

# A Critical Review of Recent Policy Documents on Urban Agriculture

In a growing number of cities, local governments have recognised the importance of urban agriculture and are designing new policies related to urban agriculture or are reformulating existing ones. In this article the authors discuss some requirements for effective policy and subsequently use these criteria to critically review some of the policies on urban agriculture that have been drawn up recently<sup>(1)</sup>. It is hoped that the reader will derive some lessons that may be of help to develop effective policies on urban agriculture in other cities.

**A** policy can be described as a **course of action** adopted by government to induce certain **changes** in the decisions and behaviour of actors in that society in order to achieve certain **goals**. Such a definition makes clear from the onset that a policy is not just a white paper or a bye law, but a strategy to realise certain changes in the local society. In this text we will use the word policy to demarcate both the policy strategy and the policy document.

In our view, a well-defined policy<sup>(2)</sup> includes the following:

1. A short description of the **policy formulation process** and the actors involved in that process.
2. A **concise analysis of the existing situation regarding urban agriculture in the city**, e.g. its presence and participation, various types of urban agriculture and their constraints and opportunities, actual and potential positive and negative impacts.
3. A clear **vision regarding the desired development of urban agriculture**. This entails the functions one expects urban agriculture to play in the realisation of the city's strategic development plan and the Millennium Development Goals or the kind of developments in urban agriculture that will be supported or conditioned.
4. Well-defined **objectives** (with

- quantified targets for the expected results in a certain time period), **target groups** (whose behaviour and decisions are to be influenced) and **beneficiaries** (who are intended to benefit from this policy).
5. A well-selected **mix of policy measures** and **instruments** to realise these objectives.
6. A well-defined **institutional framework** and **sources of financing** for the operationalisation, implementation and monitoring of the policy.

The policy document(s) should also include a concise explanation of all terms used in the document in order to enhance clarity and prevent multiple interpretations and ambiguity.

Subsequently, such a well-defined policy in its operation should include and lead to:

7. Effective **operational planning and implementation of the policy measures**

8. **Periodic review and adaptation of the policy** based on the experiences gained during implementation of the policy (only in practice does one find out what policy measures work well and what others are less effective).

## Effective policy design is not possible without a clear vision on the longer-term development of urban agriculture

Elements 1-3 are sometimes referred to as a conceptual and contextual framework, whereas elements 4, 5 and 6 form the policy itself, which might be presented in the same or a separate document.

The operationalisation of the policy (preparation of specific bye laws and ordinances, design of projects, etc) is most often presented in various separate



Petra Jacobi, UVPP

Ward Profile Map Drawing for monitoring activities related to urban agriculture

Joanna Wilbers and Henk de Zeeuw  
ETC-Urban Agriculture  
✉ [j.wilbers@etcnl.nl](mailto:j.wilbers@etcnl.nl)

Imagen Educativa



**Simple Hydroponics at a school in Peru**

documents. In the remainder of this article we will discuss each of these requirements one by one and use them to review the above-mentioned recently formulated policies on urban agriculture.

**POLICY FORMULATION: WHO PARTICIPATED?**

Providing clarity about how the policy came into being and what actors participated in its formulation is recommendable. Direct involvement of the urban farmers themselves and other intended beneficiaries of this policy in its formulation will greatly enhance its legitimacy and acceptability. Furthermore, direct involvement of

Marielle Dubbeling



**Mayor of Quito signing inter-actor agreement on UA**

relevant governmental agencies, civil society organisations, intended beneficiaries and other local stakeholders in policy implementation will enhance the likelihood of its success and prevent inconsistencies from developing between different policy areas and instruments. The article by Dubbeling in this issue discusses important lessons learnt regarding the process of participatory multi-stakeholder policy formulation on urban agriculture.

Some of the policy documents that were reviewed mention how the policy was formulated and who participated in this process (e.g. those of Rosario, Gobernador Valadares, Cuba national guidelines, Kampala). In other documents

this is not mentioned, but from other sources we know that in many of these cases multi-stakeholder meetings were held and/or other methods were implemented to involve the beneficiaries and other actors in the policy formulation process (e.g. the so-called Food Policy Council in Vancouver; see the article by Mendes in this issue).

**SITUATION ANALYSIS: WHAT ARE THE KEY PROBLEMS AND OPPORTUNITIES?**

In the past, cities tended to define urban agriculture as a problem (it was perceived as a nuisance and a source of health and environmental risks), often leading to restrictive policies. Nowadays, and in modern planning, the important potentials of urban agriculture receive policy attention and it is increasingly recognised that prohibiting urban agriculture is not the most effective way to reduce the associated risks. More attention is thus given to the identification of effective ways to facilitate the opportunities and overcome the constraints facing urban agriculture and thus to support development of sustainable and safe urban agriculture.

An effective policy should include a clear analysis of the situation regarding urban agriculture in the city, preferably based on a participatory diagnosis, identifying main constraints and opportunities for the development of sustainable types of urban agriculture and a selection or prioritisation of the issues that will be attended by the urban agriculture policy. The situation analysis should also include a critical analysis of existing policies and regulations regarding urban agriculture and an analysis of the actual and potential contributions of various relevant governmental, private and civil society organisations in the city for the development of sustainable urban agriculture. This is done in those cities in which RUAFF-CFF operates (see this issue).

Only some of the reviewed policy documents include a section explaining what problems and opportunities related to urban agriculture the policy seeks to address (Cuba, Botswana, Rosario, Cape Town, Bulawayo and Montreal). Such a 'problems-and-opportunities' statement also facilitates impact monitoring and future revision of a policy.

**VISION: THE ROLE OF URBAN AGRICULTURE IN SUSTAINABLE CITY DEVELOPMENT**

Effective policy design is not possible without a clear vision on the longer-term development of urban agriculture, what kinds of urban agriculture one would like to support and what the ultimate objectives are. Such a vision preferably should be created at the onset of the process and through interaction between all main stakeholders in urban agriculture: local government departments, relevant governmental organisations, farmers' groups, community organisations, etc. (see the article by Dubbeling in this issue).

Cabannes and Dubbeling describe three main policy dimensions of urban agriculture that may help to focus and differentiate policies regarding urban agriculture (as illustrated by Van Veenhuizen, 2006, and in the article by Dubbeling in this issue). The *social* policy dimension refers mainly (but not exclusively) to *subsistence-oriented* types of urban agriculture that form part of the livelihood strategies of (especially) the urban poor and are mainly focussed on producing food and medicinal plants for home consumption. The families' expenses on food and medicines are reduced and minor cash income is generated from sales of surpluses. These households need additional income sources to survive. Examples include home gardening, community gardening, institutional gardens at schools and hospitals, and open field farming (micro scale and low levels of investment). These systems show little direct profitability but have important social impacts (social inclusion, poverty alleviation, community development, HIV-AIDS mitigation, etc.).

Wendy Mendes



**Meeting of the Vancouver Food Policy Council**

The *economic* policy dimension is more related to *market-oriented* types of urban agriculture. These activities are undertaken by small-scale family-based





**Farming in the Upper Bieslandse Polder inside Delft**

enterprises or larger-scale entrepreneurial farms run by private investors or producer associations. They may include food production (e.g. irrigated vegetable production, stall-fed dairy production) and/or non-food products (like flowers and ornamental plants). These commercial farms are embedded in a chain of small-scale and larger enterprises involved in input delivery (e.g. compost, fodder), processing and marketing. These types of urban agriculture have more economic impact and higher profitability, but their externalities for the city and urban population (especially in the case of intensive and larger-scale enterprises) tend to be higher (e.g. the risk of contamination of soils and water due to intensive use of agro-chemicals, health risks due to the use of contaminated water for irrigation, and the risk of zoonosis).

The *ecological* policy dimension refers to types of urban agriculture that have a *multi-functional* character: besides providing food and generating income, they play a role in environmental management and provide other services that are in demand by urban citizens: decentralised composting and reuse of organic wastes and wastewater (including nutrients), urban greening and improvement of the urban (micro-) climate (shade, O<sub>2</sub>, dust reduction, etc.), landscape management (parks, buffer zones, zones that are flood or earthquake prone or ecologically valuable and that should be kept free from construction, etc.), provision of opportunities for leisure and recreational activities, water storage, etc.. In order to allow such combinations, multi-functional agriculture will have to adopt agro-ecological production methods and link up with eco-sanitation and decentralised sustainable waste management, as well

as with parks, nature and recreation planning and management.

The policy may be oriented toward one of these dimensions or seek to develop a specific combination or succession of them (with different target groups or zones of the city in mind). Local governments may wish to apply one focus for certain target groups or parts of the city and another for other target groups or parts of the city. A local government concerned about growing food insecurity or the exclusion of certain groups of citizens will probably focus on the social dimension of urban agriculture. Cities that are emphasising local economic development will focus on the economic dimension of urban agriculture or seek to stimulate subsistence farmers to move into the market sector. Local authorities concerned about the poor urban living climate, growing waste management problems or the negative environmental or health effects of market-oriented urban agriculture may concentrate on the environmental dimension of urban agriculture, or seek to promote a (policy) shift from high-input commercial agricultural production to sustainable and multi-functional agriculture.

Only few of the reviewed policy documents (e.g. London, Vancouver) include a section in which the municipality's vision on the desired development of urban agriculture (or the urban food system) is explained. London's Food Strategy explains very clearly its vision on the desirable urban food system, acknowledging the importance of the food system for the city's sustainable development and seeking integration of food issues in various sectoral policies and programmes (education, health, waste management, etc.). However, in most policy documents one can detect an implicit vision that shows what the city had in mind when formulating this policy. Kampala's ordinances on urban agriculture, livestock keeping and fisheries were developed with a strong focus on preventing associated health risks through a system of permits and regulations. In Governador Valadares, urban agriculture is seen mainly as a strategy for stimulating social inclusion through enhanced access to vacant land and it has accordingly become part of the

city's land use plan. In Cape Town, the role of urban agriculture in local economic development and poverty alleviation gets extra attention; implementation of the urban agriculture policy will therefore be located in the Department of Economic Development.

#### **OBJECTIVES: LINKING REALITY AND VISION**

Objectives should be formulated in such a way that they inform the actions of all actors involved in the implementation and define clearly what kind of results are expected and who is expected to benefit from the policies. It is very important that the objectives be realistic, linked to other existing policies and attainable with the policy instruments available and within the city's actual institutional and financial capacity.

#### **Article 6 of the Rosario Municipal Community Garden Decree**

"The community gardens to be established will be assigned with preference to:

- a) unemployed and underemployed
- b) nuclear family units
- c) senior citizens
- d) secondary and university students
- e) recovering drug addicts
- f) service entities (cooperatives, clubs, neighbourhood groups, educational institutions, etc.)."

Many of the policy documents reviewed state only vaguely the objectives of the policy. Quantification of intended results and time horizons are rarely mentioned. In some policy documents it is not even clear how urban agriculture is defined, what types of agriculture it pertains to nor in which parts of the municipal territory it can be applied. This creates ambiguity.

The target groups and beneficiaries of the policies are also often insufficiently specified. Various policy documents state that the policy seeks to benefit the low-income groups in society (e.g. Cape Town, Governador Valadares, Montreal). The policy formulated in Rosario provides a more precise description of the characteristics of the intended beneficiaries of their municipal urban agriculture policy (see Box).

If objectives and intended beneficiaries are only vaguely indicated, it will be very difficult to monitor and evaluate such a policy. As a consequence, it will be difficult to improve such a policy over time.

Gender gets very little attention. Only the municipality of Kampala acknowledges that a policy may have differential impacts on women and men, and it includes measures specifically designed to ensure that women practicing urban agriculture will benefit from the urban agriculture policy. None of the other policy documents take this issue into consideration, nor do the policies themselves reflect any awareness of the differential effects they may have on different sections of the target population.

**POLICY INSTRUMENTS: THROUGH WHAT MEASURES WILL THE OBJECTIVES BE REALISED?**

A well-defined policy will indicate what strategies and instruments will be applied to realise the set objectives. The choice of a particular strategy or instrument will preferably be based on an analysis of the effectiveness of the available alternative options.

Contrary to what many people seem to believe, legislation is just one of the available policy instruments. Local governments have four main policy instruments available to them (each of which is based on a specific hypothesis regarding how behaviour of actors in society can be influenced). These are legal, economic, communicative / educative and urban design instruments.

**Legal instruments**

The logic underlying legal instruments are that the actors can be forced to adopt the desired behaviour through legal norms and regulations (municipal bye laws, ordinances, etc.) and that it is possible to control whether these actors adhere to these rules and norms. Actors

who do not adhere to the rules will be sanctioned. This policy instrument is especially useful in cases when: 1) the desired behaviour cannot be realised in another way; and 2) the rules can easily be controlled. In addition, the other instruments (economic, educational and design) also require an adequate legal basis. As such, the urban agriculture programme in Governador Valadares, for example, was formalised by law (see the article by Lovo and Pereira Costa in this issue).

The most common problems with the application of this instrument are the following:

\* The *increasing number of laws, bye laws, regulations, etc.* leads to contradictions (what is allowed or promoted in one law or regulation may be prohibited or restricted in another). This situation regularly occurs regarding urban agriculture due to its multi-sectoral character (e.g. a recent urban agricultural policy of a city supports urban agriculture while its environmental or health regulations still forbid or severely restrict it; see for example the article by Foeken on Nakuru in this issue).

\* The *mechanisms to enforce the law are often weak* due to the related costs and/or lack of political will, leading to a low level of control and sanctioning of undesired behaviour and/or to unequal treatment of the various actors (some are sanctioned while others are not; the latter are often the more powerful or influential people). Such a situation (prohibited in law, but tolerated in practice until further notice) is quite common as far as urban agriculture is concerned especially in cities in Sub-Saharan Africa.

An alternative to issuing general bye laws, norms and regulations, is the **contract or covenant**. The government and certain actors sign an agreement in which the social actors (e.g. urban farmers' organisations) agree to adhere voluntarily to certain norms and regulations, often in exchange for certain support by local government or other organisation (e.g. access to municipal land, obtaining a license for a farmers' market, technical support, etc.). A good example is the agreement that is being prepared between the municipality of Governador Valadares (Office of Environment, Agriculture and Food Supply), the Autonomous Water and Sewer Service Authority and the

Association of Urban Agriculture and Community Farming on the reduction of water tariffs for urban agricultural producers, which clearly establishes the obligations for each of the three parties. Whereas a municipal bye law or ordinance generally contains do's and don'ts that are enforced for all citizens (in principle equally), the covenant is an agreement voluntarily made between local government and specific actors in a city, and that applies to (and by) only those groups. This makes it possible to establish more specific norms and regulations for specific situations.

**Economic instruments**

The logic behind the application of economic instruments is the assumption that social actors will adopt the desired behaviour if this gives them some economic gains (or losses if they continue the undesired behaviour). Local governments may grant tax incentives or subsidies if actors adopt the desired behaviour or levy special taxes for undesired behaviour (like a levy on cigarettes or alcohol). Such economic instruments also need a legal basis, but the essential element here is not the law but the economic incentive/loss.

For example, the municipality of Rosario grants tax exemptions to land owners who allow poor urban farmers use of vacant private land. The municipality of Governador Valadares reduced the tariffs for irrigation water and provides incentives for composting and reuse of household wastes. The City of Cape Town provides incentives in the form of the supply of irrigation water, tools and compost to poor urban farmers.

This policy instrument is especially useful in cases when:

- \* the economic incentive is easily recognisable and substantial enough to have an effect
- \* the economic incentive is directly related to the desired/undesired behaviour.

The most common problems with the application of this instrument are the following:

- \* The costs of the policy measure cannot be controlled and may become unfeasible when many actors make use of it.
- \* Levies and subsidies often enhance social inequity.

Raul Terrile



**Participatory design workshop La Lagunita, Rosario**

### **Communicative / educative instruments**

The assumption behind the use of these types of instruments is that people will adopt the desired behaviour if they are well informed about the positive effects of the desired behaviour and the negative effects of the undesired behaviour. Accordingly, information, education and persuasion tools (extension visits, training courses, leaflets, websites, etc.) will be applied to make people understand the importance of the desired change and to assist them in the change process. These instruments are often used complementary to the other policy instruments mentioned. The lack of an adequate communication and education strategy may strongly reduce the effectiveness of the other policy instruments used.

For example, the municipality of Governador Valadares provides technical training to urban farmers and the municipality of London provides education on healthy food, food growing and food preparation to school kids. Thornton (in this issue) underlines the importance of designing and implementing a strategy to communicate municipal policies and policy instruments to their target group.

### **Urban design instruments**

The logic behind urban design instruments is that actors will adopt the desired behaviour if their physical environment has been designed in such a way that the actors are more or less “automatically” prompted to; if public dustbins are widely available, people will throw less waste on the street. Examples related to urban agriculture are zoning, combining or separating certain land uses depending on the degree of conflict/synergy, inclusion of space for home or community gardening in social housing projects, etc. Montreal included land designated for urban agriculture in its urban land use plan and Cape Town includes land for home or community gardening in slum upgrading projects.

The policy documents reveal that many cities emphasise legal instruments, which often have a reactive character (action is taken only in the form of sanctions if legal rules and regulations are not followed properly by the social actors). In such cities urban agriculture is often

restricted or at best tolerated if the capacity of the city to enforce the existing regulations is too limited. Many examples of the other policy instruments can also be found in the documents (see the examples given above), often in cities that apply a more proactive and development-oriented approach to urban agriculture.

As noted above, the economic, educative and design instruments have to be combined with supporting legal instruments in an effective “package” of policy measures in order to arrive at a development-oriented policy on urban agriculture.

### **The lack of an adequate communication and education strategy may strongly reduce the effectiveness of the other policy instruments**

In Kampala, the new policy supports urban agriculture in the sense that it is accepted as a legal form of land use under certain conditions and forms part of the city’s poverty alleviation and social development strategy. However, the policy relies mainly on legal instruments (the Kampala City Ordinances on urban agriculture, fish, livestock and meat), which restrict unwanted behaviour by establishing a system of licenses, regulations, control and sanctions. It is not yet clear how the ordinances are combined with other more development-oriented measures to support and stimulate this sector (training, marketing support, access to land, etc.) – though separate projects in these fields do take place in the city – and it may thus be questioned how and when the original focus on poverty alleviation will in fact be achieved. For example, the new ordinances restrict urban agricultural use of certain areas to urban farmers in order to protect wetlands, greenbelts, road reserves and drainage channels. Farmers also need permission from the council to cultivate old industrial sites or any other land believed to be contaminated. While these restrictions make sense from a health and environmental point of view, they also point to the need for the further development of a policy and guidelines on land use that include urban agriculture, especially if farming is to

benefit the urban poor. These observations may feed the discussion in Kampala, since policy and programme development processes are still ongoing, illustrating the fact that policy change is normally incremental (step by step).

Another approach is taken by the city of Rosario, where the emphasis is mainly on the economic and communicative and educative instruments: that city has chosen an approach that focuses on stimulating good behaviour by means of positive incentives (tax reduction for landowners, farmer education and technical assistance – specifically in the field of organic farming, subsidies for composting, support to marketing – all financed and supported by the municipal urban agriculture programme). The Rosario approach is more programme-oriented, focussing on enabling approaches, while the Kampala approach is – as yet – more regulatory and focussed on punitive approaches (see the articles in this issue).

Since good examples are scarce and Kampala’s experiences are widely known, the Kampala ordinances are now being copied by various other cities in Sub-Saharan Africa (as illustrated by the article by Foeken on Nakuru in this issue). However, those cities should not just copy the Kampala ordinances but first develop their own policy regarding urban agriculture, in response to the specific local situation. Moreover, in our view it is better to first develop a clear comprehensive policy (vision, objectives, selection of strategies/instruments including the legal instruments as well as other strategies, defining the institutional framework) before developing detailed legal instruments. Permits and regulations may be needed in order to protect public health and will probably help build support for urban agriculture amongst richer citizens and policy makers. However, creating positive incentives and a support structure will have more positive impacts on the situation of the poor and the development of urban agriculture. Many of the reviewed policy documents hardly differentiate between policy measures for various types of urban agriculture existing in a city, with the exception of the national guidelines on urban agriculture for Cuba that includes 27 sub-programmes (one for each main



type of urban agriculture). Kampala developed separate ordinances for horticulture, livestock keeping and fisheries. In Bulawayo, specific policy proposals have been sent to the city council on maize cultivation. Differentiation of the policy measures for the different types of agriculture (according to main product, level of technology and scale) is important since each type of urban agriculture has specific characteristics in terms of its relevance for certain policy goals and the level and type of externalities (e.g. health and environmental impacts) that they cause. But this is hardly practiced so far. Urban livestock tends to be restricted much more than vegetable growing. It is often limited to the periurban areas or to minimal numbers of small stock, due to perceived health and environmental risks (e.g. the draft policy for Cape Town and the situation in Nakuru, see Foeken in this issue). The norms used in bye laws, ordinances and zoning regulations to establish the limits between permitted and prohibited numbers of animals are often arbitrarily drawn (e.g. 2 cows, 6 sheep, 20 hens, etc.). Such norms are often not linked to the local conditions in which urban livestock is taking place (e.g. proximity to sources of drinking water, population density, presence of sources of air/soil/water pollution), even though these conditions highly influence the health or environmental effects that urban agriculture may have. The application of instruments like GIS makes it relatively easy nowadays to make such linkages.

**INSTITUTIONAL AND OPERATIONAL FRAMEWORK: HOW AND BY WHOM WILL THESE STRATEGIES BE COORDINATED, IMPLEMENTED AND MONITORED?**

For a policy to be effective, practical and efficient institutional arrangements are needed for its implementation. The policy should thus clearly indicate: The role of the various actors involved in its implementation (and maybe certain changes in their institutional mandate or functioning, if needed). The mechanisms that will be applied for periodic operational planning (to translate the policy into concrete actions) and for the coordination of the implementation (maybe some new department or secretariat has to be established). The policy document also



Wendy Mendes

**Farmer Market in Vancouver**

should mention how monitoring and evaluation will be organised (instruments to be used, responsible organisations). The sources and mechanisms of financing for the various policy measures (which municipal budget lines, public-private cooperation, national funds, payments by the beneficiaries, etc.) and who will be responsible for the management thereof. The mechanisms that will be applied to communicate the policy's contents to all stakeholders: how will target groups and beneficiaries be informed of the policy and the rights and obligations stemming from it? This issue poses an extra challenge in developing countries where poor urban farmers often lack access to information due to illiteracy, inadequate infrastructure, etc. Without such arrangements and mechanisms, the policy document will remain a dead letter and might even make things worse for the urban farmers rather than better. The reviewed policy documents in general give surprisingly little attention to outlining the institutional and operational framework needed for the implementation and monitoring of the urban agriculture policy. Since urban agriculture is a multi-sectoral phenomenon that often lacks an "institutional home", extra attention to the definition of an appropriate institutional framework is required.

Positive examples are the Montreal Food Policy document, which includes a clear task definition for each of the municipal bodies involved in the implementation of the policy, and Cuba national policy. The Cuban resolution that established the National Group on Urban Agriculture includes a list of institutions to be represented in the group as well as its major tasks (*Resolution no.208/98*). Another Cuban policy document, containing guidelines for the 28 urban agriculture sub-programmes, pays a lot of attention to the way in which each of the sub-programmes will be monitored. Per sub-programme success indicators are mentioned as well as the criteria for evaluation. To further stimulate municipalities' adherence to the urban agriculture policies, a reward scheme is applied. In most other cases the operational framework only indicates the main coordinating and implementing units. In the case of Kampala, policy documents give the city council responsibility for coordinating implementation and monitoring of the policy and indicate which department will be in charge. In the case of Rosario, responsibility for coordinating the urban agriculture programme is placed with the Secretariat of Social Promotion.. Cape Town's draft urban agriculture policy is coordinated by the Economic Development Department of the Municipality and indicates the links with existing municipal programmes and funding

schemes into which urban agriculture projects will be integrated. In various cases, such as Rosario, the policy document establishes a new municipal office and programme that will carry out certain specific activities (e.g. to stimulate the use of organic production methods or, as in Montreal, to stimulate community gardening).

Since the local government in most situations will rely on the active participation of national government organisations as well as the private sector and civil society organisations, the policy should create a conducive framework for wider participation. In this respect Montreal's policy document is a good example since it explicitly seeks better harmonisation of the roles and responsibilities of all parties (governmental and non-governmental) involved in urban agriculture and it establishes a special multi-stakeholder platform or forum with a secretariat and working groups.

Sources and mechanisms of funding of the policy measures are rarely mentioned in the reviewed policy documents, which may severely hamper their implementation. If certain activities are made part of the mandate of specific organisations and included in their regular budgets, implementation of the urban agriculture policy will become much more continuous. If such arrangements are missing, for each activity specific approval and funding may have to be obtained which will slow down implementation tremendously. The Vancouver policy report mentioned above provides a detailed estimate of the resources involved in the actions proposed. The Amsterdam Note on Urban Gardens outlines the city's main goals with regards to the policy on urban community gardens. Although the document mainly has a strategic character and detailed action plans will be formulated jointly with the garden associations, it already includes a list of foreseen actions with respective budgeted costs and sources of funding.

### CONCLUDING REMARKS

The recently formulated city policies on urban agriculture that were reviewed in this article are very diverse in their design and content, partly reflecting the differences in local views on urban

agriculture, the role it is expected to play and the differences in how local policy systems operate, but also indicating the relatively underdeveloped status of policy making on urban agriculture and the shortage of good examples of well-defined policies and policy instruments. There is a need to go beyond the reformulation of bye laws and ordinances and to design a comprehensive policy that makes use of various types of policy instruments. Also, much more attention is needed for the design of an adequate institutional and operational framework for the implementation and monitoring of the policy, since that defines to a large extent whether the policy will be effective or not.

Local governments and other actors involved in policy design and implementation are kindly invited to actively exchange examples of policies and the experiences gained with the implementation of these policies in order to improve the quality and impacts of local policies on urban agriculture.

#### Notes

- 1) This article can be seen as an interim report of a project in progress. The collection of policies on urban agriculture is still far from exhaustive and the RUAF partners will continue this process of collection and analysis. The policy documents that were reviewed include those from Governador Valadares (Brazil), Rosario (Argentina), Kampala (Uganda), Montreal (Canada), Cape Town (South Africa), Cuba (Cienfuegos and national level policies), Botswana at national level, Bulawayo (Zimbabwe), Vancouver (Canada) and London (UK). Some of these policy documents are still in the drafting stage (e.g. Cape Town, Botswana). Some of the policies discussed here (Vancouver, London) have a focus on urban food systems rather than urban agriculture as such. Some others (like Cape Town) have not yet been formally adopted as a municipal policy.
- 2) In preparing this section we used Birkland's book *An Introduction to the Policy Process* as a reference guide, but the synthesis and formulation is fully our own.
- 3) Although this system allows the functioning of the sub-programmes to be evaluated, no provisions are made to assess the impacts of the programme on the population (e.g. improved nutrition or increased income), environment, health, etc.

#### References

- Birkland, Thomas A. 2005. *An introduction to the policy process; Theories, concepts and models of public policymaking*. 2<sup>nd</sup> edition, M. E. Sharpe, Inc. New York.
- Cabannes, Yves. 2006. Financing and investment for urban agriculture. Chapter 4 in: R. van Veenhuizen. 2006. *Cities farming for the future: Urban agriculture for green and productive cities*, RUAF Foundation/IDRC/IIRR. <http://www.ruaf.org/node/969>

### LIST OF REVIEWED URBAN AGRICULTURE RELATED POLICY DOCUMENTS

Kampala, Uganda The Kampala City Urban Agriculture Ordinance: A Guideline, KUFSALCC and Urban Harvest, Kampala and Nairobi, 2005. The Kampala City Fish Ordinance: A Guideline, KUFSALCC and Urban Harvest, Kampala and Nairobi, 2005. The Kampala City Meat Ordinance: A Guideline, KUFSALCC and Urban Harvest, Kampala and Nairobi, 2005. The Kampala City Livestock and Companion Animal Ordinance: A Guideline, KUFSALCC and Urban Harvest, Kampala and Nairobi, 2005. Rosario, Argentina Ordinance 4713 related to the operations of the Municipal Community Garden Programme (1999), Municipality of Rosario, Argentina (original text in Spanish). Ordinance 7341 related to the development of the Municipal Programme for Organic Agriculture (2002), Municipality of Rosario, Argentina (original text in Spanish). Ordinance related to the establishment and management of a Municipal Land Bank for UA (2003), Municipality of Rosario, Argentina (original text in Spanish). Decree No. 1072 related to the establishment of the Garden Parks Programme, Rosario, 17 May 2004. Governador Valadares, Brazil Reduction of water, sewage and sanitation tariffs for urban agriculture (including proposed agreement), Municipality of Governador Valadares, Brazil, October 2003 (original text in Portuguese)\*. Law No. 5.265 of 29 December 2003, 'Creating the Urban Agriculture Programme of the Municipality of Governador Valadares', Municipal Council of Governador Valadares, Brazil, 29 December 2003. Use of progressive and regressive taxing policies to encourage the productive use of private spaces. Municipal Secretary of Environment, Agriculture and Food Supply (SEMA), Municipal Secretary of Planning (SEPLAN) and Municipal Housing Secretary (SMF), Governador Valadares, Brazil, 2004 (original text in Portuguese). Inclusion of urban agriculture in the City's Master Plan based on the City Statute, Municipality of Governador Valadares, Brazil, 19 October 2003 (original text in Portuguese). Cienfuegos, Cuba Analysis land use policy Cienfuegos Cuba Lineamientos para los sub-programas de la agricultura urbana para el 2005 al 2007 y sistema evaluativo. Grupo Nacional de Agricultura Urbana, Ministerio de Agricultura, La Habana, Cuba, Noviembre 2004. Resolución No. -208 / 98 on Creation of National Group on Urban Agriculture, Ministry of Agriculture, Cuba, 15 April 1998. Montreal, Canada Montreal Community Gardening Programme, Cahier de Gestion 2004 Cape Town, South Africa Cape Town Urban Agriculture Policy (draft, 2005) Botswana Keboneilwe D. et al (2006) Urban and Peri-urban Agriculture (PUA) Working Paper (approved by the Policy Advisory Committee on March 21st, 2006) London, UK Healthy and Sustainable Food for London: The Mayor's Food Strategy Summary, May 2005. London Development Agency. Vancouver, Canada Policy report on Action Plan for Creating a Just and Sustainable Food System for the City of Vancouver, prepared by the Food Policy Task Force for presentation to the Vancouver City Council on November 20, 2003. Amsterdam, the Netherlands Nota Volkstuinen in Amsterdam, Dienst Ruimtelijke Ordening Amsterdam, November 2005. Bulawayo, Zimbabwe Urban Agriculture in Bulawayo – Issues and an Inception of Policy Guidelines (a summary)