11

Summary, conclusions and recommendations

This study set out to explore how gender dynamics in urban agriculture shaped the construction of household livelihoods and impacted livelihood outcomes of farming households, and of individual men and women. This was intended not only as a contribution to the emerging body of knowledge on the importance of gender in urban agriculture, but also to the debate on policy implications for sustainable and equitable urban agriculture. Considered from a livelihoods perspective, the study conceptualized urban agriculture as constituting one of the livelihood strategies that were adopted by urban residents – and one which was interlinked with other livelihood strategies in varied ways – against a backdrop of a wide range of trends and events that defined urban residents' vulnerability contexts and increasingly strained their abilities to sustain household livelihoods and individual well-being. Such trends and events included loss of jobs following closure of, and retrenchments from, industries based in Eldoret and beyond due to macro-economic restructuring, as well as declining incomes, diminishing job opportunities in the local job market, and escalation of commodity prices. The most dramatic event during the course of the study was the post-2007 election violence.

The extent to which urban farmers were able to make a living from urban agriculture was mediated by various institutions and processes, operating at multiple but inter-locking scales. Of particular interest was how the various national urban agriculture-related laws and policies were implemented within Eldoret municipality, and how they impacted opportunities for the farming men and women. At the household level, the study focused on gender relations and how these mediated men's and women's access to resources, the respective roles they played in the construction of household livelihoods in general and in urban agriculture in

particular, and the implications of these not only for household livelihoods and individual well-being, but also for urban agriculture policy.

The first of three sections of this chapter that follow summarizes the key findings of the study and reflects on related theoretical postulations. The second section discusses the implications of urban agriculture policy for urban households and gender mainstreaming in light of the foregoing findings. The chapter ends with some recommendations for further research.

Summary of findings and theoretical reflections

Urban agriculture policy

Chapter 5 demonstrated how the interplay of national and municipal laws and policies, and the politics surrounding their enforcement shaped the practice of urban agriculture within Eldoret municipality. It showed how the contradictions and inconsistencies inherent in national legislations and policies, and the negative official attitudes towards urban agriculture within Eldoret Municipal Council (EMC) have not only engendered contradictions in the application of existing laws and policies within the municipality, but also impeded the evolution of a more responsive legal and policy framework for urban farming. In exercising its discretion about which national laws and policies to effect within its jurisdiction, the EMC has in most cases restricted and criminalized urban farming, with particularly stringent regulations being directed towards livestock-keeping. The EMC also tended to enforce its by-laws selectively, exercising leniency towards some sections of the farming community while harassing others on the basis of their ethnic identities. In addition, some EMC and government officials also practised urban agriculture, while some national government agencies and non-governmental organizations participated in promotional activities for urban farming against the EMC's wishes. These dynamics emboldened the resolve of urban farmers to continue farming despite the restrictions they faced.

Whether due to a lack of moral authority or the capacity to enforce its own by-laws against a resilient farming community, or due to its relative powerlessness vis-à-vis national government agencies involved in promotional activities, the EMC has had to tolerate urban agriculture in the town. The laxity in enforcing its by-laws also reflected the growing appreciation of the value of urban farming to the households involved, and of the challenges implied in land-use change in areas newly incorporated into the municipality. However, the tolerance of urban agriculture has not been accompanied by a change in official attitude and policy at the municipal level, which remain unfavourable and at best ambivalent towards urban agriculture. The EMC's latest set of by-laws (2009) do not make any provision for the support or regulation of crop cultivation and are prohibitive

of livestock keeping. On its part, however, the national government recently initiated policies aimed at regulating and supporting farming in Kenya's urban areas.

The EMC's tolerance of urban agriculture despite its anti-urban agriculture policies, and the government's recent pro-urban agriculture policy responses demonstrate that while meso-macro policies and institutions do shape individual's micro contexts for livelihood construction, the livelihood strategies individuals pursue at the micro-level may in turn impact meso-macro policies and institutions as well (e.g. Brons *et al*. 2005; Oberhauser & Hanson 2007). Also highlighted is the fact that institutions are necessarily dynamic and subject to multiple interpretations, contestation and negotiations (Scoones 1998) and that they also impact the livelihood options of different individuals and collectives differently, depending on their positioning within the social and power structures within which they are situated. Moreover, policy and institutional changes at the meso-macro levels must be understood not only from the point of view of the agency of urban farmers *per se* but, importantly too, from the point of view of the tensions between formal and informal policies and institutions, and the role of external actors and their relative power relations.

Access to farming resources and constraints

Farming households and individual men and women accessed the various farming resources across the five asset/capital categories – i.e. natural, physical, financial, human and social – to varying degrees, and with varying implications for household and individual outcomes. While all farming households had, by definition, access to land of some kind, the spaces under cultivation were generally small and perceived as inadequate by the majority of the farmers. Farming households established entitlement over the farming spaces mainly through purchase, social connections, and informal use of land around their dwellings. While those who owned land had unrestricted freedom of access to and use rights over such plots, the rest enjoyed tenuous use rights. For a variety of reasons, including social norms and cultural practices related to inheritance and ownership of land as well as better economic status, most farming spaces were owned or accessed by men in male-headed households; but female household heads also accessed land in their own right, although they did so to a limited extent and their holdings were generally smaller than men's. However, despite high incidences of non-ownership of land among them, women seemed to enjoy considerable access and use rights over household land for farming, but such rights were more limited for other land-uses such as housing. As such, many married women did not prioritize land ownership, preferring instead to negotiate the use of their husbands' plots.

Unlike married women, female household heads enjoyed greater control over the use of household land holdings for whatever uses.

Most farming households had access to water sources – mostly shallow wells and piped water – that were not only located within short distances of their dwellings, but also reliable all-year-round and, in the case of well water, accessible at no financial cost. However, a very small proportion of farming households irrigated their plots and those who did did not practice full-time irrigation. Many farmers considered drawing water from the wells to be cumbersome with some choosing to use piped water instead, although this was prohibited by the municipal council. Most crop cultivators practiced rain-fed agriculture and adapted their farming systems to rainfall seasonality and variability.

Financial credit tailored for urban agriculture was not available in Eldoret, and the farmers' plots lacked titles that could be used as collateral for loan acquisition from formal banking institutions. This constrained farmers from accessing additional farming spaces to increase the scale of production. It also limited their ability to modernize, intensify and optimize productivity of available spaces, and to engage in high-value agricultural enterprises. And whereas many women participated in informal credit-based social networks through which they accessed credit, such credit was rarely (re-)invested in urban agriculture. Many farmers relied on their limited personal savings and incomes from non-farming sources to make only modest investments in urban farming. Men tended to have greater access to such incomes due to their higher levels of participation in the informal sector. Financial resources for investment in urban agriculture were also generated through the sale of crop produce and livestock.

Although extension services were available in Eldoret, only a small proportion of the farmers had benefited from the services. Some farmers did not consider it necessary to seek the services, either because of the uncertainty over the future of urban agriculture, their view of urban agriculture as a marginal activity that did not require much investment, a lack of awareness about the existence of farming technologies that could improve productivity of their holdings or, in the case of women, a lack of time due to domestic responsibilities. The effectiveness and reach of extension services were also constrained by the lack of a structured urban agriculture extension programme, and by restrictions on urban agriculture by the municipal council as well as by inappropriate approaches adopted in targeting the farmers. As a consequence, farmers relied mostly on traditional knowledge and skills, and/or informal networks for agricultural information, and tended to adapt non-optimal farming systems and practices that were often not appropriate for the urban context. Because of their reliance on traditional knowledge and skills, men's and women's agricultural knowledge and skills were gendered, somehow reflecting the traditional rural-based agricultural division of labour and

roles. However, men's relatively higher literacy levels and greater spatial mobility enabled them to appropriate agricultural knowledge and information available in the public space to a greater extent than women.

The farmers, and particularly female household heads, derived a number of inputs from the local environment such as manure, crop residues, local seeds and seedlings for crop cultivation. Male-headed households accessed market-based inputs such as chemical fertilizers and pesticides to a greater extent than female-headed households. Livestock keepers also relied on the open spaces, dumpsites, garbage heaps and urban waste available in the local environment for livestock inputs. They also procured some inputs from the market, namely veterinary drugs and feed supplements. Most livestock keepers raised local breeds which, although considered more disease-resistant and less costly, were less productive.

Aside from the constraints related to access to farming resources, urban crop cultivators faced other constraints as well. Pests and diseases was the most prevalent problem among both crop cultivators and livestock keepers, and in both cases women and especially female household heads were the most affected. Theft of crops was also prevalent and was perceived more as a problem by women compared to men. Rainfall unreliability and variability, poor soils, and destruction of crops by livestock (of others) were also reported by crop cultivators. Other problems perceived by respondents as constraints to livestock keeping included conflict with neighbours, labour shortages, and theft of livestock.

Several conclusions can be drawn from the foregoing patterns of access to farming resources by households and individual men and women. Whether it is women's use rights over their household's farming spaces, or (under)utilization of the widely available water resources for irrigation and extension services to improve productivity, as has come to be emphasized in livelihood and gender studies (Bebbington 1999; Mandel 2004; Kabeer 1999), access to and not just availability of resources is critical in livelihood construction. And while more focus has been placed on the role of formal policies and institutions in mediating access to resources (Brons *et al* 2005), it seemed the case that at the household level informal institutions related to culture (i.e. social norms and gender ideologies) were perhaps more important, not least because they imbued assets and livelihood options with varied meanings for men and women. In the particular case of land, for instance, women's relatively easier access to household land for farming compared to its use for housing shows how social norms and gender roles can not only influence men's and women's livelihood options, but also shape how men and women relate to and value different livelihood assets and, related to this, prefer different modes of establishing entitlement over the assets.

Moreover, whether and how men and women exercised their agency in identifying probable livelihood opportunities, and whether they optimally utilized as-

sets available to them in making a living was dependent on their capabilities. Thus, the fact that many urban farmers underestimated the potential productivity and profitability of urban agriculture and in the process underutilized available extension services and/or withheld financial investments from the activity goes some way in sounding caution over the livelihood perspective's over-emphasis on poor people's agency. However, while this also makes the case for external interventions in catalyzing the agency of the poor to enable them realize greater potential of their assets, attention must be paid to the implications of such interventions for the meanings that men and women attach to, and their claims over, the assets involved and the activities to which they deploy the assets to earn a living. In other words, the potential impact of external interventions on household livelihoods, personal well-being, and gender relations cannot be underestimated.

Contribution of men and women to household livelihoods

Complementarities between men's and women's roles and livelihood activities in the construction of household livelihoods were apparent within conjugal households. Such roles and livelihood activities were underpinned by social norms and gender roles and responsibilities, and by personal agency augmented by individual capabilities and entitlements, which varied between and among men and women.

Men and women were responsible for different spheres of household well-being obligations. Generally men were regarded as overall breadwinners and decision-makers responsible for household provisioning, children's education, medical expenditure, housing, and other 'major' investments that involved lump-sum expenditures (e.g. land purchase). On the other hand, women were expected to take care of 'minor' household expenditures, food preparation, childcare, and home-keeping. However, as was apparent in Chapters 4 and 6, the prevailing economic circumstances had increasingly diminished men's abilities to effectively provide for their families, forcing many women to play more prominent roles in household provisioning as well, mostly by engaging in diverse activities in the informal sector, key among them being urban agriculture.

As with urban farming, most non-farming livelihood activities of choice for women were generally interconnected with their gender roles and home-keeping, and as such they primarily focused on food provisioning and were highly localized. The latter point illustrates the local embeddedness of the livelihoods of (female) urban farmers. In some cases, however, women did not only engage in more economically visible livelihood activities and venture into the public sphere – which is socially constructed as men's domain – but also became 'real' breadwinners for their households. The extent to which women took up this challenge was determined by a confluence of various factors, including ethnicity, age, and

socio-economic status within their households – implying that women (and men too) should not be treated in development planning as if they constitute homogenous categories. Yet as a result of the contraction of livelihood opportunities for men in the public sphere, they were on their part increasingly retreating into the feminine domestic space to explore alternative means of providing for their families – mostly in urban agriculture – sometimes with adverse implications for women's economic independence and autonomy. Such dynamics illustrate the fluidity of the gendered private/public spatial divide and its role in the (re)production of gender inequalities in changing economic contexts (see Youngs 2000).

As was indicated in Chapter 6, complementarities between men's and women's livelihood activities within household livelihood systems were mostly observed among spouses. Other household members who participated in livelihood activities were not only few, but also in most instances seemed less obligated to contribute towards household well-being. School-going children were also rarely mobilized to augment household livelihoods, except when their participation in livelihood activities did not interfere with their school work. Moreover, the complementarities between men's and women's livelihood activities did not necessarily involve complete disclosure and pooling of incomes, nor were the activities always intended for a shared household livelihood outcome. Most men and women pursued personal interests concurrent with their contributions towards household well-being. And while the pursuit of household livelihoods involved a certain level of co-operation between spouses, their personal interests were sometimes in competition or in conflict. Individuals' contributions towards household livelihoods were informed by their gender roles and responsibilities as well as perceptions of their obligations and of those of others. However, non-disclosure of incomes limited spouses' claims on each other's incomes thereby blurring such perceptions.

That children in farming households were less involved in urban agriculture and other livelihood activities – as their parents privileged their education instead – is relevant to the debate as to whether poor people's so-called livelihood strategies are actually borne out of strategic decisions or are simply here-and-now reactionary responses to adversity without an eye on the future. This particular case illustrates that the urban farmers did, to some degree, sacrifice their present circumstances and possibilities for short-term livelihood enhancement with a view to breaking intergenerational transfer of poverty. As for urban agriculture, however, the non-participation of children threatens its sustainability into the future, if it is recalled that many urban farmers relied on traditional knowledge gained from their farming backgrounds. Also to be considered among 'strategic' actions were the decisions by many urban farmers to limit investments in urban agriculture for fear of losing out due to EMC restrictions, or to avoid the vulner-

abilities associated with rainfall variability. Moreover, most of those who preferred to invest the income gained from urban agriculture in housing rather than re-invest it in urban farming considered their actions as a strategy of securing their old age when they would no longer be able to farm.

Men's and women's contributions to urban agriculture

The contributions of men and women to urban agriculture are considered here in terms of their decision-making roles and labour contributions. Urban agriculture literature has demonstrated how gender division of labour results in inequalities in livelihood outcomes for men and women, and how different patterns of labour allocation derive different outcomes for farming households. It has been suggested, for instance, that because women prefer and channel their labour predominantly in subsistence enterprises, their decision-making roles and labour contribution in urban agriculture hold greater prospects for household food security and well-being than men's decisions and labour which tend to dominate income-related urban agriculture activities and to derive greater personal benefits for men (see Jacobi *et al*. 2000).

Chapter 9 showed that men and women played different but complementary roles in decision making and that the roles were influenced by various factors, including relative control over farming resources (especially land), social norms and gender roles, personal agency, individual as well as household socio-economic standing, and the scale of agricultural production and its perceived economic visibility. Consistent with most urban agriculture studies in sub-Saharan Africa, it was the case that the initial decision to farm was mostly taken by women, and that they showed preference for subsistence crops and small livestock. Where men took the initiative, they tended to go for income-earning crops, large livestock, and to be involved when the scale of production was economically more visible. However, men were increasingly turning to subsistence farming (mostly cultivation of maize) to provide for their families as their non-farming income sources declined. Because of the conflicting interests between men and women on the one hand, and given the limited farming spaces available to households, on the other hand, power relations between men and women also came into play in determining whose decisions prevailed. And although men generally wielded greater decision-making power at the household level, women employed a variety of strategies and especially exploited their social spaces and gender roles to negotiate a bigger role in decision-making related to choice of crops and livestock, and use of urban agriculture products and income.

Chapter 10 confirmed that indeed women provided most of the labour in urban agriculture. The influence of social norms and gender roles on men's and women's labour contribution manifested in the type of agricultural activities and

tasks performed, the spatial segregation of the activities and tasks, and in labour access and control patterns. Because of their reproductive responsibilities, women dominated home gardening involving subsistence crops as well as the keeping of small livestock. Men, on the other hand, were involved to a greater extent with off-plot farming activities, those undertaken primarily for income and with large livestock, especially dairy cows and pigs. And in conforming to constructs of maleness and femaleness, men also performed what were considered difficult tasks while women performed 'easy' tasks. However, women spent longer hours than men on farm work because women's tasks were usually of a repetitive and routine nature while men's were usually undertaken on a one-off basis or only occasionally. Moreover, as the main household decision makers, men exercised greater control over women's labour but women had little or no control over men's labour.

The gendering of activities and tasks was also augmented by gender differentials in capabilities embodied in entitlements and farming knowledge and skills. Men and women sometimes performed certain tasks whose responsibility they were reluctant to give up on the assumption – rightly or wrongly – that they were the most knowledgeable about, and the most able, to perform them. In circumstances of unequal control over household labour, the gendered agricultural knowledge and skills enabled women to make claims on men's labour. There was evidence, however, that in certain circumstances some men and women crossed (or were willing to cross) gender boundaries and performed activities traditionally associated with the opposite gender in response to economic realities, shortage of labour of the opposite gender in the household, and because of the need to control benefits associated with the activities.

These decision-making patterns and gender division of labour had implications for livelihood outcomes. As would be expected, women's dominance of subsistence crops and their responsibility for small livestock and for certain tasks related to large livestock (e.g. milking) enhanced their control over the use of agricultural products thereby improving the availability of the products for home consumption. As primary marketers of farm produce and main decision makers on income use, women were also able to access income necessary for meeting other household needs. Agricultural decisions taken by men, especially at the level of produce and income use tended to mostly benefit them individually. As was shown in chapters 8, 9 and 10, this was particularly common with the sale of large livestock. However, it was evident that women did exploit their social space to also derive personal benefits from their labour and to advance their personal interests. They took advantage of men's general underestimation of the economic value of urban agriculture as well as men's relative absence from the home to underreport or even completely conceal the income from home gardens

as a strategy of gaining some economic independence and autonomy. Because of women's care giving and food provisioning responsibilities, some men also willingly ceded to them control over the use of agricultural output and income. Thus, while women's participation in urban agriculture might have been burdensome, the assumption of responsibility for crops, as well as livestock, was actually self-rewarding for them.

Granted, men's control of the more profitable enterprises – especially large livestock – derived greater personal benefits for them than for women despite the latter's labour contribution. However, in circumstances where women's labour was critical to the success of the enterprises, it became an important fall-back position for women in the household bargaining process. Co-operative arrangements and improved relations between spouses were more likely where women's labour was important, while in other cases women used the threat of labour withdrawal as a bargaining chip to share in income from livestock sales. But as Apusigah (2009) has pointed out in a different context, the consequence of gender inequalities and the socialization process that reproduces them is that such actions by women – as recounted, for example, by Njoroge in Chapter 10 – often yield limited gains "as they (women) negotiate and bargain within prescribed limits" and with little else (beyond labour) in terms of fall-back position. This is reflected in Mhubiri's explanation (captured in Chapter 10) as to why he often sold sheep by force whenever there was need despite knowing that his wife would protest and feel bad about it.

With regard to men's increased involvement with subsistence farming as an alternative means of meeting their social obligations to their households, the implications for household and individual outcomes were mixed too. Because they were relatively better-off in terms of resources entitlements and capabilities, men's involvement improved their household's access to inputs as well as labour for tasks that women could not manage. Indeed, evidence elsewhere has shown that men are less likely to yield to women's requests for urban agriculture-related support if they are not involved in and/or they undervalue urban farming (see e.g. Toriro 2009). In addition, and as several cases referred to in Chapters 8, 9 and 10 indicated, whenever there was any surplus farm produce to be sold – and for which the men were aware – most men did not ask for income from such sales. Thus, it may be concluded that where productivity and profitability was good, women would gain greater financial autonomy to respond to both household needs as well as personal interests. However, in many instances it also led to men scaling down on household provisioning thereby increasing women's burden of providing for their households.

The importance of urban agriculture: motives and needs of men and women

Urban agriculture achieved various outcomes for farming households and derived varied meanings – material as well as non-material – for individual men and women. It is evident from the foregoing discussion that, owing largely to their gender roles and responsibilities, men and women had different interests and preferences in urban agriculture and benefitted differently from it. This conclusion notwithstanding, both men and women tended to have a shared vision regarding the most immediate and basic household survival needs, namely to enhance food availability and income to meet basic household requirements.

The main motivation for men's and women's participation in urban farming was the need to enhance food availability at the household level, and to earn and/or save some income. It was clear that most respondents turned to urban farming in an effort to diversify their portfolio of activities to cope with economic hardships, mostly after incomes from other non-farming activities were no longer sufficient to support their families. They also participated in urban agriculture for cultural reasons, to gain economic independence, to utilize available space, and as a pass-time.

Overall, urban agriculture only made marginal contributions to household food supply and incomes, but such contributions were nonetheless significant for household survival at some critical moments. Although non-farming activities constituted the main sources of livelihood for most farming households, there were nonetheless important linkages and trade-offs between the two types of activities. In other words, the contribution of urban agriculture to household livelihoods and personal well-being cannot be conceived of simply in terms of direct food and income contributions. The relative contributions of urban agriculture vis-à-vis non-farming activities to household livelihoods as well as inter-linkages and trade-offs between them also varied over time and between households.

At the individual level, urban agriculture was valued by men more as a means of saving money on food expenditure that enabled them to use their often limited financial resources to meet other household obligations. However, livestock keeping was also a relatively important source of additional income, but more so for women. Urban agriculture, especially crop cultivation, provided the means with which women were more able to perform their gender roles and responsibilities (practical gender needs), and to gain social and economic empowerment (strategic gender interests). This was especially the case where urban agriculture leveraged their participation in social networks through which they were able to access financial credit.

The findings that urban agriculture generally catered for only a small portion of household food and income needs no doubt emboldens critics of urban agriculture policy advocacy who hold that the real significance of urban agriculture is

only speculative if not exaggerated, and that the practice is therefore not deserving of any special policy support (e.g. Webb 2011; Ellis & Sumberg 1998). However, for most of those who participate in urban agriculture, the activity's benefits, limited as they may seem, are clearly demonstrable and greatly valued. Moreover, as long as economic hardships of urban residents persist – characterized by falling incomes, declining purchasing power and rising food prices – own food production will remain an important strategy of improving their household food situations, even if only marginally. As has come to be recognized, following Amartya Sen, availability of food in the market does not necessarily translate into food availability at the household level for those who lack financial resources to establish entitlement over the food.

Moreover, it is now widely recognized in livelihood studies that poverty and well-being are better understood not just from the point of view of economic and material concerns, but from the totality of poor people's lived experiences and livelihood goals – including non-material and social concerns – as expressed by the poor themselves (Chambers 1995; Scoones 1998; Chambers & Conway 1992). If this is so, then the varied meanings that participation in urban agriculture give to the worlds of those participating in it (see Bebbington 1999), and more so in the case of women, clearly affirm the status of urban agriculture as a potentially important strategy for fighting urban poverty. In any case, urban agriculture's economic marginality and environmental and health risks associated with it are largely a function of poor regulatory regimes and lack of support. Moreover, besides the non-material benefits that accrued to urban farmers, urban agriculture was inter-linked and traded off with other income-generating activities in varied direct and indirect ways, the totality of which constituted household livelihood systems. Conceptually, this latter point highlights the need to adopt a broader and more holistic approach to people's livelihood response strategies – a point that is commonly emphasized but rarely taken up by livelihood studies (Brons *et al*. 2005).

Implications for policy

Recently, the Government of Kenya adopted the 'Sessional Paper No. 3 of 2009 on National Land Policy' and made public the draft National Urban and Peri-Urban Agriculture and Livestock Policy (UPAL) document. The two policy initiatives are aimed at regulating and supporting urban farming.

The Sessional Paper provides the most progressive and coherent national policy statement yet on urban agriculture. It is intended to "form the basis for, and (…) the overall guide to all other land-related policies" (Section 270) and a reference point for the review and harmonization of "land use planning functions of

(all) local authorities" (Section 255), including existing legislative frameworks for urban agriculture (Sections 254, 255, 270). Besides addressing a wide range of issues related to land that have a bearing on urban agriculture – e.g. land governance, management, utilization, access, equity, social justice, and tenure rights for various groups, including women, etc. – the Sessional Paper goes a step further. Not only does it recognize that "[U]rban agriculture has not been properly regulated and facilitated", it lays down principles upon which it shall be carried out: (a) "promotion of multi-functional urban land use, and (b) putting in place an appropriate legal framework to facilitate and regulate urban agriculture and forestry" (Section 12).

As a planning concept, urban multifunctional land use (MLU) promotes intensification in the use of urban space by emphasizing the combination of diverse but synergetic and inter-dependent land uses in one area (see Vreeker *et al*. 2004). In the context of urban agriculture, this principle disabuses the notion that the activity does not belong in the city and that it is incompatible with other urban landuses. It also departs from the oft-preferred 'zoning' model (see for example Owusu 2007; Mireri *et al*. 2007) that proposes the designation of particular areas as farming zones while excluding agricultural activities from other areas designated for other land uses such as residential, industrial, recreational, etc. Based on the MLU model, a case could be argued, for example, in favour of promoting urban agriculture within (or in close proximity of) residential areas because of its predominantly subsistence nature, but also because of the existence of a ready market (for home consumption) for any surplus agricultural produce. Allowing urban agriculture within close proximity of their residences rather than zoning far away areas for farming would also tap into women's labour and enhance their participation in the activity. This is because of women's supposed ability to juggle between the various domestic chores and farming tasks (Bryld 2003; Mougeot 2000; Jacobi *et al*. 2000), especially where agricultural activities and products can be integrated into their other income-generating activities. Given their domestic-based reproductive responsibilities, women are usually excluded from off-plot farming activities due to distance and time-related constraints.

The MLU principle's focus on maximization of urban space finds resonance in Section 109 (c) of the Sessional Paper which spells out that "the government shall (…) encourage development of underutilized land within urban areas". To appreciate the importance of this provision one has to consider that many urban farmers in Kenya cultivate plots in open, undeveloped public and private spaces but under circumstances of great anxiety and uncertainty over precarious tenure rights and harassment by local authorities as well as landlords and their agents (see Foeken 2006; Dennery 1996; Freeman 1991). Furthermore, as a custodian of

some of the (undeveloped) public spaces, the government can actualize the provision by allocating such land for purposes of urban farming. It is particularly instructive that unlike in the past when bureaucracy, corruption and nepotism excluded the poor from benefitting from allocation of public land in Kenya's urban centres (see Musyoka 2004; GoK 2009), the Sessional Paper contains provisions that cushion poor urban dwellers, including women, against exclusion in the land allocation process. For instance, it spells out that public land shall be allocated "through public auctions except for land earmarked for the support of livelihoods in urban and rural areas" (Section 84, c). This means that the government can deliberately allocate land to the poor rather than open it up for competition through the public auction process that would in all likelihood favour those with ample financial resources. The position of the poor urban residents – and especially women – in respect of access to public land for urban farming is further augmented by the emphasis the Sessional Paper places on "equitable access to land in the interests of social justice" (Section 39, e).

As regards the second principle, namely "putting in place a legal framework to facilitate and regulate urban agriculture", it is expected that the legalization of urban agriculture will go a long way in removing anxiety among farmers about the official status and future of urban agriculture in general, and about possibilities of having their crops destroyed or, as in the case of pig farmers in Eldoret, their livestock baited by municipal authorities. It is expected that a supportive and facilitative legal and policy environment would constitute an important incentive for urban farmers to invest in urban agriculture, but also attract outside resources, innovations and technologies necessary for improving productivity, profitability and environmental sustainability (see Bryld 2003; van Beek & Rutt 2007).

The Sessional Paper also makes clear the need to balance between the benefits of urban agriculture with ecological and public health concerns. It highlights the need for land use plans that promote "orderly management of human activities to ensure that such activities are carried out taking into account considerations such as the economy, safety, aesthetics, harmony in land use and environmental sustainability" (Section 104, c). Ironically, it is such framing of the essence of spatial planning that has defined the restrictive policy and legal frameworks for urban agriculture in many African cities. As was observed in Chapter 2, anti-urban agriculture policies and official attitudes were invariably predicated on the activity's perceived marginality to the urban economy, public health and security risks as well as its supposed incompatibility with other more formal urban landuses. The inherent risks of the said section of the Sessional Paper in the particular case of Eldoret should be understood in light of persistent negative attitudes towards urban agriculture among officials of the municipal council. The Sessional Paper's

emphasis on public participation in the spatial plans preparation and development control processes "for all urban and peri-urban areas in the country" (Section 109. a.; 59.h), and on the democratization of, and consideration of public interest and stakeholder needs in land appropriation for public use potentially bodes well for urban agriculture in this respect (Sections 42-3; 51 b; 104 f; and 105 c). However, this does not in and by itself necessarily guarantee a favourable regulatory framework for urban agriculture.

It should also be noted, as evidence from elsewhere on the continent suggests (e.g. Mkwambisi *et al*. 2010; Mlozi 2003), that favourable national policy frameworks for urban agriculture will amount to nothing if concrete steps are not taken to translate them at the local level. In light of the prevailing negative official attitudes within the EMC, educational and advocacy programmes targeted at municipal officials should thus form an integral part of the implementation process. The purpose of such programmes should be to raise awareness among officials of the importance of urban farming for urban households, and of ways in which the practice could be integrated into urban planning in a manner that enhances the urban environment. The involvement of civil-society organizations and research institutions will be critical in this process. Such programmes have yielded positive results in Kenya's Nakuru town (Foeken 2008), and in other urban centres in Sub-Saharan Africa (van Beek & Rutt 2007).

Effective implementation of the national policies at municipal level will also require improved coordination among various stakeholders in urban agriculture, including the EMC, relevant government departments, research institutions and civil-society organizations (including farmers' organizations) operating in the municipality. And finally, greater participation by the farming community in the design and implementation of urban agriculture support and regulatory framework is imperative. The (aspiring) urban and peri-urban farmers must find a way of engaging and negotiating with urban authorities (and other stakeholders in urban land use planning) and articulating their interests in an organized and structured manner. This is best realized by farmers' organizations, which are currently rare in urban centres in Kenya. Non-governmental and civil-society organizations can play an important role in raising awareness among farmers and organizing them and/or strengthening the capacity of farmers' organizations as vehicles through which farmers can participate in the policy implementation process. As has been demonstrated elsewhere (see e.g. Brock & Foeken 2006), organized farmers' groups could also play a critical role in enabling their members to access – through collective bargaining – farm inputs at affordable rates, extension services and new farming techniques and technologies, as well as markets and good prices for their produce. As shall be discussed below, participation of wo-

men in farmers' groups also offers them opportunities to network and build solidarity necessary for psychological support and collective action.

It is the proposed National Urban and Peri-Urban Agriculture and Livestock Policy (UPAL) – a draft of which was made public in May 2010 – that more specifically lays down policy guidelines and intervention measures for the support of urban farming.[1] The policy's broad objective is "to promote and regulate sustainable UPAL development to improve incomes, food security, create employment, enhance living standards and reduce poverty; while focusing on land use, public health and environmental management"(Section 2.1). This objective betrays a broad-based approach to urban agriculture planning aimed at harnessing its multiple functions within the broader context of sustainable urban development and city-wide food security.

At the household level, the policy addresses a broad range of constraints that many (would-be) urban farmers encounter, and environmental and health risks attributed to urban farming that typically provide the pretext for restricting its practice. The constraints – some of which were identified in Eldoret (see Chapter 7) as they have been in other urban contexts across sub-Saharan Africa – include lack of or inadequate access to farming resources such as land (and associated security of tenure problems), inputs, extension services tailored to the urban context, and appropriate urban agriculture technologies. Environmental and public health risks identified by the proposed policy document as requiring attention relate to unplanned disposal of urban agriculture waste, overuse of agrochemicals, cultivation of contaminated sites, use of untreated sewage, nuisance associated with marauding livestock, and transmission of zoonotic diseases. The policy outlines specific measures to address these challenges. The urban farmers' recognition of environmental and health risks associated with unregulated urban farming (see Chapter 5) augurs well for the regulatory initiative, the successful implementation of which will require environmental awareness and effective participation of urban residents.

Support for farmers to access farming resources as proposed in the policy (section 3.0) will be of particular significance. Especially for the poor and recent immigrants to urban areas for whom access to farming space is the most problematic (see e.g. Dennery 1996), intervention measures aimed at enabling urban residents to access land stand out. As for those already with some farming space, access to more land is essential for expanding and diversifying production. The question is what and how much the government and urban authorities can actually do to meet the predictably high demand for agricultural land – and whether it makes economic sense to do so – in a context of stiff competition from other

[1] The policy was developed jointly by the ministries of Agriculture, and Livestock Development.

competing landuses over the increasingly scarce land resource. Other measures that focus on improving productivity include the promotion of agricultural intensification through adaption of appropriate technologies, high value crops and livestock, and promotion of extension services. Such measures are particularly important given that the majority of farming spaces, especially home gardens, are typically small holdings.

By virtue of women's gender roles and, deriving from this, their control over the use of agricultural produce (especially crop and some livestock products), it could be assumed that any improved productivity will translate into improved household well-being and advance women's practical gender interests by enabling them to play their reproductive roles more effectively. As a result of this, and more so by generating income with which they can build social capital and use it as a basis for accessing financial capital, improved productivity would enable women to also enhance their contributions to household sustenance and asset building thereby raising their social status and voice at the household and community levels.

However, it must be borne in mind that since women provide the most labour, any increase in the scale of urban farming, without securing men's greater involvement in domestic responsibilities and/or in farming activities associated with or previously carried out by women, comes with the possibility of increased demands on their time and labour (see Hovorka 2006). This is more the case if the (extra) plot to be accessed is located at a considerable distance from the home. Yet greater involvement of men in urban agriculture activities – especially once such activities become more economically visible – may not necessarily benefit household well-being or serve women's interests. On the contrary, it may lead to men's withdrawal of budgetary support with income from non-farming activities, and/or undermine women's claims on the incomes derived from urban farming thereby reducing their space to maneuver with the income that may accrue to their labour. Unlike women's labour which contributed more directly to household well-being, men tended to privilege their own interests. And while adoption of some technologies may also lessen women's workload, improvements in agricultural productivity resulting from the use of such technologies has the potential of attracting greater interest of men in urban agriculture with a similar effect of eroding women's maneuvering space. It must be recalled that women's economic independence and autonomy was largely gained through concealment of incomes, which was made possible by men's under-estimation of the activity's economic value, and their regular absence from the home. As for the men who knowingly ceded to women control over the use of income as a means of safeguarding their own personal incomes, it is difficult to speculate whether or not they would continue to do so (and under what circumstances)

when and if productivity improved substantially. In other words, the challenge for gender planning in urban agriculture is to support urban agriculture in a way that lessens women's labour burdens and/or promotes more equitable sharing of labour between men and women, while at the same time enhancing their decision-making role in the use of agricultural produce and income. Interventions in favour of home-based agricultural activities that are critical to household food supply and that also earn some income, and over which women traditionally exercise greater control such as vegetable production, will be particularly beneficial. Among large livestock, support for dairy farming would most probably enhance more co-operative arrangements between men and women, improve household welfare (in terms of milk consumption), and derive equitable benefits for both men (in terms of saving on food expenditure) and women (in terms of economic independence) than, say, pig production.

Moreover, while women's access to agricultural extension services is important in terms of improving productivity and reducing their dependence on men (who may sometimes be un-cooperative) for the performance of agricultural tasks and access to knowledge and skills, it may in certain instances have adverse implications for women. If – as was apparent from many men's accounts – men took up certain tasks because of their perception that women were unable to perform them, then any extension services offered with men's knowledge that improves women's agricultural knowledge and skills in performing those tasks will annul men's rationale for performing the tasks. Thus, it may be argued that any attempt to bridge the gender knowledge and skills gap – e.g. through extension services – that does not simultaneously address the power asymmetry in relation to labour allocation may work to the disadvantage of women.

Ultimately, the empowerment potential of urban agriculture more generally is more probable when, as Hovorka (2006: 60) notes, "women's participation in urban agriculture comes out of choice rather than need". This will require that structural causes of poverty and gender inequalities are confronted. It was certainly the case that through their participation in urban farming, some women were able to renegotiate intra-household gender relations in their favour and to gain a voice at the household level. However, such women mostly preferred not to project such empowerment beyond their households in order to avoid harming the public image of their spouses as well as to retain their own respectable 'wifely' status in the community. (This reflects the cultural sanctions of gender inequalities operating at the extra-household or community level.) Thus, although individual women's agency may achieve emancipation at the household level, by remaining invisible in the public domain, the impact of such agency on the structural inequalities and women's conditions more generally remain limited (Kabeer 1999). Consequently, to improve the circumstances of women individually and

collectively, development programmes must aim at redressing gender inequalities at the community level as well, and should of necessity entail "collective solidarity in the public arena (besides propping up) individual assertiveness in the private" (*ibid.*: 457). In the context of urban agriculture, community gardening and farmer's organizations can constitute important forums through which women can access support for agricultural production, build solidarity and a sense of community and, through conscientisation, engage in collective action to improve their conditions (see e.g. Slater 2001).

It should be pointed out, however, that while interventions in the public arena may be relatively easy to implement and/or monitor, it is more difficult at the level of the household, which, as Chant (1998: 19) observes "is widely seen as a 'private' as well as a 'natural' domain". Moreover, external actors' perceptions about women's circumstances and prescriptions about the choices they ought to make may not necessarily cohere with women's own values and the meanings they attach to their choices, or even be feasible in the contexts within which the women are situated (Kabeer 1999). It has been mentioned, for instance, that female farmers preferred to negotiate power relations silently and to avoid disrupting intra-household power relations, perhaps because acting contrary could be more costly given their lack of strong fall-back positions. Thus, policy interventions need to take cognizance of such sensitivities embodied in cultural structures operating at the extra-household level, and of the available possibilities and opportunities for exercising agency, if the activities that are subject of intervention are to have meaning for and be valued by the participants. It is noteworthy that the proposed UPAL policy proposes to "incorporate gender concerns in UPAL related development programmes; and (...) [to] develop and implement innovative programmes that enhance equity between men and women in UPAL production and marketing" (section 3.9.1). Hopefully the concerns discussed above, among others, will inform such programmes.

Besides the household and personal benefits that are likely to be gained from improved productivity of urban agriculture as envisaged by the UPAL policy interventions, it is also expected that such improvements would positively impact urban development more generally. In the particular case of food security, the sale of surplus food and improved incomes for farmers and other participants along the urban agriculture production chain will contribute towards city-wide food security. And whereas the policy's proposal to "discourage informal marketing of UPAL products through establishment of designated food courts, cottage industries and mainstreaming them into formal marketing" (section 3.5.2) is aimed at aiding this process, formalization of marketing – to be augmented by stringent food handling and processing standards and guidelines – may end up stifling poor urban farmers' participation in formal markets. It will also constrain

poor urban residents' access to food that would otherwise be more affordable and more easily available from informal markets within their neighbourhoods. This adds to the doubts about the feasibility and potential of urban agriculture as a poverty-alleviating strategy in light of the enormous resources required for its support as implied by the wide range of proposed intervention measures on the one hand, and the scarcity of resources and competing demands on the same, on the other hand. It does not help that some urban farmers themselves tended not to consider urban agriculture as an activity worth more serious attention and substantial investment, putting greater premium instead on other livelihood activities. While this may, by itself, have been a consequence of legal constraints and lack of support for and limited productivity of urban agriculture, such perceptions augment apprehensions about urban agriculture policy advocacy. Yet, the urban agriculture policy initiatives do not explore any possibilities for inter-linkages and enhanced synergies between urban agriculture and non-farming livelihood activities. For instance, what would support for urban agriculture mean for other livelihood activities, and for the direction of inter-linkages between urban agriculture and other non-farming livelihood activities within the household livelihood systems? And, by implication, would it not therefore make more economic sense and be more responsive to the felt needs of the poor to support livelihood activities chosen by them, if that is what their lived realities dictate?

Implications for research

A study based largely on home gardens or on-plot farming, such as this, provides only a partial picture of gender dynamics in urban agriculture. It misses out on other issues that play out in the context of off-plot farming (i.e. farming in public/open urban spaces) such as access to land and tenure (in)security, community organizing and collective action associated with community gardening, public health and aesthetic concerns, etc. These issues are central to debates about the sustainability of urban agriculture and, as such, to urban agriculture planning. Besides, while urban agriculture undertaken on people's own plots in most part falls beyond the purview of the municipal authority's planning regulations, open space farming is subject to direct surveillance of municipal authorities. Thus, exploring gender dynamics in both home gardening and open space farming is critical for gaining a more complete picture of the role of gender in shaping the functioning of urban agriculture. In particular, it will provide a better understanding of the role of the gendered private/public spatial division in (re)producing gender inequalities in the context of urban agriculture on which intervention measures at the household as well as the extra-household level can draw.

Similarly, greater attention should be paid to the trade-offs and inter-linkages between urban agriculture and other household livelihood strategies and the role of gender in this, if the real value of urban agriculture is to be better understood. Studies have tended to focus on urban agriculture as an isolated livelihood strategy without paying attention to the varied ways in which it impacts and is impacted by other livelihood strategies that together constitute household livelihood systems. At the policy level such information is essential for enabling planners to anticipate probable consequences of supporting urban agriculture on other livelihood activities and vice versa, and on overall household livelihood systems as well. It also enables planners to explore possibilities of targeting support for urban agriculture in a manner that enhances beneficial synergies between urban agriculture and other livelihood activities.

Whereas access to farming resources has been identified in the literature among important constraints that require policy attention, the findings of this study point to the need to pay greater attention to how men and women relate to, and the varied meanings they attach to, different farming resources, and the implications of different modes of establishing entitlement over such resources for their respective roles in urban agriculture, and for personal as well as household livelihood outcomes. As Kabeer (1999: 44) has pointed out, "if it is to be useful as a measure of empowerment, the 'resource' dimension has to be defined in ways which spell out the potential for human agency and valued achievements more clearly than simple 'access' indicators generally do."

Attempts should also be made to gain more insights into the varied meanings of, and the value attached to agricultural work and to different agricultural tasks by men and women. This will help in understanding the continuities and changes, in the urban context, of the traditional agricultural division of labour and the gendered agricultural knowledge and skills. As with many studies on work (Jackson & Palmer-Jones 1999), analysis of division of labour in urban agriculture research has tended to overemphasize the relative 'burdensomeness' and time constraints related to men's and women's participation in urban agriculture and in the performance of specific agricultural tasks as a proxy for gender inequalities in well-being outcomes.

Lastly, urban agriculture research in sub-Saharan Africa has paid scant attention to the inter-generational dimension, which is in many ways intertwined with that of gender and integral to the sustainability of urban agriculture. This begs the question: if we should plan for the sustainability of urban agriculture into the future, shouldn't we focus too on the role and contribution of the future farmers, i.e. young men and women?

Appendices

Appendix 3.1 Key issues and related diagnostic/data extraction tools

Form	Key issues	Sub-issues	Diagnostic tool
1		Household composition: Sex, age, marital status, education, employment status, ethnicity	
		Urban-rural linkages	
2	Importance of urban agriculture for farming households	Farming activities undertaken by households	Gender benefits analysis
		Motives for participating in urban agriculture	Gender analysis matrix
		Benefits from urban agriculture	
3	Needs of men and women in urban agriculture	Choice of farming activities	Gender decision-making matrix
		Personal benefits from urban farming	Gender benefits analysis
		Household participation in non-farming livelihood activities	
4	Contribution of men and women to urban agriculture and household livelihoods	Performance of roles and tasks in urban agriculture	Gender activity analysis chart
		Household food security	Gender decision-making matrix
			Gender resource analysis and mapping
5	Constraints of men and women in urban agriculture	Problems faced by men and women in urban agriculture.	Gender problems analysis
		Access to farming resources (land, water, inputs, technical support, financial capital).	Gender resource analysis and mapping
6	Household poverty/welfare level	Household ownership of assets	Asset-based welfare index construction
		Access to amenities	
		Physical conditions of dwellings	
7.	Legal and policy framework for urban agriculture	Knowledge of municipal council policies on urban agriculture. Enforcement of municipal council policies. Perception of environmental and health risks of urban agriculture by urban farmers.	

Appendix 3.2 Demographic characteristics of respondents

Characteristic	No. of respondents	% of total
Geographic distribution		
Block 3	67	34
Block 4	133	67
Total	200	100
Sex of respondent		
Female	128	64
Male	72	36
Total	200	100
Relation to household head		
Female household head	31	16
Female spouse	95	48
Male head (conjugal)	62	31
Male head (single)	8	4
Other (son)	2	1
Other (daughter)	2	1
Total	200	100
Respondents age (years)		
>20 years	2	1
20-29	26	13
30-39	46	23
40-49	57	28.5
50-59	39	19.5
60-69	17	8.5
70 and above	13	6.5
Total	200	100
Respondents' education level		
No formal education	24	12
Up to upper primary	61	32
Secondary and above	108	56
Total	193	100
Respondents' ethnicity		
Kikuyu	100	50
Luhya	27	22
Kisii	43	14
Kalenjin	15	8
Luo	3	5
Kamba	9	1.5
Others	3	1.5
Total	200	100

Appendix 3.3 Principal component analysis descriptive statistics

	Mean	Std. deviation	Analysis N
vehicle/motorbike	.0938	.29240	160
bicycle	.4188	.49490	160
television set	.5000	.50157	160
radio	.7688	.42296	160
urban plot(s)	.4563	.49965	160
rural plot(s)	.2250	.41889	160
owner-occupied dwelling	.9438	.23113	160
cemented walls	.3688	.48398	160
cemented floor	.5125	.50141	160
access to electricity	.1313	.33873	160
access to piped water	.6688	.47214	160

Appendix 6.1 Crops grown by farming households in Langas

Crop	No. of Households cultivating	% of total	Crop	No. of households cultivating	% of total
Sukuma wiki (kale)	97	61	Passion fruit	4	3
Maize	95	59	*Dhania*	4	3
Spinach	40	25	Carrots	4	3
Bananas	33	21	Pumpkins	3	2
Suja (black night shade)	28	18	*Saga* (spider plant)	3	2
Sugarcane	28	18	*Nderema*	3	2
Beans	24	15	Cabbages	3	2
Cowpeas	20	13	Green peas	1	1
Nduma (arrow roots)	17	11	Green peppers	2	1
Onions	16	10	Oranges	1	1
Avocados	14	9	Luguards	1	1
Tomatoes	13	8	Guavas	1	1
Irish potatoes	11	7	Sorghum	1	1
sweet potatoes	9	7	Cucumbers	1	1
Cassava	5	3	Mangoes	1	1

Appendix 6.2 Participation in non-farming livelihood activities (NFAs), by gender and type of household headship

	N	Men	Women	Male h'head	Female spouse	Female h'head	Other male	Male headed	Female headed
Landlord	59	44	15	44	3	12	-	47	12
Grocery	37	3	34	2	26	8	1	28	9
Hawking (general merchandize)	35	20	15	17	8	7	3	25	10
Casual employee	30	25	5	16	2	3	9	27	3
Artisanal/manufacturing	23	16	7	14	3	4	2	19	4
Regular employee	17	11	6	9	5	1	2	16	1
Retail trade (shop, kiosk)	11	3	8	2	6	2	1	9	3
Transport	10	9	1	9	-	1	-	9	1
Community service	4	4	-	4	-		-	4	-
Other services	4	1	3	1	1	2	-	1	2
Total	230	136	94	118	54	40	18	185	45

Appendix 7.1 Constraints faced by crop cultivators, by gender (%)

Problem/constraint	Total	Men	Women	Male Head	Female spouse	Female head
N	176	68	108	65	84	23
Resource access-related						
High input costs	25	22	27	23	25	30
Labour shortage	10	13	8	12	7	17
Lack of money	8	6	9	5	7	22
Insecurity of tenure	5	4	5	5	5	4
Lack of access to water	5	6	4	6	5	-
Lack of farming skills	3	4	2	5	1	4
Low market prices	2	1	2	3	1	-
Environmental/ecological						
Pests and diseases	64	60	67	62	62	83
Insufficient/unreliable rainfall	19	21	19	22	19	17
Poor land quality	16	15	18	15	15	26
Water logging	2	1	3	3	10	4
Social problems						
Theft of crop	22	13	27	12	26	30
Destruction of crops	6	3	8	3	8	4

Appendix 7.2 Constraints faced by livestock-keepers, by gender (%)

Problem/constraint	Total	Men	Women	Male Head	Female spouse	Female head
N	148	64	84	61	59	24
Resource access-related						
Lack of financial capital						
High input costs	16	13	18	11	15	21
Labour shortage	11	9	12	10	5	17
Poor market prices	6	9	4	5	3	8
Environmental/ecological						
Pests and diseases	75	63	82	62	80	88
Shortage of fodder/feeds	11	16	8	16	7	13
Social problems						
Conflict with neighbours	14	9	17	8	17	21
Theft of livestock	9	9	10	10	8	13
Predation	3	5	2	5	2	4

Appendix 9.1 Decision-making on choice of crops, by gender

Crop	N*	Men	Women	Joint
FOOD CROPS				
Sukuma wiki (kale)	104	17	53	30
Maize	91	27	31	33
Spinach	37	10	17	10
Beans	*22*	4	12	6
Cow peas	7	2	2	3
Nduma (arrow roots)	8	-	7	1
Onions	12	3	9	0
Tomatoes	10	3	4	3
Irish potatoes	6	-	6	-
Sweet potatoes	8	-	6	2
Pumpkins	2	-	2	-
Saga	1	-	1	-
Cabbages	2	-	1	1
Cassavas	4	-	4	-
INCOME-EARNING CROPS				
Suja (black night shade)	30	9	10	11
Dhania	5	3	-	2
Green pepper	2	2	-	-
OTHER CROPS				
Bananas	27	3	20	4
Sugarcane	26	4	17	3
Avocadoes	9	4	3	2
Passions	3	2	1	-
Oranges	2	-	2	-
Luguards	1	1	-	-
TOTAL	389	96(25%)	206(53%)	129(33%)

* The number of decision-making instances, i.e. the number of households cultivating the crop.

Appendix 9.2 Decision-making in consumption and sale of crop products, by gender

Crop product	Consumption				Sale			
	N	Men	Women	Joint	N	Men	Women	Joint
FOOD CROPS								
Sukuma wiki leaves	93	8	69	13	72	10	37	24
Sukuma wiki suckers	-	-	-	-	5	2	1	2
Maize grain	90	18	38	34	7	1	3	3
Spinach	30	9	16	4	25	7	15	3
Beans	14	2	2	8	2			2
Cowpeas	6	-	3	3	4	1	2	1
Nduma	8	-	7	1	2	-	2	-
Onions	12	2	9	1	5	2	2	1
Tomatoes	10	3	4	3	7	-	2	2
Irish potatoes	6	1	5	-	1	1	-	-
Sweet potatoes	8	-	6	2	-	-	-	-
Cassavas	4	-	4	-	-	-	-	-
Pumpkin leaves	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-
Saga	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-
Cabbage	2	-	2	-	-	-	-	-
INCOME-EARNING CROPS								
Suja	26	3	18	5	19	6	8	5
Dhania	4	3	-	1	4	2	-	2
Green pepper	2	-	-	2	2	2	-	-
OTHER CROPS								
Avocados	7	2	3	2	4	-	2	2
Passions	3	-	2	1	-	-	-	-
Sugarcane	23	3	13	6	6	2	2	2
Bananas	23	1	22	-	5	2	2	1
TOTAL	373	55(15)	225(60)	86(23)	170(46)	38(10)	80(21)	51(14)

Appendix 9.3 Decision-making on use of income from crops, by gender

Crop product	No. sold	Male spouse	Female spouse	Joint
FOOD CROPS				
Sukuma wiki leaves	72	6	46	19
Sukuma wiki suckers	5	2	3	-
Maize grain	7	-	4	3
Spinach	25	3	19	3
Beans	2	-	-	2
Cowpeas	4	-	2	2
Nduma	2	-	2	-
Onions	5	-	2	3
Tomatoes	7	-	4	3
Irish potatoes	1	1	-	-
Sub-total	130	12	82	35
INCOME-EARNING CROPS				
Suja	19	4	6	9
Dhania	4	2	2	-
Green pepper	2	2	-	-
Sub-total	25	8	8	9
OTHER CROPS				
Bananas	5	2	2	1
Sugarcane	6	-	3	3
Avocados	4	-	4	-
Sub-total	15	2	9	4
TOTAL	170	22(13)	99(58)	48(28)

Appendix 9.4 Decision-making in use of livestock products, by gender

Crop product	Consumption				Sales			
	N	Men	Women	Joint	N	Men	Women	Joint
Large livestock								
Cow milk	30	6	11	13	20	6	6	8
Cow manure	-	-	-	-	4	2	-	2
Live cows	-	-	-	-	10	3	-	7
Sheep meat	22	5	4	13	-	-	-	-
Sheep manure	-	-	-	-	2	-	2	-
Live sheep	-	-	-	-	15	10	-	4
Goat meat	4	1	-	3	-	-	-	-
Live goats	-	-	-	-	4	3	-	1
Live pigs	-	-	-	-	9	5	-	4
Sub-total	56	12(21)	15(27)	29(52)	64	29(45)	8(13)	26(41)
Small livestock								
Chicken meat	43	8	17	18	-	-	-	-
Chicken eggs	42	5	28	9	17	-	13	4
Live chickens	-	-	-	-	18	3	8	7
Duck meat	15	3	5	7	-	-	-	-
Duck eggs	12	3	5	4	4	-	3	1
Live ducks	-	-	-	-	8	1	4	3
Sub-total	112	19(17)	55(49)	38(34)	47	4(9)	28(60)	15(32)
Total	168	31(18)	70(42)	67(40)	111	33(30)	36(32)	41(37)

Note: Figures in parentheses denote corresponding percentages.

Appendix 10.1 Responsibility for crops, by gender

Crop	N	Male household Head	Female spouse	Joint
FOOD CROPS				
Sukuma wiki	104	19	66	9
Maize	91	22	55	9
Spinach	37	11	18	6
Beans	22	-	15	5
Cow peas	7	1	6	-
Nduma	8	-	8	-
Onions	12	2	10	-
Tomatoes	10	5	5	-
Irish potatoes	6	-	6	-
Sweet potatoes	8	-	8	-
Cassavas	4	-	4	-
Pumpkins	2	-	2	-
Saga	1	-	1	-
Cabbages	2	-	2	-
INCOME-GENERATING CROPS				
Suja	30	10	16	3
Dhania	5	1	2	2
Green pepper	2	-	1	1
OTHER CROPS				
Bananas	27	4	21	-
Sugarcane	26	4	20	-
Avocadoes	9	6	3	-
Passions	3	2	1	-
Oranges	2	-	-	2
Luguards	1	-	-	1
TOTAL	389	87(22)	270(69)	38(10)

Note: The figures in parentheses represent corresponding percentages. Where they do not add up to 100% in their respective rows in respect of decision-making and responsibility, it is either because of rounding or because the decisions were taken by, or it was the responsibility of, members of households other than the male household head or the spouse.

Appendix 10.2 Responsibility for livestock, by gender

	N	Men	Women	Joint
Large livestock				
Cows	36	12	13	10
Sheep	42	11	20	6
Goats	9	3	2	3
Pigs	14	4	6	3
Sub-total	101	30(30)	41(41)	22(22)
Small livestock				
Chickens	57	9	39	9
Ducks	21	1	17	3
Sub-total	78	10(13)	56(72)	12(15)
Total	179	40(22)	97(54)	34(19)

Note: Some percentages do not add up to 100% because household members other than the male household head and/or the female spouse also took decisions on the choice of livestock.

References

ABDALLA, M.A. (2008), *Poverty and inequality in urban Sudan: Policies, institutions and governance*. Leiden: African Studies Centre.

ADEPOJU, A. (2004), Feminisation of poverty in Nigerian cities: Insights from focus group discussions and participatory poverty assessment. *African Population Studies*, 19(2sA): 142-154.

AGARWAL, B. (1997), "Bargaining" and gender relations: Within and beyond the household. *Feminist Economics* 3(1): 1-51.

AMIS, P. (1995), Making sense of urban poverty. *Environment and Urbanization* 7(1): 145-158.

ANGELES, L.C. (2009), Rethinking the feminization of poverty thesis. *Sex Roles* (61): 293-6.

ANGEL-URDINOLA, D. & Q. WODON (2010), Income generation and Intra-household decision making: A gender analysis for Nigeria. In: J.S. Arbache, A. Koler & E. Filipiak, eds *Gender disparities in Africa's labour markets,* pp. 381-406. Washington, D.C.: World Bank.

APUSIGAH, A.A. (2009), The gendered politics of farm household production and shaping of women's livelihoods in Nothern Ghana. *Feminist Africa* 12: 51-68.

BADEN, S. (1999). Gender, governance and the feminisation of poverty. Background Paper #2 presented at the Meeting on Women and Political Participation: 21st Century Challenges, United Nations Development Programme, March 24-26, 1999.

BAKHIT, A.H. (1994), Availability, affordability and accessibility of food in Khartoum. *GeoJournal* 34(3): 253-255.

BARDASI, E. & Q. WODON (2009), Working long hours and having no choice: Time poverty in Guinea. Washington D.C: World Bank Policy Research Working Paper Series # 4961.

BEALL, J., N. KANJI & C. TACOLI (1999), African urban livelihoods: Straddling the rural-urban divide. In: S. Jones & N. Nelson, eds, *Urban poverty in Africa: From understanding to alleviation*, pp. 160-168. London: Intermediate Technology Publications.

BEBBINGTON, A. (1999), Capitals and capabilities: A framework for analyzing peasant viability, rural livelihoods and poverty. *World Development* 27(12): 2021-2044.

BENNETT, E. (2005), Gender, fisheries and development. *Marine Policy* 29: 451-459.

BINGEN, J. (2000), *Institutions and sustainable livelihoods*. Michigan State University.

BLACKDEN, C.M. & R.S. CANAGARAJAH (2003), Gender and growth in Africa: Evidence and issues. World Bank UNECA Expert Meeting on Pro-Poor Growth, Kampala, Uganda, June 23-24.

BLESS, B.D. (2005), Challenges and livelihood strategies of girls and boys in child-headed households in Maseru, Lesotho. In: F. Kalabamu, M. Mapetla & A. Schlyter, eds, *Gender, generations and urban living conditions in Southern Africa*, pp. 13-34. Lesotho: Institute of Southern African Studies (ISAS).

BOOYSEN, F., S. VAN DER BERG, R. BURGER & M. VON MALTITZ (2008), Using an asset index to assess trends in poverty in seven sub-Saharan African countries. *World Development* 36(6): 1113-1130.

BOURQUE, M. (2000). Policy options for urban agriculture.In: N. Bakker, M. Dubbeling, S. Guendel, U. Sabel Koschella & H. de Zeeuw, eds, *Growing cities, growing food, urban agriculture on the policy agenda*. Feldafing, Germany: Deutsche Stiftung für Internationale Entwicklung (DSE).

BRADSHAW, S. (2002), *Gendered poverties and power relations: Looking inside communities and households*. Managua, Nicaragua: Fundación Puntos de Encuentro.

BRIDGE (2001), Briefing paper on the feminisation of poverty. Paper Prepared for the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (Sida).

BROCK, B. & D. FOEKEN (2006), Urban agriculture for a better environment: A case of Cotonou, Benin, *Habitat International* 30: 558-578.

BROCKERHOFF, M. (2000), An urbanizing world. Achieving urban food and nutrition security in the developing world. *Focus 3, Brief 2 of 10*. Washington D.C: International Food Policy Research Institute.

BRONS, J., T. DIETZ, A. NIEHOF & K. WITSENBURG (2005), Dimensions of vulnerability to livelihoods in less-favoured areas: Interplay between the individual and the collective. Paper prepared for the Ceres Summer School, June 2006.

BRUCE, J. (1989), Homes divided. *World Development* 17(7): 979-991.

BRYLD, E. (2003), Potentials, problems, and policy implications for urban agriculture in developing countries. *Agriculture and Human Values* 20: 79-86.

CENTRAL BUREAU OF STATISTICS (CBS) (Kenya), MINISTRY OF HEALTH (MOH) (Kenya) & ORC MACRO (2004), *Kenya demographic and health survey 2003.* Calverton, Maryland: CBS, MOH, and ORC Macro.

CHAMBERS, R. (1995), Poverty and livelihoods: Whose reality counts? *Environment and Urbanization* 7(1): 173-204.

CHAMBERS, R. & G. CONWAY (1992), *Sustainable rural livelihoods: Practical concepts for the 21st century*. Brighton: University of Sussex, Institute of Development Studies Discussion Paper 296.

CHANT, S. (1998), Households, gender and rural-urban migration: reflections on linkages and considerations for policy. *Environment and Urbanization* 10(1): 5-22.

CHANT, S. (2007), *Gender, generation and poverty: Exploring the feminisation of poverty in Africa, Asia and Latin America.* Cheltenham, UK; Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar.

CHANT, S. (2009), The Feminisation of poverty in Costa Rica: To what extent a Conundrum? *Bulletin of Latin American Research* 28(1): 19-43.

CHIPETA, L.K. (2005), Gendered separation of space in Blantyre city, Malawi. In: F. Kalabamu, M. Mapetla & A. Schlyter, eds, *Gender, generations and urban living conditions in Southern Africa*, pp. 35-52. Lesotho: Institute of Southern African Studies (ISAS).

DANIELS, L. (1999), The role of small enterprises in the household and national economy in Kenya: A significant contribution or a last resort? *World Development,* 27(1): 55-65.

DE HAAN, L. (2000), Globalization, localization and sustainable livelihood. *Sociologia Ruralis.* 40(3): 339-365.

DE HAAN, L. & A. ZOOMERS (2003), Development geography at the cross-roads of livelihood and globalisation. *Tijdscrift voor Economische en Sociale Geografie* 94(3): 350-362.

DE HAAN, L. & A. ZOOMERS (2006), How to research the changing outlines of African Livelihoods. *Africa Development* XXXI(4): 121-150.

DEKKER, M. (2004), Sustainability and resourcefulness: Support networks during periods of stress. *World Development* 32(10): 1735-1751.

DENNERY, P.R. (1996), Urban food producers decision making: A case study of Kibera, city of Nairobi, Kenya. *African Urban Quarterly* 11(2 & 3): 189-200.

DEVAS, N. & D. KORBOE (2000), City governance and poverty: The case of Kumasi. *Environment and Urbanization* 12(1): 123-135.

DIETZ, T. (2011), *Silverlining Africa: From images of doom and gloom to glimmers of hope – From places to avoid to places to enjoy.* Inaugural Address, Leiden University & African Studies Centre.

DIETZ, T. & F. ZAAL (2001), The provisioning of African cities, with Ouagadougou as a case study. In: I. Baud, J. Post, L. de Haan & T. Dietz, eds, *Re-aligning government, civil society and the market. New Challenges in urban and regional development. Essays in honour of G.A. de Bruijne*, pp. 309-328. Amsterdam: AGIDS.

DRAKAKIS-SMITH, D., T. BOWYER-BOWER & D. TEVERA (1995), Urban poverty and urban agriculture: An overview of the linkages in Harare. *Habitat International* 19(2): 183-194.

ELLIS, A, J. CUTURA, N. DIONE, I. GILLSON, C. MANUEL & J. THONGORI (2007), *Gender and economic growth in Kenya: Unleashing the power of women.* Washington D.C: The World Bank.

ELLIS, F. & J. SUMBERG (1998), Food production, urban areas and policy responses. *World Development* 26(2): 213-225.

FILMER, D. & L.H. PRITCHETT (2001), Estimating wealth effects without expenditure data – or tears: An application of educational enrollments in states of India. *Demography* 38(1): 115-132.

FLORO, M. & R.B. SWAIN (2010), *Food security, gender and occupational choice among urban low-income households*. College of Arts and Sciences, American University, Washington D.C. Working Paper # 2010-6.

FLYNN, K.C. (2001), Urban agriculture in Mwanza, Tanzania. *Africa* 71(4): 666-691.

FOEKEN, D. & A. MWANGI (2000), Increasing food security through urban farming in Nairobi. In: N. Bakker, M. Dubbeling, S. Guendel, U. Sabel-Koschella & H. De Zeeuw, eds, *Growing cities, growing food: Urban agriculture on the policy agenda,* pp. 303-328. Feldafing: Deutsche Stiftung für Internationale Entwicklung (DSE).

FOEKEN, D. & S.O. OWUOR (2008), Farming as a livelihood source for the urban poor in Nakuru, Kenya. *Geoforum* 39(6): 1978-1990.

FOEKEN, D. (2005), *Urban agriculture in East Africa as a tool for poverty reduction: A legal and policy dilemma?* Leiden: African studies Centre, ASC Working Paper 65.

FOEKEN, D. (2006), *"To subsidise my income": Urban farming in an East-African Town*. Leiden/Boston: Brill Academic Publishers.

FOEKEN, D. (2008), Urban agriculture and the urban poor in East Africa: Does policy matter? In: M. Rutten, A. Leliveld & D. Foeken, eds, *Inside poverty and development in Africa: Critical reflections on pro-poor policies*, pp. 225-254. Leiden/Boston: Brill Academic Publishers.

FOEKEN, D. & S.O. OWUOR (2000), *Urban farmers in Nakuru, Kenya.* Leiden: African Studies Centre, Working paper 45.

FRAYNE, B., J. BATTERSBY-LENNARD, R. FINCHAM & G. HAYSOM (2009), *Urban food security in South Africa: Case study of Cape Town, Msunduzi and Johannesburg*. Development Bank of Southern Africa, Development Planning Division, Working Paper Series # 15.

FREEMAN, D. (1991), *A city of farmers: Informal agriculture in the open spaces of Nairobi, Kenya.* Queens, Canada: McGill & Queens University Press.

FREEMAN, D. (1993), Survival strategy or business training ground? The significance of urban agriculture for the advancement of women in African cities, *African Studies Review* 36(3): 1-22.

FREIDBERG, S. (2001), To garden, to market: Gendered meanings of work on an African periphery. *Gender, Place and Culture* 8(1): 5-24.

GALLI, R.E. & U. FUNK (1995), Structural adjustment and gender in Guinea-Bissau. In: G.T. Emeagwali, ed., *Women pay the price: Structural adjustment in Africa and the Caribbean*, pp. 13-30. Trenton, New Jersey: Africa World Press.

GARRETT, J.L. (2000), Achieving urban food and nutrition security in the developing world. Overview. *Focus 3, Brief 1 of 10*. Washington, DC: International Food Policy Research Institute.

GAYE, G. & M.N. TOURÉ (2009) Gender and urban agriculture in Pikine, Senegal. In: A. Hovorka, H. de Zeeuw & M. Njenga, eds, *Women feeding cities: Mainstreaming gender in urban agriculture and food security*, pp. 219-233. Bourton on Dunsmore (UK): Practical Action Publishing.

GITHINJI, M. (2010), Growing unequally: An audit of the impact of Kenya's Vision 2030 growth on equality, In: *Kenya's Vision 2030: An audit from an income and gender inequalities perspective,* pp. 1-40. Nairobi: Society for International Development.

GITU, K.W. (2004), Agricultural development and food security in Kenya: Building a case for more support. Paper prepared for Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO). (http://www.fao.org/tc/TCA/work05/Kenya.pdf).

GODFREY, A.B. (2010), Household gender and resource relations: Women in the marketing arena of income generating crops in Uganda. *Eastern Africa Social Science Research Review* XXVI(2): 1-29.

GOK (2001), *Uasin Gishu District Development Plan, 1997-2001*. Nairobi: Government Printer.

GOK (2007), *Kenya Vision 2030: A globally competitive and prosperous Kenya.* Nairobi: Ministry of Planning and National Development & National Economic and Social Council.

GOK (2009), *Sessional Paper No. 3 of 2009 on National Land Policy.* Nairobi: Government Printer.

GOK (2010). *Kenya 2009 population and housing census highlights.* (http://www.knbs.or.ke/Census Results/KNBS Brochure.pdf).

GOLIBER, T.J. (1994), Forward. In: J.D. Tarver, ed., *Urbanization in Africa*. Westport, Connecticut & London: Greenwood Press.

GWEBU, T.D. (2005), Gender, HIV/AIDS and household dynamics in old Naledi, Gaborone. In: F. Kalabamu, M. Mapetla & A. Schlyter, eds, *Gender, generations and urban living conditions in Southern Africa,* pp. 53-66. Lesotho: Institute of Southern African Studies (ISAS).

HADDAD, L., M.T. RUEL & J.L. GARRETT (1999), Are urban poverty and undernutrition growing? Some newly assembled evidence. *World Development* 27(11): 1891-1904.

HAPKE, H.M. & D. AYYANKERIL (2004), Gender, the work-life course, and livelihood strategies in a South Indian fish market. *Gender, Place and Culture* 11(2): 229-256.

HOPE, L., O. COFIE, B. KEERAITA & P. DRECHSEL (2009), Gender and urban agriculture: The case of Accra, Ghana. In: A. Hovorka, H. de Zeeuw & M. Njenga, eds, *Women feeding cities: Mainstreaming gender in urban agriculture and food security*, pp. 65-78. Bourton on Dunsmore (UK): Practical Action Publishing.

HOVORKA, A. (1998), *Gender resources for urban agriculture research: Methodology, directory and annotated bibliography*. Ottawa, Canada: IDRC Cities Feeding People Series, Report 26.

HOVORKA, A.J. (2005), The (re)production of gendered positionality in Botswana's commercial urban agriculture sector. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 95(2): 294-313.

HOVORKA, A.J. (2006), Urban Agriculture: Addressing Practical and Strategic Gender Needs. *Development in Practice* 16(1): 51-61.

HOVORKA, A., H. DE ZEEUW & M. NJENGA, eds (2009), *Women feeding cities. Mainstreaming gender in urban agriculture and food security*. Bourton on Dunsmore (UK): Practical Action Publishing.

IBRAHIM, F. (1994), Hunger-vulnerable groups within the metropolitan food system in Khartoum. *GeoJournal* 34(3):257-261.

ISHANI, S. (2009), Key gender issues in urban livestock keeping and food security in Kisumu, Kenya, In: A. Hovorka, H. de Zeeuw & M. Njenga, eds, *Women feeding cities: Mainstreaming gender in urban agriculture and food security,* pp. 105-122. Bourton on Dunsmore (UK): Practical Action Publishing.

ISHENGOMA, C.G. (2004), Accessibility of resources by gender: The case of Morogoro region in Tanzania, In: *Gender, economies and entitlements in Africa*, pp. 53-66. Dakar**:** CODESRIA Publications.

IYUN, F. (1995), The impact of structural adjustment on maternal and child health in Nigeria. In: G.T. Emeagwali, ed., *Women pay the price: Structural adjustment in Africa and the Caribbean*, pp. 31-37. Trenton, New Jersey: Africa World Press.

JACKSON, C. & R. PALMER-JONES (1999), Rethinking gendered poverty and work. *Development and Change* 30: 557-583.

JACOBI, P., J. AMEND & S. KIANGO (2000), Urban agriculture in Dar es Salaam: Providing an indispensable part of the diet. In: N. Bakker, M. Dubbeling, S. Guendel, U. Sabel-Koschella & H. De Zeeuw, eds, *Growing cities, growing food: Urban agriculture on the policy agenda*, pp. 257-283. Feldafing: Deutsche Stiftung für Internationale Entwicklung (DSE).

JACOBS, P. & T. XABA (2008), Women in urban and peri-agriculture: Sustaining livelihoods in the Cape Metropolitan Area. *Agenda* 78: 186-197.

JAIYEBO, O. (2003), Women and household sustenance: Changing livelihoods and survival strategies in the peri-urban areas of Ibadan. *Environment & Urbanization* 15(1).

KAAG, M., R. VAN BERKEL, J. BRONS, M. DE BRUIJN, H. VAN DIJK, L. DE HAAN, G. NOOTEBOOM & A. ZOOMERS (2004), Ways forward in livelihood research. In: D. Kalb, W. Pansters & H. Siebers, eds, *Globalization and development: Themes and concepts in current research*, pp. 49-74. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

KABEER, N. (1999), Resources, agency, achievements: Reflections on the measurement of women's empowerment. *Development and Change* 30: 435-464.

KABEER, N. (n.d.), *Gender mainstreaming in poverty eradication and the Millennium Development Goals: A handbook for policy-makers and other stakeholders*. (http://www.idrc.ca/openbooks/067-5/#page 132).

KALABAMU, F., M. MAPETLA & A. SSCHLYTER (2005), Introduction: Gender, generation and urban living conditions. In: F. Kalabamu, M. Mapetla & A. Schlyter, eds, *Gender, generations and urban living conditions in Southern Africa*, pp. 1-12. Lesotho: Institute of Southern African Studies (ISAS).

KAMAU, P. (n.d.), *An economic analysis of gender diversity and urban poverty in Kenya: A case study of Eldoret town*. Electronic publications from the University of Nairobi, Kenya. (http://www.fiuc.org/iaup/esap/).

KELLETT, P. & A.G. TIPPLE (2000), The home as workplace: A study of income-generating activities within the domestic setting. *Environment and Urbanization* 12(1):203-214.

KENYA HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION & NATIONAL NETWORK FOR IDPS IN KENYA (2011), *Gains and gaps: A status report on IDPs in Kenya, 2008-2010.* Nairobi: KHRC.

KIGULI, L.N., A. NAWAGABA, D. MWESIGWA & J. KIGULI (2003), Access to land for urban agriculture in Kampala. *Urban Agriculture Magazine* 11: 11-12.

KIMANI-MURAGE, E.W. & A.M. NGINDU (2007), Quality of water the slum dwellers use: The case of a Kenyan slum. *Journal of Urban Health: Bulletin of the New York Academy of Medicine* 84(6).

KRÜGER, F. (1994), Urbanization and vulnerable urban groups in Gaborone/Botswana. *GeoJournal* 34(3): 287-293.

KYOMUHENDO, G.B. (1999), Decision-making in poor households: The case of Kampala, Uganda. In: S. Jones & N. Nelson, eds, *Urban poverty in Africa: From understanding to alleviation*, pp. 113-125. London*:* Intermediate Technology Publications.

LEACH, M., R. MEARNS & I. SCOONES (1999), Environmental entitlements: Dynamics and institutions in community-based natural resource management. *World Development* 27 (2): 225-247.

LEE-SMITH, D., M. MANUNDU, D. LAMBA & P.K. GATHURU (1987), *Urban food production and the cooking fuel situation in urban Kenya.* 1985 National Survey Report. Nairobi: Mazingira Institute.

LITTLE, J. (1987), Gender relations in rural areas: The importance of women's domestic role. *Journal of Rural Studies* 3(4): 335-342.

LOHNERT, B. (1994), How do urban vulnerable groups cope with price increases of staple food? The displaced people of Mopti. *GeoJournal* 34(3): 269-275.

LYNCH, K., T. BINNS & E. OLOFIN (2001), Urban agriculture under threat: The land security question in Kano, Nigeria. *Cities* 18(3): 159-171.

MABOGUNJE, A.L. (1994), Introduction. In: J.D. Tarver, ed., *Urbanization in Africa,* pp. xxi-xxxii. Westport, Connecticut & London: Greenwood Press.

MALATZI, M. (1995), Possibilities for cushioning the adverse effects of the structural adjustment program on vulnerable women in Zambia. In: G.T. Emeagwali, ed., *Women pay the price: Structural adjustment in Africa and the Caribbean,* pp. 121-132. Trenton, New Jersey: Africa World Press.

MANDA, K.D., M.S. KIMENYI & G. MWABU (2000), A review of poverty and antipoverty initiatives in Kenya. Background paper prepared for Poverty, Education and Health (PEH) Project, Social Sector Division. Nairobi: Kenya Institute for Policy Research and Analysis (KIPPRA).

MANDEL, J.L. (2004), Mobility matters: Womens livelihood strategies in Porto Novo, Benin. *Gender, Place and Culture* 11(2): 257-287.

MATHAUER, I., J. SCHMIDT & M. WENYAA (2008), Extending social health insurance to the informal sector in Kenya. An assessment of factors affecting demand. *International Journal of Health Planning and Management* 23: 51-68.

MAXWELL, D. (1995), Alternative food security strategy: A household Analysis of Urban Agriculture in Kampala. *World Development* 23(10): 1669-1681.

MAXWELL, D. (1999), The political economy of urban food security in sub-Saharan Africa. *World Development* 27(11): 1939-1953.

MAXWELL, D., C. LEVIN, M. AARMAR-KLEMUSU, M. RUEL, S. MORRIS & C. AHIADEKE (2000), *Urban livelihoods and food and nutritional security in greater Accra, Ghana,* Washington: International Food Policy Research Institute.

MAXWELL, D., C. LEVIN & J. CSETE (1998), Does urban agriculture help prevent malnutrition? Evidence from Kampala. *Food Policy* 23(5): 411-424.

MBAYE. A. & P. MOUSTIER (2000), Market-oriented urban agricultural production in Dakar. In: N. Bakker, M. Dubbeling, S. Guendel, U. Sabel-Koschella & H. De Zeeuw, eds, *Growing cities, growing food: Urban agriculture on the policy agenda,* pp. 235-256. Feldafing: Deutsche Stiftung für Internationale Entwicklung (DSE).

MBIBA, B. (1995), *Urban agriculture in Zimbabwe: Implications for urban management and poverty.* Aldershot: Avebury.

MEIKLE, S. (2002), The urban context and poor people, In: C. Rakodi & T. Lloyd-Jones, eds, *Urban livelihoods: A people-centred approach to reducing poverty,* pp. 37-51. London: Earthscan Publications Ltd.

MEIKLE, S., T. RAMASUT & J. WALKER (2001), *Sustainable urban livelihoods: Concepts and implications for policy*. London, UK: Development Planning Unit, UCL, Working Paper #112.

MEMON, P.A. & D. LEE-SMITH (1993), Urban agriculture in Kenya. *Canadian Journal of African Studies* 27(1): 25-42.

MERCER, C. (2002), The discourse of Maendeleo and the politics of women's participation on Mount Kilimanjaro. *Development and Change* 33: 101-127.

MILLER, H.M. & R.N. SINGH (1994), Urbanization during the post colonial days. In: J.D. Tarver, ed., *Urbanization in Africa,* pp. 65-79. Westport, Connecticut & London: Greenwood Press.

MIRERI, C., A. KYESSI, A. KYESSI N. MUSHI & P. ATEKYEREZA (n.d.), *Urban agriculture in East Africa: Practice, challenges and opportunities*.

MIRERI, C., P. ATEKYEREZA, A. KYESSI & N. MUSHI (2007), Environmental risks of urban agriculture in the Lake Victoria drainage basin: A case of Kisumu Municipality, Kenya. *Habitat International* 31: 375-386.

MITLIN, D. (2005), Chronic poverty in urban areas. Editorial. *Environment and Urbanization* 17(2): 3-10

MITULLAH, W.V. (1999), Urban poverty and gender issues. In: R.A. Obudho, ed., *Environment and development: Research papers presented at Academy Public Lecture Series on*

urbanization and management of Kenya's urban centres in the 21st Century, pp. 111-124. Nairobi: Kenya National Academy of Sciences.

MKENDA-MUGITTU, V. (2003), Measuring the invisibles: Gender mainstreaming and monitoring experience from a dairy development project in Tanzania. *Development in Practice* 13(5): 459-473.

MKWAMBISI, D., E. FRASER & A. DOUGILL (2010), Urban agriculture and poverty reduction: Evaluating how food production in cities contributes to food security, employment and income in Malawi. *Journal of International Development* n/a. doi: 10.1002/jid.1657.

MLOZI, M. (1997), Urban agriculture: Ethnicity, cattle raising and some environmental implications in the city of Dar es Salaam, Tanzania. *African Studies Review* 40(3): 1-28.

MLOZI, M. (2003), Legal and policy aspects of urban agriculture in Tanzania. *Urban Agriculture Magazine* 11: 40-41.

MOSER, C. (1989), Gender planning in the Third World: Meeting practical and strategic gender needs. *World Development* 17(11): 1799-1825.

MOSER, C. (1998), The asset vulnerability framework: Reassessing urban poverty reduction strategies. *World Development* 26(1): 1-19.

MOUGEOT, L. (2000), Urban agriculture: Definition, presence, potentials and risks. In: N. Bakker, M. Dubbeling, S. Guendel, U. Sabel-Koschella & H. De Zeeuw, eds, *Growing cities, growing food: Urban agriculture on the policy agenda,* pp 1-42. Feldafing: Deutsche Stiftung für Internationale Entwicklung (DSE).

MUBVAMI, T., S. MUSHAMBA & R. VAN VEENHUIZEN (2003), Availability, access and usability of land for urban agriculture. *Urban Agriculture Magazine* 11: 1-3.

MUDIMU, G. (1996). Urban agricultural activities and womens strategies in sustaining family livelihoods in Harare, Zimbabwe. *Singapore Journal of Tropical Geography* 17(2): 179-194.

MULUGETA, M.S. (2009), *Determinants of livelihood strategies of urban women: The case of female household heads in Wolenchiti town, Ethiopia*. Kimmange Development Studies Centre series.

MURRAY, C. (2000), Changing livelihoods: The Free State, 1990s. *African Studies* 59(1): 115-142.

MUSYOKA, M.P., J.K. LAGAT, D.E. OUMA, T. WAMBUA & P. GAMBA (2010), Structure and properties of urban household food demand in Nairobi, Kenya: Implications for urban food security. *Food Security* 2: 179-193.

MUTORO, B.A. (1995), *Women working wonders. Small-scale farming and the role of women in Vihiga District, Kenya. A case study of North Maragoli.* PhD. thesis, Department of Human Geography, University of Utrecht.

MUSYOKA, R. (2004), *Informal land delivery processes in Eldoret, Kenya: Summary of findings and policy implications.* Policy Brief-3, International Development Department of School of Public Policy, University of Birmingham.

MWAIPORO, R.R.N. (2000), Gender and power in the use and management of coastal space and resources in Saadani village, Tanzania. *APAD Bulletin* # 20.

NABULO, G., J. KIGULI & L. KIGULI (2009), Gender in urban crop production in hazardous areas in Kampala, Uganda. In: A. Hovorka, H. de Zeeuw & M. Njenga, eds, *Women feeding cities: Mainstreaming gender in urban agriculture and food security,* pp. 79-92. Bourton on Dunsmore (UK): Practical Action Publishing.

NARAYAN, D., R. PATEL, K. SCHAFFT, A. RADEMACHER & S. KOCH-SCHULTE (1999), *Can anyone hear us? Voices from 47 countries,* Voices of the poor Volume 1. Poverty Group, PREM World Bank.

NAYLOR, R.L. & W.P. FALCON (1995), Is the locus of poverty changing? *Food Policy* 20(6): 501-518.

NDEGE, P. (2005), Afrikaner identity politics and the growth of Eldoret town, 1903-1939. *Maarifa: A Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences.*

NELSON, N. (1999), Urban poverty in Africa: An historical perspective. In: S. Jones & N. Nelson, eds, *Urban poverty in Africa: From understanding to alleviation,* pp. 1-15. London: Intermediate Technology Publishers.

NITISH, J.H.A. (2004), Gender and decision naking in Balinese agriculture. *American Ethnologist* 31(31): 553-572.

NGOME, I. & D. FOEKEN (2012), "My garden is a great help": Gender and urban gardening in Buea, Cameroon. *GeoJournal* 77(1): 103-118.

NUGENT, R. (2000), The impact of urban agriculture on the household and local economies. In: N. Bakker, M. Dubbeling, S. Guendel, U. Sabel-Koschella & H. De Zeeuw, eds, *Growing cities, growing food: Urban agriculture on the policy agenda,* pp. 67-98. Feldafing: Deutsche Stiftung für Internationale Entwicklung (DSE).

NYAKAANA, J.B. (1996), *Kenya's development centre policy: The case of Eldoret – An assessment of its implications and impact.* Amsterdam: Netherlands Geographical Society/Faculty of Environmental Sciences, University of Amsterdam.

NYAKAANA, J.B. (1997), Informal sector employment and its contribution to rural development: The case of Eldoret municipality in Kenya. *East African Geographical Review* 19(2): 93-111.

NYAMARI, J.M. & G.M. SIMIYU (2007), Urban livestock and potential human health risks in Eldoret town, Kenya. *The Journal of Building and Land Development* 14(2): 100-107.

Nyancham-Okemwa, S. (2000), Enduring passions: The fallacies of gender-focused development in Kenya. *APAD Bulletin* 20: 103-132.

O'CONNOR, A. (1991), *Poverty in Africa: A geographical approach*. London: Belhaven Press.

OBERHAUSER, A.M. & K.T. HANSON (2007), Negotiating livelihoods and scale in the context of neoliberal globalization: Perspectives from Accra, Ghana. *African Geographical Review* 26: 11-36.

OBERHAUSER, A.M., J.L. MANDEL & H.M. HAPKE (2004), Gendered livelihoods in diverse global contexts: An introduction.*Gender, Place and Culture* 11(2): 205-208.

OBERHAUSER, A.M. & PRATT, A. (2004), Women's collective economic strategies and political transformation in rural South Africa. *Gender, Place and Culture* 11(2): 209-228.

OBOSU-MENSAH, K. (1999), *Food production in urban areas: A study of urban agriculture in Accra. Ghana,* Aldershot: Ashgate.

OBUDHO, R.A. (1999a) Urbanization and sub-urbanization processes over time and space. In: R.A. Obudho, ed., *Environment and development: Research papers presented at Academy Public Lecture Series on urbanization and management of Kenya's urban centres in the 21st Century,* pp. 1-48. Kenya National Academy of Sciences.

OBUDHO, R.A. (1999b), Urban development, national planning and management strategies. In: R.A. Obudho, ed., *Environment and development: Research papers presented at Academy Public Lecture Series on urbanization and management of Kenya's urban centres in the 21st Century,* pp. 145-162. Kenya National Academy of Sciences.

OBUDHO, R.A. & R.A. OBUDHO (1994), The growth of Africas urban population. In: J.D Tarver, ed., *Urbanization in Africa,* pp. 49-64. Westport, Connecticut & London: Greenwood Press.

ODHIAMBO, W. & D.K. MANDA (2003), Urban poverty and labour force participation in Kenya. Paper prepared for the World Bank Urban Research Symposium, Washington D.C, December 15-17, 2003.

OKALI, C. (2006), *Linking livelihoods and gender analysis for achieving gender transformative change.* Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, Livelihood Support Programme (LSP), Working Paper # 41.

OLIMA, W.H.A. & L.M. OBALA (1999), The effect of existing land tenure systems on urban land development: A case study of Kenya's secondary towns, with emphasis on Kisumu. *Habitat International* 23(1): 113-124.

OMBURA, C.O. (1997), *Towards an environmental planning approach in urban industrial siting and operations in Kenya: The case of Eldoret town.* Amsterdam: Netherlands Geographical Society/Department of Human Geography, University of Amsterdam.

OTUNGA, R.N., G. OPATA & F.N. MUYIA (2001), Women entrepreneurs in Eldoret Town: Their socio-economic background and business performance. In: P.O. Alila & P.O Pedersen, eds, *Negotiating social space: East African enterprises.* Asmara & New Jersey: Africa World Press.

OUMA, H. & B.N. MAINA (2010), Vision 2030: Social pillar gender analysis. In: *Kenya's vision 2030: An audit from an income and gender inequalities perspective,* pp.71-140. Nairobi: Society for International Development.

OVERÅ, R. (2007), When men do women's work: Structural adjustment, unemployment and changing gender relations in the informal economy of Accra, Ghana. *Journal of Modern African Studies* 45(4): 539-563.

OWUOR, S. (2006), *Bridging the urban-rural divide: Multispatial livelihoods in Nakuru town, Kenya.* Leiden: African Studies Centre.

OWUOR, S.O. & D. FOEKEN (2006), Surviving in the neighbourhoods of Nakuru town, Kenya. In: P. Konings & D. Foeken, eds, *Crisis and creativity. Exploring the wealth of the African neighbourhood*, pp. 22-45. Leiden: Brill.

OWUOR, S.O. & FOEKEN, D.W.J. (2009), *Water reforms and interventions in urban Kenya: Institutional set-up, emerging impact and challenges*. Leiden: ASC Working Paper 83/2009.

OWUSU, F. (2007), Conceptualizing livelihood strategies in African cities: Planning and development implications of multiple livelihood strategies. *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 26: 450-465.

OWUSU, G. & P.W.K. YANKSON (2007), Poverty in Ghana is basically a rural phenomenon: Are we underestimating urban poverty? *Ghana Journal of Development Studies* 4(1): 87-105.

OXFAM (2009), *Urban Poverty and vulnerability in Kenya.* Background analysis for the preparation of an Oxfam GB Urban Programme Focused on Nairobi, September 2009. Nairobi: Oxfam GB Kenya Programme.

PAGE, B. (2002), Urban agriculture in Cameroon: An anti-politics in the making? *Geoforum* 33: 41-54.

PASQUINI, M.W. (2006), The use of town refuse ash in urban agriculture around Jos, Nigeria: Health and environmental risks. *Science of the Total Environment* 354: 43-59.

POTTS, D. (2009), The slowing of sub-Saharan Africa's urbanization: Evidence and implications for urban livelihoods. *Environment & Urbanization* 21(1): 253-259.

POTTS, D. (1997), Urban lives: Adopting new strategies and adapting rural links. In: C. Rakodi, ed., *The urban challenge in Africa: Growth and management of the large cities,* pp. 447-494. Tokyo/New York: United Nations University Press.

POYNTER, G. & D. FIELDING (2000), Findings of a survey into urban livestock in Kumasi, Ghana. *Urban Agriculture Magazine* 1(2): 28-29.

PRAIN, G. (2006), Participatory technology development for urban agriculture: Collaboration and adaptation along the urban-rural transect. In: R. van Veenhuizen, ed., *Cities farming for the future: Urban agriculture for green and productive cities*, pp. 273-312. Leusden: ETC-Urban agriculture.

RAKODI, C. (1988), Urban agriculture: Research questions and Zambian evidence. *Journal of Modern African Studies* 26(3): 495-515.

RAKODI, C. (2002a), A livelihood approach – conceptual issues and definitions. In: C. Rakodi & T. Lloyd-Jones, eds, *Urban livelihoods approach: A people-centred approach to reducing poverty*, pp. 3-22. London: Earthscan Publications.

RAKODI, C. (2002b), Economic development, urbanization and poverty. In: C. Rakodi & T. Lloyd-Jones, eds, *Urban livelihoods approach: A people-centred approach to reducing poverty*, pp. 3-22. London: Earthscan Publications.

RAZAVI, S. (1999), Gendered poverty and well-being: Introduction. *Development and Change* (30): 409-433.

ROGERSON, C.M. (1998), Urban agriculture and urban poverty alleviation: South African debates. *Agrekon* 37(2): 171-188.

RONO, J.K. (2002), The impact of the structural adjustment programmes on Kenyan society. *Journal of Social Development in Africa* 17(1): 81-98.

RUEL, M.T., J.L. GARRET, S.S. MORRIS, D. MAXWELL, A. OSHAUG, P. ENGEL, P. MENON, A. SLACK & L. HADDAD (1998), *Urban challenges to food and nutrition security: A review of food security, health, and caregiving in the cities*. International Food Policy Research Institute, Food Consumption and Nutrition Division, Discussion Paper # 51.

SAITO, K.A., H. MEKKON & D. SPURLING (1994), *Raising the productivity of women farmers in sub-Saharan Africa.* Washington, D.C: World Bank.

SANYAL, BISHWAPRIYA (1987), Urban cultivation amidst modernization: How should we interpret it? *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 6(3): 197-207.

SARDIER, M. (2003), Women's socio-economic roles in the urban Sahel: A preliminary study of Bamako and Niamey. *Journal of Political Ecology* 10: 47-55.

SATTERTHWAITE, D. (2007), *The transition to a predominantly urban world and its underpinnings*. International Institute for Environment and Development, Human Settlement Discussion Paper Series.

SCHMINK, M. (1984), Household economic strategies: Review and research agenda. *Latin American Research Review* 19(3): 87-101.

SCHULTZ, U. (2004), Negotiating gender: Gender relations and identities in African marketplace. In: K. Wohlmuth, A. Gutowski, T. Knedlik, M. Meyn & S. Pitamber, eds, *African Enterpreneurship and Private Sector Development*. London: Transaction Publishers.

SCOONES, I. (1998), *Sustainable rural livelihoods: A framework for analysis.* IDS Working Paper 72, Institute for Development Studies, Brighton, UK.

SCOONES, I. (2009), Livelihoods perspectives and rural development. *Journal of Peasant Studies* 36(1): 171-196.

SEN, A. (1987), *Hunger and entitlements: Research for Action*. Forsa, Finland: World Institute for Development Economic Research, United Nations University.

SEN, A. (1999), *Development as freedom.* New York: Alfred A. Knoff.

SHAW, J., B. CRAWSHAW & F. FRANCOIS (1994), Using project food aid to help alleviate urban poverty – experience and issues. *GeoJournal* 34(3): 305-313.

SIMATELE, D.M. & T. BINNS (2008), Motivation and marginalization in African urban agriculture: The case of Lusaka, Zambia, *Urban Forum* 19(1): 1-21.

SIMIYU, R. (2008), Contextual influences on voting decision: Mapping the neighbourhood effect in multi-ethnic rural setting in Kenya. *South African Geographical Journal* 90(2): 106-121.

SITUMA, F. D.P. (1999), Urban environmental problems. In: R.A. Obudho, ed., *Environment and development: Research papers presented at Academy Public Lecture Series on urbanization and management of Kenya's urban centres in the 21st Century,* pp. 127-144. Nairobi: Kenya National Academy of Sciences.

SLATER, R.J. (2001), Urban agriculture, gender and empowerment: An alternative view. *Development Southern Africa* 18(5): 635-650.

SMIT, J., A. RATTA & J. NASR (1996), *Urban agriculture: Food, jobs and sustainable cities.* New York: United Nations Development Programme (UNDP).

SSEBAANA, K.J. (2002), Key food security issues /challenges in Kampala city. Paper presented at the World Banks Food Security Initiative on Feeding Cities in the Horn of Africa workshop, Addis Ababa.

STAGE, J., J. STAGE & G. MCGRANAHAN (2010), Is urbanization contributing to higher food prices? *Environment and Urbanization,* 22(1): 199-215.

STECKLEY, G. & M. MULEBA (2003), Facilitating land Access for the copperbelts peri-urban farmers. *Urban Agriculture Magazine* 11: 34-36.

THOMSON, A.M. (2000), Sustainable livelihoods approaches at the policy level. Paper prepared for FAO e-conference and Forum on Operationalising Participatory Ways of Applying a Sustainable Livelihoods Approach.

THORNTON, A. (2008), Beyond the metropolis: Small town case studies of urban and peri-urban agriculture in South Africa. *Urban Forum* 19: 243-262.

TINSLEY, J. (2003), Urban agriculture and sustainable livelihoods. *Peace Review* 15(3):295-299.

TORIRO, P. (2009), Gender dynamics in the Musikavanhu urban agriculture movement, Harare, Zimbabwe. In: A. Hovorka, H. de Zeeuw & M. Njenga, eds, *Women feeding cities: Mainstreaming gender in urban agriculture and food security*, pp. 93-104. Bourton on Dunsmore (UK): Practical Action Publishing.

TRAUGER, A. (2004), Because they can do the work: Women farmers in sustainable agriculture in Pennsylvania, USA. *Gender, Place and Culture* 11(2): 289-307.

UN-HABITAT (2009), *Global report on human settlements: planning*. Nairobi: UN-Habitat.

UNITED NATIONS (2010), *World population prospects: The 2009 revision.* New York: United Nations, Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Population Division.

VAN AVERBEKE, W. (2007), Urban farming in the informal settlements of Atteridgeville, Pretoria, South Africa. *Water SA* 33(3): 337-342.

VAN BEEK, S. & R. L. RUTT (2007), Cleaning, greening and feeding cities: Local initiatives in recycling waste for urban agriculture in Kampala, Uganda. *Urban Agriculture Magazine* (19): 36-38.

VAN VUUREN, A. (2003), *Women striving for self-reliance: The diversity of female-headed households in Tanzania and the livelihood strategies they employ.* Leiden: African Studies Centre.

VREEKER, R., H. DE GROOT & E. VERHOEF (2004), Urban multifunctional land use: Theoretical and empirical insights on economies of scale, scope and diversity. *Built Environment* 30(4): 289-307.

VYAS, S. & L. KUMARANAYAKE (2006), Constructing socio-economic status indices: How to use principal components analysis. *Health Policy and Planning* 21(6): 459-468.

WANJALA, B.M. & M.T. ODONGO (2010), Gender and Kenya vision 2030: An audit of the economic pillar. In: *Kenya's Vision 2030: An audit from an income and gender inequalities perspective*, pp.41-69.Nairobi: Society for International Development.

WEBB, N.L. (2011), When is enough, enough? Advocacy, evidence and criticism in the field of urban agriculture in South Africa. *Development Southern Africa* 28(2): 195-208.

WIERINGA, S.E. (1998), Rethinking gender planning: A critical discussion of the use of the concept of gender. *Gender, Technology and Development* 2(3):349-371.

WHITEHEAD, A. (2002), Tracking livelihood change: Theoretical, methodological and empirical perspectives from North-East Ghana. *Journal of Southern African Studies* 28(3): 575-598.

WILBERS, J., A. HOVORKA & R. VAN VEENHUIZEN (2004), Gender and urban agriculture. *Urban Agriculture Magazine* 12: 1-5.

WILK, R. (1991), The household in anthropology: Panacea or problem. *Reviews in Anthropology* 20: 1-12.

WOOLCOCK & NARAYAN (2000), Social capital: Implications for development theory, research and policy. *The World Bank Research Observer* 15(2): 225-249.

XU, K., C. JAMES, G. CARRIN & S. MUCHIRI (2006), *An empirical model of access to health care, healthcare expenditure and impoverishment in Kenya: Learning from past reforms and lessons for the future.* Geneva: HSF/WHO Discussion Paper # 3-2006.

ZACK-WILLIAMS, A. (1995), Crisis and structural adjustment in Sierra Leone: Implications for women. In: G.T. Emeagwali, ed., *Women pay the price: Structural adjustment in Africa and the Caribbean*, pp. 53-61. Trenton, New Jersey: Africa World Press.

ZALLE, D., F. MEITE & A. KONATE (2003), The land issue and urban agriculture in Bamako. *Urban Agriculture Magazine* 11: 13-14.