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I. BACKGROUND

1. We remain committed to implementing the 2014 APEC Connectivity Blueprint in order to better connect the APEC’s remote rural areas and establish a seamlessly and comprehensively connected and integrated Asia-Pacific region.

2. We reaffirm APEC’s commitment through the 2015 Leaders’ Declaration which details the efforts needed to positively impact rural development and poverty alleviation, including calls to build inclusive economies through “intensive efforts” to reduce and eradicate poverty and address inequality.

3. We recall APEC’s prior efforts included in the 2010 APEC Leaders’ Growth Strategy and welcome the assessment in 2015 by APEC PSU\(^1\), which found that more than 300 million people were lifted out of poverty in the APEC region.

4. Building upon the 2010 APEC Leaders’ Growth Strategy, we welcome the 2015 APEC Strategy for Strengthening Quality Growth for the period until 2020. This will focus on institution building, social cohesion, and environmental impact.

5. We are conscious of the fact that the 2015 APEC Leaders Declaration issued in Manila highlighted the link between urbanization and food security in Section 5(c): “We recognize that the region’s shifting demography, including ageing populations and urbanization, has profound implications for the region’s food system. We will enhance efforts to improve security and safety of the region’s food supply, sustainable agricultural and water management, and seek to increase citizens’ access to food including through better connectivity between urban, rural, and remote areas; facilitation of investment and infrastructure development; and reduction of food loss and waste along the food value chain.”

6. We also recall APEC’s Niigata Declaration on Food Security in 2010, which highlighted the importance of sharing relevant information and best practices in order to create a synergy effect between rural development and food security\(^2\).

7. We reaffirm the commitments made by economies towards implementing the Sustainable Development Goals – SDG, noting the direct relevance of a number of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) for food security.

8. We call upon APEC relevant sub-fora to bear in mind this strategic framework to update their strategic and work plans accordingly.

II. REGIONAL CONTEXT AND TRENDS

\(^1\) APEC Policy Support Unit.
\(^2\) Paragraph 11, Chapter Developing rural communities’ in Niigata Declaration on Food Security, 2010 that reads, “Diversification of income sources, including the expansion of market oriented farming activities and off-farm incomes, could thus be a focus for improving food security. To achieve these goals, we agreed to share information and best practice to bring about a synergy between rural development and food security.”
In order to develop a Rural-Urban Strategy for Food Security in APEC, there are some key regional trends that we need to take into account. This strategic framework intends to build a consensus and take these trends as a basis for further actions and decisions.

### a. Urbanization

We are rapidly moving toward a majority-urban world, with urban areas accounting increasingly for the predominant share of food consumption in the Asia-Pacific region. The urban population of APEC member economies hit 1.77 billion, 61 percent of the world’s total. According to estimates of the World Bank, urban populations are expected to reach 2.38 billion in 2050, 77 percent of the total. Asia’s urban population will grow from 48 to 64 percent, while Latin America’s will rise from 80 to 90 percent. The Asia-Pacific economies are in different urbanization stages, yet enjoy huge potential for complementary development and cooperation. Therefore, urbanization has been recognized as a frontier for regional cooperation.

Urban growth, together with economic inequality, and urban rural linkages, mean that food insecurity and poverty in cities will also become an increasing concern, alongside poverty in rural areas. The world’s urban slum populations are expected to swell beyond the current 1 billion people. It is important to note that urban areas are not limited to major cities, but also include secondary cities that are often located close to agricultural production areas. These secondary cities play a vital role in driving local economic growth that benefits rural communities, including providing non-farm employment and a source of investment for rural areas. These links highlight the importance of engaging city-level policymakers on rural development for food security.

The urbanization process and the transformation of agriculture, aquaculture, food systems and rural spaces present challenges and opportunities for inclusive growth and poverty eradication; economic, environmental and social sustainability; and food security and nutrition (FSN). Food continues to be produced predominantly in rural areas leaving urban populations to depend on food purchases. Urbanization has thus led to fast growth in the volume of food moving through rural-urban value chains, as a result, there is a need for a holistic and integrated focus on rural-urban linkages and approaches in order to fully address the challenges and maximize the opportunities presented by urbanization.

### b. Increasing intra-economy asymmetries

Some economies’ statistical average indices often hide important domestic pockets of poverty and asymmetries, which are widening within economies. A highly uneven geographical distribution across and within economies, especially in developing economies, highlights an increasing divide between geographically advantaged (rich) and poor regions.

Traditionally, regional asymmetries in FSN and poverty have been construed in terms of the urban-rural dimension. However, recent data highlight a new element within these global figures: the highly uneven geographical distribution of incomes, food security and poverty within economies.

---

1 APEC High-Level Urbanization Forum 2016
2 The Chicago Council on Global Affairs,
3 Global Forum on Food Security and Nutrition • FSN Forum (FAO 2016)
4 OECD/FAO/UNCDF, 2016
Food insecurity and malnutrition within an economy tend to occur in geographical and demographic clusters, in both urban as well as rural areas, and the forces that lead to food insecurity can vary accordingly.

c. Diet diversification and Nutrition

Diets in the APEC region are in transition. A few decades ago, the majority of urban consumers’ food expenditures went to grains and raw ingredients which they took home to process and cook. Nowadays in developing Asian and Latin-American economies:

- 65 – 75 percent of urban food expenditure is on high-value, non-grain food products (meat, fish, dairy, fruits, vegetables, edible oils). Furthermore, about 60 – 75 percent of those expenditures go to food that are processed to varying degrees.
- This dietary shift is occurring across all segments of the population, not just among the urban middle class. In fact, the most dramatic shifts are taking place among the urban poor and in rural communities, nearly 60 percent of the food consumed in rural Asia is processed.
- Much of this demand for non-grain products is being met by domestic sources, although regional trade is also important.
- This dietary transformation presents a major opportunity for producers to grow and sell diverse and high-value products. It can also create new income-generating opportunities for farm and non-farm workers in the food system.

At the same time, we still face a massive unfinished nutrition agenda. In 2013, 165 million children were stunted (1 in 5), malnutrition was responsible for 45 percent of deaths in children under 5 years old (3.1 million), micronutrient deficiencies were widespread (2 billion affected, especially women and children) and overweight and obesity were rapidly increasing as a result of the shifts in diet and the urbanization process (affecting more than 500 million adults and 42 million children). All of these factors cost economies US$2.8-3.5 trillion per annum (4-5 percent of global GDP). At the same time, dietary changes and economic inequality are creating a “double burden” of under-nutrition and over-nutrition in several economies, with nearly two billion adults and 41 million children under 5 overweight or obese and - as a result - prone to a variety of non-communicable diseases.

d. Food system transformation

Urbanization, income growth, and dietary transformation also present new opportunities for building strong and resilient food and agriculture systems that can have a transformational effect on people’s lives and societies as a whole, not least by creating jobs and spurring growth in rural and urban areas.

One of the important problems in the structures of rural areas is the migration of young people to the city, explained mainly by lack of opportunities in the rural areas. Thus, these are characterized by an aging population.

---

1 Urbanization, Diet Change, and the Rapid Transformation of Agri-food Systems: Implications for Food Security and Rural Development Strategies in Developing APEC (Thomas Reardon 2016)
2 Lancet (2013)
3 FAO 2013
The challenges and opportunities are accelerated and magnified by the “modern revolution” - the transformation of agri-food and fisheries supply chains with the rapid rise of supermarkets, large-scale processors, modern wholesale and logistics companies, modern cold storage firms, and fast food chains. For example, supermarket sales are growing 3-5 times faster than GDP per capita in developing APEC economies, changing not just the retail sector but entire markets right across the supply chains, including the farmers, fishers, processors, distributors and traders.

This fundamental change presents a huge opportunity for farmers, including small producers, and food-related businesses (processing, wholesale, transport and relevant logistics services, food preparation, packaging, retailing), including micro, small and medium enterprises (MSMEs), to sell their products to growing and more easily accessible markets. MSMEs in particular have emerged to play critical roles in regional food systems to respond to this opportunity.

Large and small companies, both domestic and regional, are responding to changing market demands by making diverse investments in value chains, including infrastructure and food safety and quality, cold storage, transportation, and mills, as well as large-scale agri-food firms and pan-seasonal supplies. But this poses a particular challenge for MSMEs and small asset-poor farms.

An aging agricultural workforce also poses major challenges for future production and adaptation to new market and environmental conditions. In areas where farmers and fishers are the major source of rural vitality, community-based activities such as maintenance of common-use irrigation systems, landscape and ecosystem conservation, and preventive actions for disaster resilience are also at risk of deterioration. However, further food system transformation can provide new opportunities for economic growth and investment in the agricultural and fisheries sectors, as well as for farm and non-farm jobs that attract young people. Some economies are taking measures to cultivate young, well-educated and professional farmers to promote productivity.

e. Climate Change

According to scientific research, APEC economies - even those with a larger share of irrigated land - are expected to be affected by the adverse impacts of climate change. Furthermore, worldwide adverse climate change effects on agriculture, aquaculture and fisheries are expected to have strong negative implications for global food supply, trade flows, and commodity prices. However, climate change may also present opportunities to be explored.

At the same time, natural disasters and extreme weather events related to climate change, could also impact infrastructure and supply chains connecting rural and urban areas, and is an important issue for APEC economies to consider in the context of rural-urban development.

A complementary Framework for Multi-Year APEC Program on Food Security and Climate Change was endorsed by PPFS.

---

20 Reardon and Timmer (2014).
21 Wiebelt et al. 2013; Wiebelt et al. 2015
22 Parry et al. 2004; Nelson et al. 2010
III. RURAL-URBAN CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

a. Understanding rural-urban development linkages

27 Strengthening rural-urban economic relationships is critical for advancing food security and inclusive growth that benefits both rural and urban areas. Effective policies for rural development and food security require a comprehensive approach that includes not only agricultural production and rural areas, but also non-farm aspects of the food system that connect rural producers and urban consumers.

28 Enhancing rural-urban development linkages can increase incomes throughout the food system and also generate resources that can be used to fund vital services and investments, including in education and health care.

29 Enhancing rural-urban food systems entails employing a "place-based approach", characterized by three principles: 1) a local focus; and 2) a focus on investment; 3) recognition that urban and rural areas function as integrated economic units, with two-way flows of people, products, services and capital, aided by investments in transport, communications, and other infrastructure. This approach emphasizes the relationship between cities and surrounding rural regions, and coordinates a wide-range of objectives and policy interventions across rural and urban areas. It also requires cross-sectoral co-operation at all domestic levels, and multi-stakeholder public-private efforts to mobilize new resources at the local level, bringing together diverse expertise not limited to the food and agriculture sector.

30 This new approach will allow policymakers adapt policy responses to different types of rural-urban regions.

b. Factors to consider

i. Sustainable Development

31 Sustainable development is defined as development that meets "the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs". It has emerged as the guiding principle for long-term global development. It consists of three pillars: economic development, social development and environmental protection.

ii. Place-based Approach

32 Current food security and nutrition policies are characterized by a sectoral, top-down, and “one-size-fits-all” approach that has been unable to deliver appropriate long-term responses to food insecurity. The regional and context-specific nature of FSN has been broadly overlooked. There is thus the need for a paradigm shift in addressing FSN that embraces interventions that are multisector, bottom-up and rural-urban in nature. This can be achieved through a place-based approach to FSN.

33 In this framework, aligning objectives and actions across all domestic levels of decision making and in collaboration with all stakeholders is critical. Doing so improves the vertical and horizontal co-
ordination of FSN policies and interventions, takes into account different conditions across and within individual economies and leads to a better understanding of opportunities and linkages. This approach allows for policies that better match the relevant economic context, focusing gradually on functional economic areas and mixed areas with strong urban and rural linkages, as opposed to the traditional focus on administrative areas and urban-rural dichotomies\(^\text{13}\).

34 The place-based approach also recognizes and capitalizes on the benefits of urban-rural linkages, instead of addressing urban and rural areas through different, often disconnected, policies. Recognizing the presence of strong urban and rural linkages, allows us to better advantage of the potential complementarity gains that can exist between both areas. This will require a better synchronization of urban and rural policies\(^\text{14}\).

**iii. Inclusive Value Chains**

35 In the last three decades, the economic integration of economies into the world market has accelerated. Falling costs of transportation and - even more sharply - of communication, coupled with progressively lower tariffs, made possible this new wave of globalization\(^\text{15}\). Rather than concentrating near certain sources or destinations, production and processing of intermediate and finished goods can now occur in multiple locations, influenced by factors other than simply location. There is great potential for supporting and growing inclusive rural – urban value chains.

36 APEC economies are important in global value chains. Our aim is to increase agricultural, aquaculture and food global value chains inclusive of smallholders through innovative approaches. This includes the development of robust, inclusive domestic value chains and the improvement of these value chain’s connection to regional and global value chains. In this sense, we will need to: i) address the enabling environment (domestic, regional and global) in which value chains operate; ii) identify and strengthen weak nodes in the chains and iii) scale up successful experiences.

**iv. Gender & Social Inclusion**

37 The gender approach considers the opportunities available to men and women, the interrelationships between them and the different social roles assigned to them that may affect equity, and overall social and economic development.

38 Women play a major role in agricultural and food production in the developing world, but they often have no control over farm income or agricultural resources such as seeds, fertilizer, and land. Evidence shows that if women farmers across the developing world had the same access as men to resources such as land, improved seed varieties, microfinance, new technologies, and better farming practices, yields could increase by as much as 30 percent per household and economies could see an increase of 2.5 to 4 percent in agricultural output.

39 The World Bank defines social inclusion as the process of improving the terms for individuals and groups to take part in society. Social inclusion aims to empower poor and marginalized people to take advantage of regional and global opportunities. It ensures that people have a voice in decisions.

---

\(^\text{13}\) OECD Regional Outlook, 2014  
\(^\text{14}\) OECD Rural-Urban Partnerships, 2013  
\(^\text{15}\) The WTO’s World Trade Report 2013 Factors Shaping the Future of World Trade presents an exhaustive review of these changes.
that affect their lives, and that they enjoy equal access to markets, services and political, social and physical spaces.

v. Farming Typology for Targeting and Prioritization

Typologies of geographical territories must be taken into account for proper targeting of intervention for rural development. This type of framework can capture smallholder heterogeneity and therefore identify and prioritize the types of institutions and infrastructure that would help link different types of farming to markets\(^\text{16}\).

Similarly, farming typologies should also be considered. From the point of view of rural-urban intervention, the more relevant typologies are medium and small farms, in particular family farms. In both developing and developed economies, family farming is the predominant form of agriculture for food production.

Family farming is defined as all family-based farming, depending mainly on family labor. This is related to several areas of rural development and comprises agricultural, forestry, fisheries and aquaculture production as well as pastoralist activities managed and operated by a family. There are three categories of family farming: Family Subsistence, Intermediate and Consolidated. The latter generates surpluses for domestic and regional markets.

c. Key policy areas

i. Infrastructure investment in secondary cities/towns and their surrounding hinterlands, not just around major cities. Important infrastructure includes roads, cold storage, and retail markets, as well as water. Effective planning to integrate these interdependent infrastructure components will be important. The investment activities should comply with the domestic laws and regulations in each economy.

ii. Rural infrastructure financing through regular (fiscal) and creative (such as public private partnerships) schemes.

iii. Cross coordination for sequenced investments to spur integrated development along food value chain and the food system.

iv. Addressing food supply chain vulnerabilities to climate/weather-related disasters, the cost of energy and water, and other challenges.

v. Promoting policy and business environments conducive to investments, both domestic and regional.

vi. Enhancing the ease of doing business in agricultural, aquaculture and food sectors, this includes improving measures for small-scale producers and MSMEs in rural-urban business.

vii. Access to finance, which should include PPPs.

viii. Promotion of food technology research, -particularly PPPs and networks of regional research centers, to improve processing, preservation, packaging, and storage.

ix. Research and strategies that encourage and support the development of production and supply chains of non-grain products such as fish, fruit and vegetables, poultry and milk, to fill the growing demand from urban areas.

x. Recognizing traditional skills and improving farmers’ skill-levels to meet the demand of increasingly knowledge-intensive farming. This includes strengthening extension services, as well as increased professionalization, PPPs and internships aimed at raising the basic technical capabilities of farmers and encouraging better management and cooperation.

xi. Vocational and technical training for non-farm workforces elsewhere in the food value chain in order to help them meet the changing demands of urban consumer markets.

xii. Ensuring women’s access to farming and related activities in the labor market, skills training, and finance, with particular attention to women and youth’s participation in family farms and food MSMEs.

xiii. Better functioning of labor markets to improve labor mobility and accelerate growth of off-farm labor, as well as to provide off-season work through complementary economic activities, such as aquaculture, fisheries, rural tourism, crafts production and agribusiness.

xiv. Maximizing the win-win aspects of linkages between rural areas and nearby secondary cities/towns as well as their integration into regional and global food value chains.

xv. Facilitating food loss and waste reduction to increase efficiency in rural-urban value chains.

xvi. Educating both rural and urban dwellers on sustainable production and healthy consumption habits.

xvii. Promotion of studies and sharing of experiences on rural-urban development and best practices among APEC member economies.

xviii. Facilitating connectivity of food standards to harmonize them to international standards, which should be implemented gradually with consideration to economies’ capacity, to achieve transparent and effective regulatory frameworks.

xix. Promoting technology transfer to improve productivity of agriculture produce and trade for wealth creation.

IV. OBJECTIVES AND STRATEGIES

44 General Objective: Strengthen Rural – Urban development to achieve food security and quality growth.

To achieve this General Objective, APEC economies will bear in mind the following specific objectives.

a. Inclusive economic development

45 Specific Objective: Improve farm and off-farm income by strengthening farmers’ and fishers’ capacity building, diversifying crops and improving infrastructure, trade facilitation, financing and better connectivity.

46 Economies may consider to pursue the following strategies.

i. Capacity Building and Extension

- Strengthening and developing farmers’ and fishers’ productive skills and capabilities including internships and scholarships.
- Sharing best practices of inclusive value chain business models.
- Promoting Public and Private Partnerships.
- Sharing best practices to minimize the development gap between the rural-urban areas and to improve the rural-urban competitiveness.
- Enhancing extension workers’ knowledge and skills on new technology and innovation.
ii. **Food productivity and diversification**

- Expanding farming opportunities beyond primary production in rural areas, including through exploration and diversification of economic and trade activities and the promotion of food MSMEs and value added, to increase incomes of both farmers, non-farmers and fishers in rural areas.
- Promoting sustainable production, distribution, and access to safe and nutritious food.
- Enhancing connectivity in policies and regulations.
- Reducing domestic and regional price volatility\(^{17}\).
- Improving access to technologies, inputs, and R&D.
- Employing local heritage in developing technology for sustainable development such as integrating pest management.
- Promoting sustainable use of agricultural fertile land in order to insure domestic and international food supply.
- Promoting urban agriculture.
- Reducing food loss and waste across the value chain through innovative programs and policies.
- Developing off-farm rural economy to improve people’s income.
- Developing enabling factors to facilitate farmers’ link to markets, institutions and innovation.

iii. **Trade facilitation**

- Strengthening the business environment and facilitating food trade.
- Sharing food trade facilitation measures (especially in agriculture and aquaculture) and best practices on implementation of such measures.
- Facilitating the use of international food safety and quality standards on as wide a basis as possible, particularly in rural areas.

iv. **Financing**

- Improving access to finance for MSMEs concentrated in rural areas, especially agricultural MSMEs.
- Promoting financial inclusion and financial literacy in rural areas giving priority to small holder farmers and small scale fishers.
- Promoting innovative financing mechanisms suited to the characteristics of low-income homes.

v. **Infrastructure and Connectivity**

- Building a rural database to assess and overcome development gaps.
- Strengthening public investments in infrastructure.

---

\(^{17}\) See Kalkuhl, Matthias & von Braun, Joachim & Torero, Maximo, 2016. ",” *MPRA Paper* 72164, University Library of Munich, Germany.
Developing an enabling environment to attract private investments and to create a virtuous cycle of savings-investment-growth-employment-income.

Promoting investment for rural-urban connectivity and access to services such as cold storage, retail market in rural and secondary cities.

b. Sustainable natural resource management

Specific Objective: conserve and enhance natural resources and promote their sustainable use by applying policies for the integrated management of resources, such as soil, biodiversity, forestry, marine, aquatic resources and landscapes - in particular – and response to climate change and nature disasters.

Economies may consider to pursue the following strategies.

i. Natural Resource Management

- Addressing pressure on soil and water resources by rural and urban users, and ensuring the quality of these natural resources with due consideration to the conditions of local ecosystems.
- Focusing on integrated, management policies for the sustainable use of these resources for productive purposes, and as adaptive measures for climate change, including preparedness and resilience to natural disasters.
- Taking steps to secure access to safe water for human consumption.
- Promoting sustainable management and use of forestry and biodiversity.
- Incentivizing the protection of ecosystem services, which contribute to increasing food production.
- Improving the role of local governments and communities in disaster risk management reduction to increase food productivity and resilience.
- Boosting resilience and adaptability through improved agriculture, fisheries and aquaculture management.

c. Social aspect

Specific Objective: Close gaps in access to services between rural and urban areas by improving the quality of social infrastructure, rural-social capital and fostering the welfare of vulnerable populations, including the poor, ageing, women, and youth.

The following strategies should be pursued:

i. Safety net services

- Developing policies and quality programs for social services implemented in rural areas.
- Strengthening the capacity of health and education managers and workers who operate in rural areas.
- Extending good quality health care outreach and universal coverage to rural areas.
- Developing social infrastructure in rural areas and secondary cities.
- Ensuring access to health services for smallholders and rural populations.
- Promoting housing policies for low-income dwellers in rural areas
Considering the gradual, transitory and sustainable application of social programs – strictly when objectively needed - such as cash and non-cash transfers (food, medicine), conditional cash transfers, near cash, food programs such as school feeding, mother and child health programs, supplemental feeding, and extension programs.

**ii. Rural – Urban Employment and human capital**

- Fostering human capital building for high quality labor, including better management, marketing and promotion of connectivity across the rural-urban food system.
- Implementing policies that promote rural employment generation along the food system, including in agriculture, livestock farming, aquaculture, fisheries, and food MSMEs, rural tourism, logistics and management.
- Improving public and private investment in rural areas that promote rural employment generation.
- Promoting rural-urban business communication-networks to facilitate knowledge and experience sharing.
- Promoting employment policies, human capital development, business internships and business opportunities aimed at rural youth to prevent their migration.

**d. Administrative efficiency**

51 Specific Objective: Promoting urban - rural administrative efficiency through approaches that emphasize inter-institutional management, multi-sector and multi-level (domestic and regional) coordination and cross-cutting development policies. The following strategies should be pursued:

i. Promoting evidence based policy making which needs availability of data at the sub-domestic level, across rural and urban regions to implement policies appropriate to different types of rural regions (both close to cities and remote) and variable geographic and demographic conditions.

ii. Defining the limits or thresholds on statistical and conceptual differences in urban and rural areas to set up specific instruments or programs according to the needs of these areas. Strengthening and empowering smallholders’ organizations and leadership as well as institutions in rural areas and secondary cities, in order to foster rural-urban administrative efficiency.

iii. Strengthening multi-level administrative efficiency, promoting horizontal and vertical coordination across different agency levels, and improving local capacities for fluid rural-urban management and inter-institutional coordination.

iv. Fostering public-private strategic partnerships to encourage synergies for rural – urban development.

**V. WAY FORWARD/NEXT STEPS**

52 Based on this Strategic Framework, APEC member economies will develop an action plan through PPFS and other relevant sub-fora, which will be submitted for consideration by the APEC Economic Leaders’ Meeting in 2017, with a view to ensure continued work on this issue and results in the collective achievement of its general objective by 2030.
53 APEC economies should also consider multi-step projects, public-private policy dialogues and experience sharing on the specific objectives and strategies identified by this framework.

54 In addition, the private sector may consider developing and enhancing social responsibility programs aimed to strengthen rural – urban development. Under this framework, the Asia Pacific Food Industry Forum (AP-FIF) may promote sharing of experiences and best practices among economies and foster further progress based on economies consensus.

55 Based in consensus, initiate and strengthen technical and conceptual alliances with other organizations that have made progress in the design and implementation of policies related to rural - urban development to enhance food security in developed and developing economies.