social and political commitment and participation.

New technologies can be tested and adapted through processes such as participatory technology development or micro-enterprise development. The participatory budgeting financial management model (See Annex 11) is concerned with developing new institutional tools that facilitate participation in decision-making and fund allocation.

In most cases, participatory progress monitoring is carried out by a steering committee or the working groups involved.

e) Follow-up and consolidation, institutionalisation and anchoring

Monitoring and evaluation are essential elements for providing a flow of systematic information feedback, which enables appropriate adjustments to be made during implementation and decision-making to be carried out on the basis of concrete information. It also facilitates the capture and synthesis of experiential lessons, especially in demonstration projects, which provides a firmer basis for replicating the process on a larger and wider scale. Monitoring should address institutional, managerial and technical issues by focusing on how to ensure participatory processes and implementation. The three cities implement monitoring through:
- multi-actor or working groups (Santiago, Dares Salaam)
- workshops or focal groups (Cuenca).

However, none of the case-studies describes the monitoring and evaluation framework in detail or defines the specific criteria or indicators used (See paper by Campilan and Dreschel).

Institutionalisation (See Annex 12) and anchoring are long-term processes of changing the ways in which things are done, of building new issues and participatory processes into procedures, norms and ideas of local stakeholders and institutions until they become routine. In all three cases, UA was officially acknowledged and this recognition was expressed in institutional plans and compromises. The establishment of inter-actor or inter-institutional working groups was of fundamental importance. Santiago and Dares Salaam achieved more progress in the legislative and regulative aspects.

In view of the risks and limitations of “project cycle and exit strategies”, long-term support is necessary to enable the various actors to implement the agreed strategies within constantly changing local economic and political contexts.

Inclusion of the processes and their results in the normative, legal and operational instruments of the cities (strategic plans, zoning plans, district development plans, etc.) would give them a much more permanent and firmer basis. It would also create support for integration of UA into other environmental, economic, social and health programmes. If UA is to be considered a permanent “urban land use” instead of a remnant of the past, its integration into land use planning (See Annex 13) is of special importance. Little is known about the spatial distribution of UA, and even less about the dynamics of agricultural land use. Agricultural land use can be included in zoning plans or given a more permanent space as mixed land use, integrated with housing or recreational functions.

Methodological tools need to be developed to achieve this integration of UA into city development plans. Facilitating frameworks should, therefore, combine policy proposals and action strategies, and provide local governments and other urban actors with practical tools for their implementation.

Increase in scale and replication capitalises and builds on what has been achieved. In the case of Dares Salaam, this process is vertical, with steps being taken for nation-wide projection of
EPM. In Cuenca and Santiago de los Caballeros, the increase in scale is mainly horizontal, with the number of farmers and micro-enterprises going up. The on-going process to use the EPM approach for preparing Strategic Urban Development Plans in nine Tanzanian municipalities is evidence of the integration of the approach at national policy level. This process requires favourable political conditions in the relevant national bodies (ministries, etc.). In all three cities, inter-institutional co-ordination problems and availability of resources emerge as the most important conditions for increase in scale.

5.3 Methods and tools
Various methods and tools can be used to implement the phases described above. Each method or tool has its specific resource (human, time and financial) requirements and its implementation depends on the context, specific programme objectives and target groups involved. Methods and tools can be applied individually or in combination (for example, a combination of conventional and participatory methods).

None of the case-studies details the methods and tools used in different situations, or relates if and how certain methods or tools were adapted to specific circumstances and the UA context. A preliminary (admittedly far from complete) list of the methods and tools identified is given in Table 3. Each method/tool is described in more detail in the annexes to this paper, and readers are invited to discuss the applicability of these methods/tools in different contexts and situations.

Table 3. Tools for policy development and action planning in urban agriculture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PHASE</th>
<th>METHODS/TOOLS</th>
<th>PURPOSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase 1: Awareness raising and lobbying</td>
<td>Municipal checklist (Annex 1)</td>
<td>To assess the local state of participatory decision-making and to customise the process accordingly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stakeholder analysis</td>
<td>To identify stakeholders and analyse their roles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gender analysis</td>
<td>To ensure equal participation of men and women in decision-making and gender-responsive strategies and actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fact-sheets, policy briefs (Annex 2)</td>
<td>To present summarised information on the existence and impact of urban agriculture in a specific situation, in order to support discussion, awareness raising and political decision-making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Situation analysis, and GIS-based mapping and quantification of land use, production, etc. (for specific tools, see Martin’s paper)</td>
<td>To provide an overview of the situation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Communication strategy: Personal lobbying; media articles/broadcasts; workshops and seminars; newsletters; exhibitions</td>
<td>To communicate to other stakeholders the importance and impact of certain issues and to stimulate their involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 2: Analysis and stakeholder commitment</td>
<td>Position paper or baseline study (Annex 3)</td>
<td>To provide an overview of the situation (for specific tools, see Martin’s paper) and to review options for focused discussions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consultations (Annex 4)</td>
<td>To promote stakeholder dialogue, consensus-building and commitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stakeholder working groups (Annex 5)</td>
<td>To create a mechanism for cross-sectoral and multi-institutional co-ordination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Needs and vision analysis (making use of specific tools such as cognitive mapping, etc.)</td>
<td>To map and visualise the needs and visions of the stakeholders involved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Facilitation (Annex 6)</td>
<td>To enhance stakeholders’ contribution and to ensure effective participation and focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inter-actor agreements (Annex 7)</td>
<td>To allow negotiated agreements between partners to be formalised and their commitments towards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from Tools for Participatory Urban Decision Making, UNCHS-HABITAT, 2001
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase 3: Strategy formulation and action planning</th>
<th>Facilitation</th>
<th>To enhance stakeholders’ contribution and to ensure effective participation and focus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conflict resolution (Annex 8)</td>
<td>To facilitate negotiations leading to consensus and/or win-win situations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action planning through, for example, programme formulation or Logical Framework approach, making use of various tools such as the problem tree, matrix ranking and cost-benefit analysis (Annex 9)</td>
<td>To translate general strategies into actor-specific and time-bound targets and commitments with results that can be monitored.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Phase 4: Implementation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demonstration projects (Annex 10)</th>
<th>To demonstrate new approaches and solutions and thus induce replication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participatory technology development (for specific tools, see Fatou’s paper)</td>
<td>To develop appropriate technologies with direct involvement of the end-users in planning, implementation and evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micro-enterprise development (for specific tools, see Holmer’s paper)</td>
<td>To develop small (agro)industries that add value to the original product (agricultural product, waste, etc.) through processing and commercialisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participatory budgeting (Annex 11)</td>
<td>To involve the population in decisions about public resource allocation and make the budget process more transparent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participatory progress monitoring (for specific tools, see paper by Campilan and Dreschel)</td>
<td>To gauge progress in service delivery and integration of the process, and to provide feedback for adjustment, improvement, increase in scale, and replication</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Phase 5: Follow-up and consolidation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participatory impact monitoring and evaluation (for specific tools, see paper by Campilan and Dreschel)</th>
<th>To assess programme success and provide the basis for better programme design and implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institutionalisation/anchoring (implying tools used in Phase 1) (Annex 12)</td>
<td>To ensure that new approaches are understood, accepted and routinely applied and practised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land use planning (implementing specific tools such as master plans, zoning, GIS) (Annex 13)</td>
<td>To provide a framework for making decisions on planning and regulation of land use</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Municipal Checklist of local conditions for participatory planning

Aim
A participatory decision-making process does not function in a vacuum; it is a political and institutional undertaking requiring certain conditions for success. The Municipal Checklist has two aims. First, it establishes the minimum political and institutional conditions required for successful participatory planning and implementation of interventions. Second, it realistically and carefully designs the scope, context and form of the participatory planning process in a way that is appropriate to the specific local situation.

The Municipal Checklist is a tool that helps the user to prepare for participatory decision-making by:
• focusing the information gathering and analysis on issues of primary concern
• helping to identify corresponding areas and types of possible intervention
• facilitating discussion and dialogue between all stakeholders to define their roles and contributions to the realisation of the planned interventions.

The use of the Municipal Checklist should lead to agreement among the stakeholders on the priority issue(s) and on the scope, content and form of the participatory decision-making process to be applied. This agreement should then be translated into actor-specific and concrete operational procedures and actions, embodied in a formal memorandum of understanding or similar instrument.

It should not be perceived as an institutional audit, but rather as a tool to support self-assessment, discussion, and collaborative engagement by the partners. Two important aspects of the application of a Municipal Checklist should be emphasised at this point. First, the aim is not to identify the ideal ground for project or process development, but (INCOMPLETE)

Indicators
A Municipal checklist includes indicators for the following key elements:

a) **Level of political will, political capacity and therefore local political “ownership”:**
• the mayor’s position and capacity in relation to the consultative process
• leadership and organisational strength of the mayor and his/her staff, including staff availability, office space, budget for operational costs, etc.
• expressed commitment to mobilising local resources for implementation of strategies through a formal memorandum of agreement signed by the mayor.

b) **Existence of Stakeholder Groups:**
• strengths and interests of social organisations and community-based organisations (CBOs)
• legitimacy and constituency of the CBOs
• level of mobilisation of social organisations in relation to priority issues
• existence of advocacy groups and organisations in relation to the priority issues
• experience of NGOs working with the local authorities

c) **Institutional conditions for operationalising stakeholder involvement:**
• local government openness to participation by the private sector and civil society organisations
• number and qualities of past and current participatory programmes
• quality of local capacity-building organisations and institutions

d) **Type and relevance of priority issue(s) and scope for improvement:**
• the scope for achieving improvement in the chosen issue(s), on the basis of a careful analysis of existing capacities and past successes or aspects of achievements.

e) **Potential for mobilising local and other resources:**
• amount of local resources (human, institutional, financial) that could be mobilised to implement action plans
• potential for mobilising national and external resources (credit, donor funds, etc.)
• potential for mobilising support from existing or modified legal/municipal framework and municipal policies

f) Existing local capacity for monitoring, and capturing and sharing experiential lessons:
• capacity and interest of local institutions in monitoring and documenting the process
• previous experience in monitoring, documenting and capturing experiential lessons.

Annex 2 Fact-sheet

Aim
The quality of decision-making depends heavily upon the quality of the information underlying the process. Problems with the quality of the available information (outdated, incomplete, unreliable, scattered among different stakeholders, not helpfully focused, etc) are the most commonly cited constraints in urban development decision-making.

A fact-sheet is a tool specifically designed to help overcome these limitations. It identifies relevant information available from various sources and assembles and organises it in a way that will support urban decision-making. A fact-sheet does this, for example, by helping to develop a better starting point for the (integrated) analysis of key issues; and facilitating the identification of actors to be involved, priority areas of intervention, existing conflicts among interested groups, existing institutional arrangements, etc.

The usefulness of a fact-sheet in participatory processes depends on the diversity of relevant stakeholders involved in the collection and interpretation of information. As the general tendency is to look to “experts” for information, emphasis needs to be given to involving a wider range of other stakeholders, including those from the private sector and the community, especially the poor. Focus or consultative groups may be established for this purpose, and the groups can later be expanded and transformed into stakeholder working groups (see Annex 5). Participatory tools for information collection, such as Rapid Appraisal, focus group discussions, and consultations, complement information from secondary data sources.

The purpose of a profile is not to generate a comprehensive and technically precise database, but to bring together in a clearly structured way the existing basic information that directly supports initial consultation and prioritisation.

A fact-sheet may be organised in several ways (depending on what is most useful to the local decision-makers): thematically, sectorally or spatially. Information should be disaggregated by gender as much as possible. A fact-sheet should be presented in a simple and accessible format and language, so that it can be understood and used by all or most of the stakeholders.

The fact-sheet will continue to be enriched and expanded as the programme progresses through strategy formulation and action planning. The principle is, “use whatever information is available; some information is better than no information; but continue updating the profile as better information is obtained”.

Preparation of a Fact-sheet
Fact-sheet preparation involves the following main activities:

Design: There are two aspects to the initial design of the fact-sheet. First is the substantive aspect, which includes determining the theme, scope and scale, as well as clarifying the analytical framework to be used and forging agreement among the key participants. Second is the organisational aspect, which includes initial identification of stakeholders and sources of information, and development of mechanisms for contacting, involving and engaging them (see stakeholder analysis).
Information Collection: Existing and readily-acquired new information is gathered through various methods (for example, Rapid Appraisal, small-scale surveys, data search, focus groups), using the skills, contacts, and linkages of the key stakeholders.

Analysis: The carefully designed framework will ensure that the information is structured into meaningful patterns focused on the topic of the fact-sheet. A variety of analytical tools can then be used to draw tentative conclusions regarding spatial patterns, evolving trends, plausible correlations, etc.

Communication: Effectively communicating the collected information to users and stakeholders is a challenge. The fact-sheet should be written in comprehensible language and in an attractive style, appealing to a wide audience while maintaining the logic and data content necessary to give force to its conclusions. To ensure this as well as to maintain close stakeholder involvement in reviewing, critiquing and enriching the fact-sheet, it should be reviewed at two intermediate stages (outline and annotated outline) before it is finalised. The final product can be made available in two versions: a summary version for wider dissemination and a full version which can be used as a working document for subsequent strategy formulation.

Annex 3 Position paper or base-line study

Aim
A position paper synthesises the viewpoints of the various stakeholders on key issues, listing main constraints and opportunities, reviewing past and on-going intervention efforts and their results, and listing the main strategies for intervention that have been identified. It also includes preliminary action proposals and an assessment of their likely impacts on living conditions and urban development, together with an examination of institutional and managerial implications.

In most cases the actions proposed are not alternatives, but a variety of overlapping and complementary strategy components. These strategy components, with associated implementation instruments, will form the basis for establishing action-oriented working groups. The best results are achieved when the position paper clearly proposes what can be done, by whom and why.

The position paper’s basic purpose is to facilitate and guide informed discussion, consensus-building, and action planning. Therefore, it has to be written so as to be easily understood by all stakeholders who participate in the consultations (see Annex 4): it should be brief, concise, well focused, and logically presented, and should avoid complicated technical argumentation.

Eventually the position paper may be split into an “issues paper” (which focuses on the situation analysis and intervention strategies) and an “institutional paper” (which focuses on the political and institutional consequences).

Preparation of a position paper
The approach to preparing a position paper should be pragmatic, and not research oriented:
• Define the issue(s) to be covered and determine the scope and level of detail required.
• Agree on main headings for the paper. The issue paper and the institutional paper will have different structures; a typical general structure for each is shown in the two boxes below.
### Issues Paper:
- Problem Statement – as viewed by different stakeholders: impacts on living conditions, future implications, current institutional arrangements
- Sub-problems that could form the basis of strategy components, and may well involve different stakeholders who need to be included in the consultations
- Statement justifying the importance given to the issue and the need to intervene
- Review of past and on-going interventions, what worked well/failed, what lessons were learned
- Summary of possible strategic interventions for discussion with key stakeholders during the consultation process; includes suggestions on who could do what and why

### Institutional Paper:
- Introduction
- Description of existing institutional framework (public/private/civil society) and how the elements interact (or don’t!)
- Strengths and weaknesses of the framework – focus on participation, co-ordination/linkages and mechanisms, overlaps/duplications/gaps.
- What characteristics should an effective institutional framework have?
- How can co-ordination mechanisms be improved?

- Ensure clear linkages between the issues paper and the supporting ‘institutional’ paper, building the institutional paper on the management ‘problems’ highlighted in the issues paper. Consolidate the examples into discussion points on the need for participation, partnerships, and improved co-ordination between stakeholders.
- The paper should present information in a structured manner, within a logical framework, and with clear arguments to provide the basis for discussion at a city consultation event, taking care to provide the background information and ideas needed to inform discussion and reach consensus and not give an ‘expert’ view or ready-made solutions.
- Conclude with clear arguments on the need to improve current decision-making mechanisms and institutional arrangements through cross-sectoral, multi-institution working groups. Give preliminary proposals on how these can be launched after the city consultation event.

## Annex 4 City consultations

### Aim/functioning
A city consultation is a participatory event bringing together key actors from the public and private sectors and civil society to identify and review urban issues of priority concern to sustainable city development. It is a tool to create better understanding of key problems; achieve agreement on priorities; identify local ‘workable’ solutions through discussion; and work out mechanisms for co-ordinated implementation, strengthening of social and political commitments and partnerships, and harnessing the will of various actors to pool resources.

By the end of a city consultation, agreements should have been reached on priority issues and forms of participation, as well as on organisational arrangements. All these agreements will be articulated and endorsed by the participants through an "Inter-actor Agreement". The city consultation will lead to the formation of cross-sectoral task groups and additional consultative processes.

A city consultation should include all key stakeholder groups (including marginalised and vulnerable ones) and should be carefully structured and facilitated to yield concrete outputs while remaining open and responsive to the stakeholders’ needs. Each of the major stakeholder groups should have ample opportunity to present their concerns, outline their perspectives and argue their case. The city consultation should promote better understanding of different perspectives and interests, and facilitate finding common ground and shared interests and willingness to develop mutually acceptable solutions.

The city consultation is not based on statutory instruments and formal administrative procedures, but instead draws its mandate and legitimacy from the expressed collective will of the participating stakeholders.
Preparation for a City Consultation
The following preparatory activities are usually undertaken to ensure a successful city consultation:

- Obtaining commitments from high-level decision-makers (to ensure political, financial and organisational support)
- Establishing and training/motivating a Consultation Organising Team
- Mobilising a facilitator/moderator and integrating the facilitation requirements (see Annex 6) into the planning of the consultation
- Identifying stakeholders and developing a list of participants
- Mobilising and briefing consultants and resource persons
- Deciding the agenda of the consultation
- Preparation of resource materials: fact-sheets (Annex 2), position papers (Annex 3), speeches, participant information packs, briefing notes, press releases, etc.
- Holding sectoral stakeholder consultations before the city consultation, to involve key groups in the preparatory activities
- Selecting discussants and preparing the agenda in detail
- Organising the key logistics: venue, dates, equipment, etc.; selection and training of the consultation secretariat (administrative and logistical support)
- Raising public awareness of the forthcoming event
- Reconfirming stakeholders’ participation, and political support and participation

Conducting a City Consultation

First Plenary
- Opening and Overview. Establishing a common understanding of context, framework, purpose and procedures of the city consultation.
- Identifying and reviewing issues of concern. Summarising the fact-sheet(s) and allowing stakeholders to identify and review the issues of concern.
- Demonstrating a methodology to discuss specific issues: how to zero in on one specific issue at a time and discuss it from the perspectives of different stakeholders.

Discussion groups
- Discussion of the issues of concern, causes and consequences of problems
- Brainstorming and discussion of potential solutions
- Reviewing institutional factors that constrain the effective management of issues
- Assessing the need to adapt and develop new participatory processes that promote better decision-making, co-ordination and implementation. This includes obtaining support for the new process from the consultation participants, and their agreement on the necessary institutional arrangements and mode of implementation.

Second Plenary
- Synthesis of outcomes of working groups
- Drawing Conclusions: agreeing on the conclusions that come out of the consultation and obtaining a broad mandate for carrying the process forward, including agreeing on monitoring arrangements.
- Closure: agreements on the results and decisions about the next steps are usually summarised in an interactor agreement (See Annex 7), which is then adopted as a formal statement of the consultation participants. This document is useful for reporting back to high-level officials and participants who were unable to attend all the sessions.

Follow-up activities
- Preparing and disseminating the consultation report
- Disseminating the inter-actor agreement summarising the relevant agreements and consensus
- Establishing the agreed monitoring arrangements
- Setting up stakeholder working groups
Annex 5 Stakeholder Working Groups

Aim
A stakeholder working group is a small consultative group consisting of core stakeholders, which has as its main task the operationalisation of agreements reached at the city consultation (see Annex 4). The working group has to analyse the key issues in more depth, develop the identified strategies further, formulate the action plans and prepare and execute demonstration projects. While doing so, the working group steadily refines and strengthens the agreements and commitments reached during the city consultation. By building up participants’ co-operation capacities and showing in practice the advantages of cross-sectoral co-operation and shared commitment to agreed common aims, the working group also provides the basis for better coordination of decisions and actions relating to cross-sectoral issues or concerns and facilitates mobilisation of resources.

The establishment and functioning of the Working Groups
a. Establishment: Working groups evolve from and build on the consultative and focus groups that were established during the preparatory phase, and on the discussion groups formed during the city consultation. Working groups are constituted by representatives of stakeholder groups and institutions and they exist as long as required for detailed elaboration of action plans (see Annex 9) and development of demonstration projects (see Annex 10). Mandate: Working groups are not independent institutions or parallel structures; they draw their legitimacy and mandate from the participating institutions and the commitments made during the city consultation, which are outlined in the draft “urban pact”.

b. Size and Composition: Experience has shown that a working group should be of a size that does not constrain its work and enables constructive discussion – usually around 10-12 members. Larger membership diminishes the ability of individuals to interact, function as a team, and agree on a suitable time for meetings. The key elements for working group effectiveness are composition and level of representation. Exclusion of important stakeholders or failure to attract representatives of the proper level of competence and authority will quickly undermine the effectiveness of the group. The working group approach is flexible and can readily accommodate changes; for example, creating sub-groups for emerging sub-issues and their components, adjusting size, modifying composition of members, etc.

c. Support to Working Groups: To perform effectively, working groups need different types of support. These include moderation of meetings, training in facilitation, mediation and conflict resolution, guidance in action planning and project development, and ad hoc specialised technical advisory services.

Annex 6 Facilitation

Aim/functioning
A participatory process brings together diverse groups of stakeholders and uses mechanisms such as consultative groups, working or task groups, and city consultations to facilitate and maintain the sharing of views and information, dialogue and exchange, negotiation on strategies and actions, and consensus-building. But these desirable results are not achieved simply by stakeholders’ coming together. The various participatory mechanisms succeed only when they are properly facilitated: structured, focused, guided and supported.

Good facilitation helps to create conditions that encourage diverse participants to freely interact on a basis of mutual respect and shared concerns, with everyone being able to participate actively in discussions and problem solving. Many stakeholders (especially the poor and marginalised groups) are unaccustomed to meetings and public events and may be reluctant to participate actively. Nonetheless, every stakeholder has legitimate interests to express, protect and negotiate, as well as important information to contribute. Good facilitation overcomes barriers and creates the non-threatening and less-formal environment needed to foster common understanding and reach consensus.
Good facilitation also ensures that consultations and working group meetings are clearly focused, logically structured in relation to the objectives, and organised in a way that will maximise constructive participation by all the stakeholders. Thus, it ensures that they are effective and produce clear outputs.

Facilitation can be applied at many levels, from small-group work to complex large-scale city consultations. In all cases, however, an experienced facilitator needs to be involved, either to organise and run the event (as in a city consultation) or to train and guide small-group leaders (e.g. working group co-ordinators) in how to organise and run discussions. The facilitator should ideally combine good expertise in facilitation with sound knowledge of the topic.

**Facilitation at work**
A number of key points about facilitation can be summarised as follows:

- Define the objectives of meetings or other events clearly, in terms of both outputs (results) and processes (how the results are achieved).
- Apply simple but effective visualisation and moderation techniques; for instance, brainstorming visualisation techniques such as the card system are often quite helpful in generating and organising ideas in a participatory way. The discussion/meeting facilitator must listen carefully to all contributors and capture or extract ideas, particularly when they are not well articulated.
- Prepare a generalised logical structure for the discussion to focus contributions in a way that leads to concrete outcomes. Outline the structure at the beginning of the event.
- Create a pleasant and informal atmosphere that encourages free communication and friendly interaction between participants. Carefully avoid encouraging any hierarchical relations or dynamics; for example, do not put high-ranking persons in a chairing or leadership position, use "neutral" moderators or facilitators instead.
- Provoke and encourage people to talk and contribute by providing positive feedback and emotional support when necessary (especially to individuals who are reticent about speaking out), which can be emulated by participants. At the same time, take polite but firm steps to prevent anyone from dominating the proceedings.
- Be alert for defensive, hostile or argumentative tendencies and take steps to deflect these into more positive and constructive dialogue.
- Use tools such as the Logical Framework (LogFrame) Analysis to develop project concepts (see Annex 9 - Action Planning).
- Consolidate results progressively through stepwise merging and allow consensus to develop around key conclusions. This can be done by gradually setting aside duplications of ideas or ideas that are not clearly expressed. However, an attempt should be made to rephrase foggy ideas first to make them clearer. Once the ideas have been pared down, highlight the ones that capture the central focus and confirm the agreement of the participants on the final outcome(s) of the activity.
- As part of the event’s closure, generate concrete commitment from participants on specific actions to be taken after the meeting or consultation. Participants should always leave with a clear understanding of what is to happen next.

**Annex 7 Inter-actor Agreement**

**Aim/Functioning**
The inter-actor agreement is a document that summarises and formalises the agreements reached and commitments made by the partners during the city consultation process. The inter-actor agreement articulates the vision, priorities for action, objectives and proposed activities agreed by the stakeholders, as well as the institutional framework and communication structure to support implementation of the agreement, and the human, technical and financial resource commitments of each partner.

The agreement also expresses the willingness of the partners to work together in a participatory framework. As this process is necessarily continuous, revision of the inter-actor agreement can be negotiated as and when significant institutional, economic, social or environmental changes occur.
Preparation of the Inter-actor Agreement
The following measures are necessary to develop an effective inter-actor agreement at the end of a city consultation (or similar participatory event):

- The consultation event needs to be carefully structured so that all the essential ingredients of the inter-actor agreement can be easily drawn from the consultation results.
- At the end of the consultation, a "neutral" person/facilitator should be appointed to draft an inter-actor agreement reflecting the agreements reached.
- To verify that the draft inter-actor agreement reflects and respects the commitments made during the consultation, it is reviewed by a small group representing the major stakeholders.
- The inter-actor agreement is approved, signed, or minuted at the next full meeting of the municipal council. This usually happens less than three months after the end of the city consultation.
- The inter-actor agreement is usually taken to the municipal council for approval in order to confirm the city's commitment to the formulation and implementation phase of the programme.
- The inter-actor agreement takes effect immediately after approval.
- After a period specified in the agreement, the achievements are reviewed through a progress report.

### Typical Outline of an Inter-actor Agreement

#### 1 Preamble
- Participants in this meeting recommend this Interactor Agreement for approval by the Municipal Council.
- Key events which preceded this meeting (e.g. earlier consultation decisions).

#### 2 Mandates
- Recall formal mandates and agreements, starting from the international level and going to the local level (e.g. Agenda 21, Habitat Agenda, national poverty reduction plan, local development plan, local by-laws).

#### 3 Fundamental principles
- Describe potentials and constraints relating to the development of the city (spatial, social, economic).
- Take note of on-going initiatives (e.g. investment plans, new policies).
- Express a shared vision of the future (e.g. how do we want our city to be like in 2015?).

#### 4 Commitment package
- Specify the measures agreed upon, according to thematic categories (e.g. undertaking a survey, demonstrating a technology, revising legislation). This is the largest section of the Inter-actor Agreement.
- Specify communication mechanisms (more mini-consultations; awareness campaign; relations with technical-political offices).
- Make institutional proposals (e.g. advisory board, working groups).

#### 5 Resources
- List partners' commitments to contribute resources (e.g. human, technical, information, financial).
- Describe intention to mobilise resources at different levels (e.g. rationalise municipal revenues, approach external support agencies).

#### 6 Monitoring and evaluation
- Specify timing and modalities for reviewing agreements (e.g. frequency of review meetings, need to produce new version of Inter-actor Agreement).

#### 7 Approval
- Date and signatures of key partners (on behalf of the consultation group).
Annex 8
Conflict resolution

Aim/functioning
In participatory planning processes, conflicting or competing interests should be accommodated and brought to a consensus through which co-operative action can be taken. For instance, issues related to land use or resource use tend to generate disputes between competing interests. Conflict management is a tool used in the participatory process when a balance must be struck between competing interests, especially when choices have to be made regarding strategic options.

The basic aim of constructive conflict management is to seek lasting resolutions that create a balance between the various stakeholders in terms of costs and benefits resulting from the interventions. Conflict management seeks to convert conflicts of interest into constructive cooperation; if properly managed, conflicts can be catalysts to achieving more sustainable means of development through consensus-building and joint action.

The design of a conflict resolution strategy
When designing a conflict resolution strategy, the root of the conflict, as well as the roles of the various players and influence of power relations within the specific cultural context, need to be analysed. Conflict management includes:

- holding preliminary conversations to build trust and understanding
- deepening those conversations to identify and define the issues
- turning the issues inside-out, upside-down, redefining and reframing them to better reflect reality from different perspectives
- engaging in mutual problem solving
- agreeing on actions that help all parties meet their needs and preserve their dignity
- following up to ensure that the expected results have been achieved.

Well-established methods for managing conflict include:

- active listening.
- constructive dialogue
- negotiation
- mediation, and
- (re)conciliation.

When selecting a method, particular attention needs to be paid to its cultural aspects, and especially to protecting the interests of vulnerable groups.

Annex 9 Action Planning

Aim/functioning
Action planning is, perhaps, the most important tool, since it links planning to implementation and hence to the actual improvement of living conditions. The action plan translates a broadly agreed set of objectives and strategies into concrete actions. It defines the necessary activities and the responsible actors. It specifies what should be done, where, by whom, when and how, and the required contribution of resources, along with a monitoring system for overseeing the process and measuring the outcomes and impacts.

The action planning process requires constant detailed negotiation between the various participants in the working groups, to reach agreement on the inputs necessary for implementing an agreed set of actions. This, in turn, requires that working group representatives inform, advocate, negotiate with, and secure commitments from their respective institutions. These commitments are often formalised in inter-organisational memoranda of understanding.
Preparation of an action plan

\textbf{a. Considering alternative courses of action:}\nAction planning begins with consideration of alternative courses of action (individually and in combination), their assessment in relation to the agreed strategies, discussion of their relative costs and benefits, and evaluation of their feasibility and suitability. In the end, action planning is about finding the right mix of interventions, as there is seldom, if ever, one single "best" option. Tools such as the ZOPP technique, the Logical Framework approach, or the MetaPlan have been found useful in such planning exercises (see summary descriptions, below).

\textbf{b. Determining the tasks and the respective actors involved:}\nHere, the working group needs to disaggregate strategy components into specific and logically coherent activities, and for each activity to identify what needs to be done, by whom, and with what resources. Many cities have found it useful at this point to undertake new inventories of stakeholders, available resources, and potential implementation instruments, in order to better assess who might offer what towards implementation of the action plan.

\textbf{c. Determining the required resources:}\nProper costing of the activities (in terms of finance and other scarce inputs) and then budgeting of the commitments made by various stakeholders to provide resources is a central element of action planning.

\textbf{d. Negotiating the time frames:}\nThis is to ensure that the activities, together with the necessary financial and other resource inputs, are properly co-ordinated over specific time frames and also suitably aligned with or incorporated into the work programmes and annual budgets of participating institutions.

\textbf{e. Identifying gaps and weak linkages:}\nThe action plan should identify weak linkages, resource gaps, areas of uncertainty, etc., and show how these are addressed. Such gaps may include:
- tasks for which no clear 'lead' actor is identified;
- financial costs for which a funding source could not be identified;
- other resource requirements that could not be mobilised;
- capacity limitations of actors.

\textbf{f. Reconfirming commitments:}\nThe essential action plan commitments made by the participating stakeholders need to be formalised through appropriate tools such as:
- Memorandum of understanding or inter-actor agreement
- Action plan workshop or launch events
- Sectoral work programmes and budgets.

\textbf{g. Agreeing on co-ordination mechanisms:}\nBecause action plans often involve multiple actors whose contributions are operationally linked, specific mechanisms for co-ordination must be agreed and put in place.

\textbf{h. Agreeing on indicators and monitoring mechanisms:}\nThe co-operating stakeholders also need to agree on measurable indicators (for both inputs and results/outputs) and monitoring mechanisms that provide an on-going overview of the action plan implementation process, enabling feed-back for adjustments as necessary.

\section*{Annex 10 Demonstration projects}
\textbf{Aim}\nA demonstration project is a relatively self-contained small-scale capital investment or technical assistance project, the purpose of which is to "demonstrate" a particular approach. The project is limited in scope, duration and geographical area so that planning, financing and implementation are easier and quicker than for full-size projects. The small size enables "demonstration" benefits to be reaped quickly and reduces the risks and management burdens
of implementation. Small geographical areas are preferred because the impacts of the project can then be identified more readily.

A demonstration project can be implemented at any time within the process, but normally it is undertaken at the beginning of the implementation phase of a participatory process, in order to show in practice how a specific type of problem can be addressed in a new or different way that can inspire and further catalyse change.

Demonstration projects are effective mechanisms for forging partnerships between the public sector, private sector and (especially) the community; developing new ways of working together; learning by doing; and generating visible results on the ground. By pooling their resources, stakeholders discover advantages and latent capacities for real change.

Demonstration projects provide ample opportunity for learning from experience. Such first-hand experience is especially important in situations where social processes, behavioural changes and institutional reforms are the keys to success. The precondition for learning from demonstration projects is that they have to be designed as an experiment, with clearly defined experimental variables that will be monitored consistently so that the experiential lessons can be properly captured and documented.

When projects are consciously designed to demonstrate new and better approaches and solutions, they provide a sound basis for replication and increase in scale. Because demonstration projects are small in scale and short-term in implementation, lessons can readily be drawn. Such information can be used to improve weak aspects in the locally tested approach or solution and be used as a sound basis for replication and increase in scale.

**Preparation of demonstration projects**

*a. Design*

A key challenge in designing a demonstration project is to ensure that it reflects the above-mentioned principles. Many cities have found it useful to set guidelines for the formulation of demonstration projects, including the following:

- **Thematic area:** should be related to priority concerns.
- **Geographical spread and focus:** preference for small, well-defined areas.
- **Scale and project cycle:** preference for small-scale actions and a short project cycle.
- **Beneficiaries:** focus on poverty reduction and/or amelioration of living conditions of the poor.
- **Local ownership:** manifested by local partner inputs and strong participation of stakeholders in project formulation and implementation.
- **Sustainability:** substantiated by built-in institutional arrangements to ensure proper management of project outputs and effective delivery of services resulting from the project.
- **Indicators:** to monitor and measure project performance and impact.

*b. Financing*

Demonstration projects can be financed through a variety of sources, perhaps catalysed through seed capital, leveraged by small grants or cost-shared through partnership arrangements. The way in which demonstration projects are financed often has implications for their sustainability and for the feasibility of increasing scale and replication.

*c. Monitoring*

Demonstration projects must be properly monitored. An effective monitoring mechanism, using clear and readily measured indicators, has to be put in place from the inception of the project to capture and synthesise experiential lessons. The "pre-project" situation should be carefully documented to provide a sound base-line.
Annex 11 Participatory budgeting

Aim
Participatory budgeting is an innovative management practice which aims to involve the population in decisions about public resource allocation, making city management more democratic and making the budgeting process more transparent. Participatory budgeting helps to decentralise public investments, focus the city's priorities towards the neediest communities, and overcome clientelism.

This practice has also shown itself to be quite an efficient instrument for making fiscal administration more effective and municipal investments more productive. Through the formation of citizens' commissions to follow the progress of public works, the participatory budgeting process becomes an efficient mechanism of inspection and supervision of these works, making the process transparent and reducing the possibility of illegal practices.

Most of the resources included in the participatory budgeting process come from the municipality, although other partners add resources to those provided by the municipality. Different entities, including NGOs, unions, community associations and clubs, should be involved in the plenary assemblies and meetings to discuss the city budget. Researchers with a specialisation in political science and administration also help to improve implementation.

Annex 12 Institutionalisation

Aim
Institutionalisation is about building the participatory decision-making processes into the normal "way of doing things". Many individual examples of good practice have been successful in isolation but remain "project islands" with little, or no wider, or lasting effects, for the simple reason that they have not been integrated into the institutional system and have not changed the normal way of doing things.

The changes needed in the "normal way of doing things" take time to be understood, accepted, and routinely applied. That demands steady, progressive, gradual changes in people's understanding and acceptance of the principles of participatory decision-making and corresponding adaptations in the institutional structure and culture.

The purpose of the institutionalisation tool is to bring this long-term perspective into sharp focus. Its basic approach is to build incrementally upon achievements (for example, through city consultation, working groups, a demonstration project, etc.) and turn these into familiar and repeatable day-to-day practices.

Key elements of institutionalisation

a. What to institutionalise
The principles of participatory decision-making. These principles have to be understood, accepted and integrated into attitudes, behaviour, and routine institutional procedures. These fundamental principles include: stakeholder involvement as integral to decision-making; the importance of focusing on connectivity between issues, sectors and institutions; shifting from sectorally based planning to an overriding concern with cross-cutting issues and with establishment of strategic planning and management founded upon co-operation and collaboration around issues.

Capacities and functions: These are the technical capacities and expertise that are built up through the participatory decision-making process, and which support activities within the different phases (for example, information collection, or issue identification and clarification in phase one). There are specialised capacities and functions that allow different actors to collaborate more effectively, complementing each other's capabilities and roles, and system-
wide functions and general capacities that are needed by all or most of the participating stakeholders.

**The products of the decision-making process:** These are the concrete outputs generated during the process, including issue-specific strategies, action plans, investment project profiles and proposals, mobilised funds for implementation, implemented demonstration projects, articulated development principles and ‘rules’, etc.

**b. How to institutionalise**
The scope, pace and nature of institutionalisation in a given city will be shaped by local factors, but in general the following steps are likely to be useful:

- Strengthening existing institutional structures in order to improve their effectiveness in planning, management, and co-ordination between different sectors and actors; when necessary, creating new institutions to accommodate special requirements – both technical and managerial – not covered by existing institutions;
- Changing or adjusting mandates of existing institutions in order to integrate new functions and roles;
- Identifying and tasking anchor institutions to take the lead and provide a home base for particular activities or phases;
- Linking to established strategic policy instruments such as annual budgeting, human resource allocation, sectoral work programming, etc.;
- Developing skills necessary to support and routinely apply the process (for example, information collection, negotiation, facilitation, strategy formulation, action planning, project management, etc.);
- Modifying legal and administrative frameworks to enable a procedural framework for smooth and effective functioning of institutions;
- Providing funds to support expenditure and equipment for capacity building and sustaining the framework, primarily through public budgetary provisions or allocations;
- Maintaining knowledge support and a learning process (for example, by documenting and evaluating experiential lessons and building collaboration with local research or consulting establishments).