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The SUPURBFOOD project

SUPURBFOOD is the acronym for a research project entitled ‘Towards sustainable modes of urban and peri-urban food provisioning’. It is financed by the European Commission’s 7th Framework Programme for Research and Technological Development.

Consortium

The project started in October 2012 and runs for 36 months. The project brings together research teams and SMEs in the food and agriculture domain from 7 European countries (The Netherlands, Belgium, United Kingdom, Spain, Italy, Latvia and Switzerland) and the International Network of Resource Centres on Urban Agriculture and Food Security (RUAF), which focuses on food and agriculture issues in urban and peri-urban settings in Asia, Africa and Latin America.

City-regions involved

The European city-regions involved in the project are: City-region Rotterdam (The Netherlands), Metropolitan Area Rome (Italy), City-region Ghent (Belgium), Metropolitan Area Vigo (Spain), City-region Bristol (United Kingdom), City-region Zürich (Switzerland), Greater Riga Region (Latvia).

Second International Seminar

The SUPURBFOOD project’s Second International Seminar was incorporated in the ICLEI – Local Governments for Sustainability 6th global forum on urban resilience and adaptation, Bonn, Germany from 8-10 June 2015. On Wednesday 10 June, RUAF Foundation in cooperation with the SUPURBFOOD project team organised three specially recommended Urban Food Forum sessions. Each SUPURBFOOD Urban Food Forum session attracted about 70 participants of the over 420 participants from 56 countries in this ICLEI 6th global forum on urban resilience and adaptation. Of the participants in the ICLEI event 25% represented local and regional governments and 75% researchers / international organisations / private sector representatives.

The ICLEI 6th global forum

The ICLEI leading platform for city representatives and experts aims to discuss urban resilience and climate adaptation on a global scale and create opportunities for dialogue and cooperation on sustainable development goals, and contribute to the process to agree to a strong and long-lasting climate agreement that keep people and regional economies healthy.
Thereby there is a role for innovative policy that directly benefits people. For this, climate change action should be co-designed with citizens, businesses and city governments, and should include areas such as energy, transport, resource recycling, water, ecology, urban agriculture and food systems, health, safety, disaster risk, waste reduction and urban planning with specific actions, indicators, and targets for the nearby and long-term future.

The ICLEI’s 6th global forum on urban resilience and adaptation aims to demonstrate how urban settlements are working to become more inclusive, safer, resilient and sustainable habitats in the present and the future, whereby local governments are key-players in the negotiation and implementation of agreements.

**SUPURBFOOD’s Urban Food Forum**

In order to share and discuss the SUPURBFOOD project’s results with this global forum, a special Urban Food Forum was organised by SUPURBFOOD that consisted of three sessions that link to the ICLEI’s objectives of creating an urban resilience agenda that joins adaptation, mitigation, disaster, risk reduction, and sustainable, equitable development.

On Wednesday June 10 a first session was on urban policy and programmes, a second session on food and urban planning, and a third session on the role of SMEs to support cities all over the world to develop resilient city-region food systems.

In the final ICLEI Plenary session, urban food production and systems (in relation to health and clean air and water resources) were mentioned as key aspects in resilience planning, which implies food should be included as one of the ISO city sustainability data.

**Session 1**

F4 Facilitator: Marielle Dubbeling, RUAF Foundation, Leusden, the Netherlands/ partner in the SUPURBFOOD project

This panel session highlighted innovative practices, strategies and policies in the field of resilient urban food systems implemented by cities from Europe and the Global South that had participated in the SUPURBFOOD project to various extents. Further policy recommendations and concrete activities undertaken to help develop sustainable urban food systems were indicated within the EU FP7 project SUPURBFOOD “Towards sustainable modes of urban and peri-urban food provisioning”, the Milan Urban Food Policy Pact process, the international CITYFOOD network and the Global partnership on city-region food systems.
Innovative practices, strategies and policies in resilient urban food systems

Cities are involved in urban food system policy and planning because of food price rises and because cities are becoming more aware of their responsibility to ensure access to food for citizens after experiencing disruptions in transport, climate related impacts on food production and supply and economic crises. Other direct concerns are health risks related to obesity and diet related diseases.

Initiatives and strategies that cities are, or should be, developing include those linked to urban agriculture and food initiatives, recycling programmes, limiting waste resulting from food packaging, parks getting oriented to food gardens, approved city food policies, but also small production on balconies and small plots in the city. Organic certification and small organic markets can help the producers to receive a price which reflects the cost of production. Many vulnerable groups get involved in projects, which are supported by the city. Food policies can start making schools meals more sustainable, promote vegetarian food patterns, vegetables gardens, and involve citizens and associations in developing local food policies.

In Sri Lanka urban food programmes are scaled-up: implemented at the provincial level, and demonstrate how at city-region level issues for building a resilient city are built in local food programmes. The implementation of urban and peri-urban agriculture policy programmes is related to urban development plans and included in educational programmes.

Key obstacles or guiding factors for putting in place an urban food policy plan are mainly related to funding and limited national and technological support for urban food production and social inclusion of minorities in urban environments.

Participants in session 1

Panellists were Nestor Alvarez, the Mayor of Munoz, the Philippines; Nayanananda Nilwala, the Secretary of the Ministry of Agriculture-Western Province, Sri Lanka; Katrien Verbeke, the Food Policy Coordinator from Ghent, Belgium; Matthew Kemphthorne, Councillor and Chairperson, Energy, Environmental and Spatial Planning Portfolio Committee, City of Cape Town, South Africa; and Alfonso Abdo Félix, Executive Director, CONQUITO Economic Development Agency Quito, Ecuador.

Want to learn more about this session, or contact people?
www.resilientcities2015.iclei.org or www.ruaf.org
The case of Quito showed it is possible to continue urban food programmes without international structural funds. Regional governments can play a role and integrate topics related to resilient city planning and local development.

SUPURBFOOD generated recommendations for city-regions on urban and peri-urban food provisioning on closing nutrient and water cycles, shortening food chains and multifunctional land-use where validated by the session panel and participants. Key issues for action are related to (1) supporting market development of small food retail and local markets, (2) space to be provided for food production and recycling, and (3) enabling innovation by supporting initiatives, and others and experimentation with new ideas of grassroots, small and medium enterprises, co-finance innovative technologies, (4) adapting policies and regulations, and (5) coordination and planning. The key issues result in the recommendation to set up an integrated food planning department, link up with other cities, and civil society organisation to join forces enabling a dialogue with policy makers and other stakeholders.

Katrien Verbeke, Food Policy Coordinator, City of Ghent, Belgium:

“It is often about making the right connections. As a city authority we often don’t have a very good idea of all that’s going on in the city, so our work is mainly to support linkages between stakeholders that in turn create synergies and momentum.”

Going beyond key obstacles

International resources and contacts available to support cities in policymaking and action planning are demonstrated in a FAO-RUAF programme on city-region food systems that bridges the rural-urban divide, which requires action on harnessing political will and developing a facilitating policy framework, inclusive governance, adequate land-use policies, research and information exchange, best practices promotion and sharing, and integration of agriculture and forestry in urban planning. Crucial in the programme are setting collaborative frameworks, knowledge exchange platforms, and building methods and tools to strengthen the capacities of local authorities and stakeholders to reinforce urban-rural linkages.

Such programmes are implemented in cities in Sub-Saharan Africa, Asia, Latin America, Europe and North America, which is described in the city-region food system booklet: the RUAF Foundation’s Urban Agriculture Magazine 29 City region Food Systems. Copies in full colour print were available to participants in the session.
The ICLEI and RUAF supported city-region network invites any city to learn about initiatives elsewhere and share concrete experiences with policy formulation and implementation. One can join the network and obtain information by writing to the ICLEI secretary.

**Plenary discussion in Session 1**

Questions discussed in the session included the following. *Global food systems rely heavily on energy input; to what extent do urban food systems reduce this energy demand? What proportion of the food consumed in the city comes from the urban agriculture projects that you described?*

Informal food economies already exist in many cities and are independent of strategic municipal programmes: these informal arrangements are characterised by low cost market entry for street vendors, very small profit margins, and short food distribution chains. Seasonal and fresh produce is brought to the cities. This seems to be invisible and it should not be: we should not ignore what is already in place. Often, in response to economic and social changes stimulated by municipal policies, people are swept out of areas where they provide these services.

*Should we pay attention to what already exists? Criminals do not steal from urban gardens generally, is that phenomenon recognised worldwide?* When health and safety programmes are implemented in informal food circuits these are not meant to sweep out people from their activities but to help them. The data on production volumes are not globally comparable nor use same metrics, so more standardised data are needed. The way local food production works, based on, for example, organic production and certification, equitable trading relations between consumers and producers and an appreciation of the environment, means that people generally do not steal from urban gardens.

Reduced food transport distances, less processing and storage, and less food being wasted can all reduce energy consumption. Awareness creation of what to eat and accept as healthy food should therefore be supported at the administrative level. Urban and peri-urban agriculture should not be limited to food production; it is the educational part that matters on other social and environmental benefits that come with urban food production.

Verbeke from Ghent states that our food system is highly regulated by the private sector; standards are strict and respected. In Ghent there is no informal food distribution; while respecting food safety regulations Belgium almost would like to reintroduce that again. Such local systems have been often preserved in the South; and she would like to get those systems back in the city of Ghent.

In relation to energy consumption in Sri Lanka programmes will be implemented on recycling and biogas production, solar panels and food miles. RUAF research projects looked at impacts of urban agriculture in relation to climate change mitigation; results on these are available from RUAF.
Session 2

G4 Facilitator: Carmen Vogt, Head of Sector Programme “Sustainable Development of Metropolitan Regions”, Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) GmbH, Eschborn, Germany

In this session panellists presented practical experiences, case studies and tools on how urban and peri-urban agriculture can be used strategically to contribute to the resilience strategy of a city or metropolitan region. Based on their activities and the link with sustainable urban food systems and the opportunities and the bottlenecks observed for future development, the four panellists presented policy recommendations and examples from cities and city-regions on how to effectively plan for resilient food systems.

Planning resilient food systems at an urban and metropolitan scale

Since there are inefficiencies in conventional food production and distribution, creating both a technical and a political problem, urban food systems should be related to urban resource cycles in order to meet the challenges of resilient city management.

Growing urbanisation and poverty were mentioned as key drivers for urban food system attention, reflecting many concerns raised in the preceding session. Urban food systems play a role in enhancing food security for vulnerable groups in the populations, climate change adaptation, and resource recycling. It will be important to look beyond the city boundaries and include peri-urban and rural areas (considering a city-region scale).
Urban green infrastructure and food security

A key issue, also identified in the SUPURBFOOD programme, is access to land, which should be arranged by local governments. This includes issues such as integration of (productive) green infrastructure in city development planning, preservation of the best soils for agriculture, and multifunctional use, and community gardens. Modification of land use codes and building regulations to accommodate urban farming in the city are central themes, which cities can promote through strategies oriented on multifunctional land-use and ecosystem services. Examples from the European SUPURBFOOD city-regions and Global South cities illustrate how these recommendations are becoming elements in resilient city planning.

UNEP and START looked at urban and peri-urban food systems through the lens of climate change, areas of attention were Asia and Africa. Urbanisation in Africa is not facilitating economic growth but, on the contrary, poverty is becoming concentrated in these urban areas.

Urban challenges include: dealing with climate change as well as food, water, and energy insecurities. These challenges call for projects that aim to institutionalise resilience.

The resource base for urban agriculture becomes increasingly marginal, while urban and climate pressures intersect, and are related to management of water systems in urbanised areas, and result in potential flooding damages.

Policies result often in displacement of farmers onto marginal lands, lack of enforcement of settlements, and waste dumping in flood buffer zones. Resilient cities should optimise the multifunctionality of resource use, and get food security on the international agenda.

The case of Medellín, Colombia

Social inclusion and family programmes in Medellin take 60% of the budget of the local administration, and therefore is an important department in the city. In under a century, the city has grown from 94,000 inhabitants in 1921 to 2.4 million in 2012. A model has to comply with the dynamic occupation of the territory: population will grow by another half million people until 2030.
Food and nutritional risks require attention and result in public policy on food security, oriented on international and national available documents and guidelines, which resulted in municipality agreements. In the food security unit many issues are integrated, and projects provided to more vulnerable groups (pregnant and breastfeeding women, children, elderly people) in the city.

**Discussion in session 2**

*What distinguishes urban food systems from urban agriculture?*

Urban and peri-urban agriculture takes on a new importance in urban growth, 800,000 people are involved in this dynamic. We should not conflate urban agriculture and urban food systems.

The distinction is that food systems include all elements of urban food security and nutrition: food produced, distribution, what consumers groups consume what type of food, nutritional aspects, and deals with the end of the cycle: food waste. In contrast, urban agriculture focuses on the production side, although simply increasing local production output does not necessarily solve the problem of food insecurity, because it leaves the challenge of food waste unchecked.

For the municipality in Medellin, food is inextricably linked to equality and social inclusion: integration of all the actors involved in the food system is important.

*Is the issue of soil and soil fertility, included in policy programmes in the context of the expansion of cities? What is the impact of city-region food systems in Europe?*

This makes it necessary to look outside municipal boundaries, watersheds, green areas, areas were waste can be recycled. The risks of erosion in areas at distance of the city but of high importance for the resilience of city-regions should be included, and the food supply function of such areas should not be underestimated. Areas are thus to be protected for the provision of food, rainfall infiltration, clean air. In Europe city-regions increasingly pay attention to this. Food security in Europe is debated in relation to vulnerable groups; not so much in terms of food systems / production in general. A question raised that related to this was how to fund food assistance and the reform of regulations on European level. In European regions where people perhaps do not perceived as vulnerable to the inconsistencies (and risks of food scarcities) in the conventional food system.

*How should the issue of food security be dealt with in the event of a food security crisis?*

In Portugal, at the national and municipal levels, green infrastructure plans are now developed, in which the soil fertility is a feature in the construction of maps.

*How to engage and promote small family enterprises to develop small enterprises?*
Small volumes of production are potential resources to make a living, which could be supported. European cases, for example Rome and Riga, but also Quito in Ecuador, provide insights in how support for entrepreneurship is organised. RUAF also reported on supportive structures for small-scaled enterprises: not everybody is or wants to be an entrepreneur (which implies a careful selection of beneficiaries). Therefore producers are in need of training in marketing and consumer relations, which improve opportunities for adaptation to consumers’ demands, and the time and volume of production, as appropriate. Opening public farmers’ markets and producers’ kiosks are important instruments in creating market demand; legal requirements need to be adapted to SMEs. Finally, the need to find schemes to get things started was raised: business plans for start-ups before sustaining themselves (in general a period of about 5 years).
Session 3

H4 Facilitator: Jan-Willem van der Schans, WUR-LEI; Den Haag, the Netherlands / partner in the SUPURBFOOD project

This session explored how small and medium enterprises (SMEs), active in the field of urban and peri-urban food provision, contribute to the development of more sustainable city-region food systems.

There is high diversity of business models of SMEs involved in sustainable city-region food production, which all have opportunities and threats for sustainable business development.

Some SME activities require public and civic support to contribute to more sustainable city-region food systems.

Hence, the facilitator states that city farms in Europe need to employ multi-functional strategies and funding schemes because stand-alone food production is hardly profitable; farmers all over Europe already know this, and need support from governments and other stakeholders.

Unfortunately, the actions created by the SMEs in this session (e.g. the creation of a native forest seven kilometres away from downtown, and the organisation of a cultural festival at a restored historical site in combination with farmers’ markets) are not yet on the radar of local governments.

Participants in session 3

Panellists were representatives of small and medium enterprises (SMEs) in the SUPURBFOOD city-regions of Rotterdam, Vigo, Riga and Bristol: Huibert de Leede, (owner of ‘Stichting Uit Je Eigen Stad’, Rotterdam), Manuel López Rodriguez (secretary of CMVMC Teis, Vigo), Una Meiberga (Kalnciema Quarter, Riga) and Alison Belshaw (The Community Farm, Bristol).

Want to learn more about this session, or contact people?
www.resilientcities2015.iclei.org or www.ruaf.org

Small and medium enterprises in urban food systems development

Huibert (Rotterdam), Manuel (Vigo), Una (Riga) and Alison (Bristol) introduced their business approach and activities (ten minutes each) to the audience, after which the SMEs’ representatives reflected together with the audience on the role of SMEs in, and contribution to, sustainable food systems in their city-region.

Rotterdam’s urban farm

The site of the ‘Stichting Uit Je Eigen Stad’, an old train station in Rotterdam, has been transformed into a city farm with several activities: vegetable, fish production, and egg and poultry production, a restaurant and farm shop.
The aquaponic system is a closed loop and the gardens, chicken droppings and waste from the restaurant also fit into loops as well as a purification system, which supplies phosphates.

Threat is profitability: 800,000 - 900,000 euros turnover, of which 80% is made in the restaurant, but the annual costs are equal to this turnover. In addition to these on-farm activities, other producers of food and energy promote their businesses at this site, for which they pay a small fee. Further a municipal unemployment scheme brings people to the farm as well: people compost on the site and can sell this and earn revenues. Because the land on which the farm sits was an industrial site, the contaminated soil had to be sealed with a liner before new topsoil was brought in for vegetable production. It is a temporary location, which is available for ten years until the planned construction of housing forces the farm to move. The farm activities will contribute to the quality of the area, and thus to raise the value of the area.

Vigo’s community forest

In the city-region of Vigo, a community forest (land commonly owned by residents of the parishes, a wide-spread phenomenon in Galicia and the north of Portugal, in this case land owned and managed by the CMVMC Teis) suffered from the construction of the highway, which led to a loss of tracts of forest and split the area in two parts. The most frustrating factor was that no study has been implemented on the development’s impact on the environment. The anger that came along with the frustration has been translated into action: the creation of a native forest (in other community forests foreign species have been introduced). Next to maintenance and improvement of the forest, community members run educational programmes on how to protect and preserve the environment.

When it all started, 18 years ago, they had no idea what would result but now there is significantly enhanced biodiversity, including the return of endangered species, forests fruits, mushrooms, and the recovery of old trails that run through the forest. The fight against foreign species demands a dense new forest plantation: otherwise the non-native and invasive acacia and eucalyptus trees outcompete the new plantations again. Forest fires are common in Galicia and spread quickly through eucalyptus plantations, but not so rapidly through the native forest.
The reintroduction of native trees improves landscape aesthetics as well as helping to improve air quality. The area is managed with machinery and personnel respectively owned and employed by the association. Further forest fruit and honey production have resulted from the new situation.

The recovery of creeks in the area resulted in clear water availability, leading to the rediscovery of a rare salamander species, which had not been recorded for many years. Although the local administration supports the zoo, which exhibits tigers, bears and other rare species, until now there has been no interest in linking the public function of the native forest that surrounds the zoo and bringing this to the attention of zoo visitors.

Riga’s meeting place

Kalnciema Quarter, presented by Una Meiberga, is housed in an heritage area of Riga that is distinguished by its wooden architecture. KQ is a meeting place, and venue for cultural events and a weekly local food and crafts market. There are seven houses under the management of the SME and in the garden is a restaurant. It took 5 years to establish as it is, which includes the food and craft market, and attracts traders from all over Latvia.

The combination of cultural events, music concerts, and opportunities to meet family and friends, attracts up to 3,000 visitors per night. As a very popular meeting point it communicates cultural values. To attract visitors, the food markets are thematically oriented, and often combined with celebrations linked to preserving traditions. Social media has been an important tool in attracting visitors, e.g. the Kalnciema Quarter has 35,000 followers on Twitter and is active on Facebook. There are no linkages between the local authority and KQ yet of the type seen in other case studies across Europe. KQ would like to find new traders, and will maintain its focus on the multi-functionality of its activities, however, the physical limits of the space may restrict future developments. KQ recently created MarketHopper.Com, which is a freely accessible platform: a global network for local markets.

Bristol’s Community Farm

Since 2012 the Community Farm, Alison Belshaw informs the audience, has been growing vegetables and sells these via vegetable boxes and at farmers’ markets. CF farmers try to connect people to the land though voluntary work, school visits (for a fee), and formal apprenticeships. The revenues help to support the training of future growers, some of whom have established their own business. The farm is a social enterprise with over 500 shareholder-members. It occupies 12 hectares of land of which only 2 hectares actively are farmed.
The remaining areas are linked to agri-environment schemes or are rented out. There is a low profit margin in vegetable production. Soil quality and biodiversity are integral to the CF’s vision and horticultural practices are planned accordingly. The key difficulties relate to financial issues. Over the past 4-5 years the farmers have been continuously fundraising. From a business perspective it is difficult to remain commercially viable solely by selling vegetables. Although efforts are made to increase customers’ awareness of the contexts of CF food production, customer loyalty can be easily eroded in the light of the marketing campaigns of other, dominant larger-scale grocery chains.

Among the opportunities: using the land to make people want to come back to the farm, which lies in a beautiful location.

Discussion in session 3

Huibert asks Una if the initiative makes a profit. Una replies Kalnciema Quarter generates revenue mostly by renting their premises for offices and events, and also selling some reclaimed wood, while 11 people are working for KQ. Architects and local government representatives pay many visits to KQ but there is no more interaction than that. Although very minor in the general scheme of things some support is provided through competitive city-run grants for cultural activities.

On the question how is the relationship between the community forest and the local administration, Manuel starts explaining how the regional government has dealt with communal land after the Franco dictatorship. The land has been given back to rural dwellers because at the time this was an easy strategy to deal with the land but now realise it was a mistake since they cannot benefit, and build for example wind parks. Nowadays, 30% of the territory in Galicia is in hands of local communities. The technical staff of the regional government, the level at which forestry activities are governed and management plans have to be accepted, did not understand trees were planted but to do not cut them. The logic behind the activity differs from the state’s aims and objectives, which are directed toward fast growing forestry for paper industries and biomass energy production.

Although the community forest of CMVMC Teis provides public services until today the city council does not appreciate their efforts on creating a native forest. The community forest project is kept running through renting out a few smaller plots to a small restaurant and dog-training site, and funds were raised to plant part of the native forest. A significant financial advantage is related to the construction of the highway: there was money that compensated the community for the loss of areas of forest to the highway. This money was used to create a native forest close to the city, and sooner or later people will hopefully realise what the CMVMC Teis has to offer to the city. A constraint is the issue of the political time frame of four years not being the time frame for a forest to grow (25-30 years), which results in a serious source of neglect of this type of activities by the local politicians.
Huibert avoids thinking about the fact that his project will end. The investments are made for ten years, and he hopes the enterprise can stay put, but he cannot rely on this. Efficiency is different in larger-scaled, industrial modes of business: here, there is no profit but there is a break-even. Outdoor-reared tomatoes taste much better than those grown in industrial greenhouses, and although Huibert’s tomatoes attract premium prices, the season is very short.

Patricia Silva from Almada City Council congratulated Huibert for his efforts on building a resilient community. Huibert is very welcome in Portugal where the season is much longer, and sites are available with similar aims and objectives, for a longer period. In the case of land made available to citizens in Portugal nobody showed interest, since most of the Portuguese residents do not like to invest over 30 years in land owned by somebody else. Property ownership perhaps is more important in Portugal: people like their sons to benefit from their own investments and be able to hand on investments.

At the Community Farm there are many costs involved and margins are too low.

Matt Reed (CCRI) linking back to the discussions of this morning observes SMEs need to find a place in the urban food system. E.g. the Community Farm is based in urban agriculture, but is barely viable, and needs a range of extra activities that relate to food production. However, these are often realised with external funding. In this respect, there are differences between the North and South in terms of what type of activities are profitable, and how multi-functionality relates to food production.

Manuel: you stop anyone on the street and you ask 'do you like organic, native forests?’ the answer is yes, but the problem is commitment. If the people would know what they eat is not good and what the breath is not good they would perhaps take different decisions.

Huibert suggested that on his farm in Rotterdam that there are no production activities that are profitable in isolation: it has to be explained to consumers what you do and how you produce, and from there you have to benefit from added values. This helps to persuade consumers to pay the premium prices for produce from the farm.

The Community Farm found funding for three years to guide the volunteers, and to develop a sense of community accessibility on the farm.
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Guests from the global South:
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