7.2 Small-Scale Sustainable Food Supply: Urban Farming in Kenya: 10-minute Pack

AQA 8035 · Calculators not allowed · about 10 minutes

Total Marks

Name: _____ Date: ____ / ____ / _____

Answer ALL questions. Show all your working.

1 Define the term 'appropriate technology' as used in small-scale urban farming projects in Nairobi, Kenya.

(Total for Question 1 is 1 mark)

2 Give one example of an urban farming technique used in Nairobi informal settlements, such as those around Kibera and Mathare.

(Total for Question 2 is 1 mark)

3 State one environmental benefit of urban sack gardens and vertical growing in Nairobi.

(Total for Question 3 is 1 mark)

4 'Assess the value of small-scale, sustainable food schemes compared with large-scale schemes.'

(Total for Question 4 is 6 marks)

© Revision Library | revisionlibrary.co.uk

Mark scheme · 7.2 Small-Scale Sustainable Food Supply: Urban Farming in Kenya: 10-minute Pack

Question 1

technology that is low-cost, easy to use and maintain, and suitable for the local community and environment, oe **B1**

Answer: Technology that is low-cost, easy to use and maintain, and suitable for the local community and environment.

Question 2

e.g. sack gardens, vertical pallet gardens, small drip irrigation systems, oe **B1**

Answer: Sack gardens.

Question 3

e.g. reduced food transport miles if food is grown locally, or increased green space and biodiversity in dense settlements, oe **B1**

Answer: Reduced food transport miles because food is grown locally.

Question 4

Level 1 Simple statements about small-scale schemes or large-scale schemes with little or no development, limited use of the Nairobi context and no clear judgement. **1-2**

Level 2 A developed answer that discusses advantages and limitations of small-scale schemes and of large-scale schemes with some reference to Nairobi examples; offers a partial judgement supported by evidence. **3-4**

Level 3 A detailed, balanced assessment that uses named Nairobi initiatives (e.g. sack gardens, vertical growing in Kibera/Mathare) to weigh benefits such as food security, low cost and environmental value against limitations like limited output and need for training. Considers when large-scale engineering is more appropriate and reaches a clear, justified conclusion. **5-6**

Indicative content:

- Small-scale schemes in Nairobi, such as sack gardens and vertical growing, increase household food security, improve nutrition and can generate small incomes for women and youth, reaching vulnerable households directly.
- They use appropriate technology and permaculture principles, are low-cost, reduce food miles and can be implemented on rooftops and in tiny spaces where large farms cannot operate.
- Limitations include low per-sack yields, dependence on ongoing community organisation and training, and limited influence on national or city-wide food deficits; they are vulnerable to loss of funding or waning participation.
- Large-scale engineered schemes can deliver high outputs and feed cities at scale, but require major capital, technical expertise, reliable water supplies and can have greater environmental impacts and displace smallholders.
- Effective policy may combine approaches: support small-scale schemes for resilience and local benefits while investing in larger supply infrastructure where appropriate, for example peri-urban irrigation to supply markets alongside community gardens that boost household resilience.
- A strong conclusion should judge the contexts in which small-scale schemes are most valuable and where large-scale engineering is necessary, supported by Nairobi-specific examples and clear reasoning.

© Revision Library | revisionlibrary.co.uk