

RIU

Mobilizing city-edge communities for action

Validated RNRRS Output.

Experiences from participatory work to help the poor in peri-urban areas cope with rapid city growth, and safeguard their natural resources, offer insights for planning efforts around the developing world. As urban areas expand, farming and livelihood systems are forced to change fast. To overcome local problems arising from this, such as soil erosion, deforestation, and the silting-up of irrigation tanks, six communities on the fringes of India's Hubli-Dharwad city developed wide-ranging action plans and put them into practice. The plans worked at different levels: from household and self-help group to village and district administration level. Around 40% of the poor and very poor in these communities have benefited so far. Plus, work on policies which recognize the uniqueness of the peri-urban zone is already bearing fruit.

Project Ref: **NRSP31:**

Topic: **6. Promoting Success: Partnerships, Policy & Empowerment**

Lead Organisation: **University of Wales, Bangor, UK**

Source: **Natural Resources Systems Programme**

Document Contents:

[Description](#), [Validation](#), [Current Situation](#), [Current Promotion](#), [Impacts On Poverty](#), [Environmental Impact](#),

Description

Research into Use

NR International
Park House
Bradbourne Lane
Aylesford
Kent
ME20 6SN
UK

Geographical regions included:

[India](#),

Target Audiences for this content:

[Crop farmers](#), [Livestock farmers](#), [Fishers](#), [Forest-dependent poor](#),

NRSP31

A. Description of the research output(s)

1. *Working title of output or cluster of outputs.*

In addition, you are free to suggest a shorter more imaginative working title/acronym of 20 words or less.

Participatory planning and implementation

2. *Name of relevant RNRRS Programme(s) commissioning supporting research and also indicate other funding sources, if applicable.*

NRSP

3. *Provide relevant R numbers (and/or programme development/dissemination reference numbers covering supporting research) along with the institutional partners (with individual contact persons (if appropriate)) involved in the project activities. As with the question above, this is primarily to allow for the legacy of the RNRRS to be acknowledged during the RIUP activities.*

R7867, R7959, R8084, PD138

R7867

Dr. R.M. Brook, Project Manager
School of the Environment & Natural Resources,
University of Wales Bangor,
Bangor, Gwynedd, LL57 2UW

Karen Hillyer, Paul Smith, Martin Hollingham, Andrew Packwood,
CAZS Natural Resources
University of Wales Bangor,
Bangor, Gwynedd, LL57 2UW

Prof. C.S. Hunshal, Dr B Basavraj, Dr J A Mulla,
Department of Agronomy
University of Agricultural Sciences
Dharwad 580005

Kian Shindhe, L. Joshi,
SDM College of Engineering and Technology,
Dharwad, 580008

Dr. Prakash Bhat
BAIF Development Research Foundation

11th Cross Plot No 2
Kelgeri Raod
Dharwad 580008

R7959

Dr. R.M. Brook, Project Manager
School of the Environment & Natural Resources,
University of Wales Bangor,
Bangor, Gwynedd, LL57 2UW

Bianca Ambrose-Oji
CAZS Natural Resources
University of Wales Bangor,
Bangor, Gwynedd, LL57 2UW

Adriana Allen
Development Planning Unit
University College London
9, Ednsleigh Gardens
London WC1H0ED

Prof. C.S. Hunshal
Department of Agronomy
University of Agricultural Sciences
Dharwad 580005

Meera Halakatti
India Development Service
Sadhankeri Road
Near German Hospital
Dharwad 580 008

Dr. Sangeetha Purushothaman
Best Practices Foundation
1, Palmgrove Road
Victoria Layout
Bangalore 560 047

Dr. Prakash Bhat
BAIF Development Research Foundation
11th Cross Plot No 2
Kelgeri Raod
Dharwad 580008

R8084

Dr. R.M. Brook, Project Manager
School of the Environment & Natural Resources,
University of Wales Bangor,
Bangor, Gwynedd, LL57 2UW

Bianca Ambrose-Oji
CAZS Natural Resources
University of Wales Bangor,
Bangor, Gwynedd, LL57 2UW

Karen Hillyer
CAZS Natural Resources
University of Wales Bangor,
Bangor, Gwynedd, LL57 2UW

Adriana Allen
Development Planning Unit
University College London
9, Ednsleigh Gardens
London WC1H0ED

Prof. C.S. Hunshal
Department of Agronomy
University of Agricultural Sciences
Dharwad 580005

Meera Halakatti
India Development Service
Sadhankeri Road
Near German Hospital
Dharwad 580 008

Dr. Sangeetha Purushothaman
Best Practices Foundation
1, Palmgrove Road
Victoria Layout
Bangalore 560 047

Dr. Prakash Bhat
BAIF Development Research Foundation
11th Cross Plot No 2

Kelgeri Raod
Dharwad 580008

4. Describe the RNRRS output or cluster of outputs being proposed and when was it produced? (**max. 400 words**). This requires a clear and concise description of the output(s) and the problem the output(s) aimed to address. Please incorporate and highlight (in bold) key words that would/could be used to select your output when held in a database.

The problem being addressed was twofold:

- a) Rapid urbanization was changing the peri-urban interface and a forerunner project (R7867) had indicated that the poor were most vulnerable to the effects of change and least able to adapt to changing circumstances.
- b) Rapid change in the PUI was leading to a neglect of the natural resource base due to rapidly changing agricultural systems and practices. Examples of degradation were soil erosion, silting up of irrigations dams ('tanks'), deforestation, fragmentation of land holdings into sub-economic units, sale of land and abandonment of farms, mining of clay from fields for brick making.

The project response was also two-fold. To address a), the project established village level self help groups, informal savings and loans schemes and the market oriented value enhancement programme for business development for the poor, landless and illiterate. These are the subjects of separate proformas. To address b), at village level the project developed action plans and implemented them at a series of levels; household, self help group, user-group, whole village and district administration level, to rehabilitate and enhance the natural resource base.

The output was a series of multi-dimensional plans (for each of the levels listed) for six peri-urban villages around Hulbi-Dharwad, Karnataka, and for the local administrations, namely the Hulbi-Dharwad Municipal Corporation and the Dharwad District Panchayat (Council), and the implementation of those plans. In addition, discussion on policies for administering the PUI as a single, dynamic zone of interaction were initiated at District and State level.

5. What is the type of output(s) being described here?
Please tick one or more of the following options.

Product	Technology	Service	Process or Methodology	Policy	Other Please specify
	X	X	X	X	

6. What is the main commodity (ies) upon which the output(s) focussed? Could this output be applied to other commodities, if so, please comment

7. What production system(s) does/could the output(s) focus upon?
Please tick one or more of the following options. Leave blank if not applicable

Semi-Arid	High potential	Hillsides	Forest-Agriculture	Peri-urban	Land water	Tropical moist forest	Cross-cutting

			X			
--	--	--	---	--	--	--

8. What farming system(s) does the output(s) focus upon?

Please tick one or more of the following options (see Annex B for definitions).

Leave blank if not applicable

Smallholder rainfed humid	Irrigated	Wetland rice based	Smallholder rainfed highland	Smallholder rainfed dry/cold	Dualistic	Coastal artisanal fishing
				X		

9. How could value be added to the output or additional constraints faced by poor people addressed by clustering this output with research outputs from other sources (RNRRS and non RNRRS)? (**max. 300 words**).

Please specify what other outputs your output(s) could be clustered. At this point you should make reference to the circulated list of RNRRS outputs for which proformas are currently being prepared.

Validation

B. Validation of the research output(s)

10. **How** were the output(s) validated and **who** validated them?

Please provide brief description of method(s) used and consider application, replication, adaptation and/or adoption in the context of any partner organisation and user groups involved. In addressing the “who” component detail which group(s) did the validation e.g. end users, intermediary organisation, government department, aid organisation, private company etc... This section should also be used to detail, if applicable, to which social group, gender, income category the validation was applied and any increases in productivity observed during validation (**max. 500 words**).

These outputs were validated externally through a mid-term assessment of the Participatory Action Planning project R7959 by a member of the NRSP Steering Group. The mid term evaluation led to a crucial new goal being added namely community mobilization as a precondition to participatory planning. The action plans that emerged from R7959 were implemented in R8084. For R8084, the mid-tern review was undertaken in August 2003, again by a member of the NRSP Steering Group.

Social groups targeted were the poor and very poor living in peri-urban villages, usually from lower castes, and often illiterate and landless. Impact assessment of R8084 was conducted by ITAD, a consultancy company, on behalf of NRSP, in January 2005 (NRSP PD 138) and by Cambridge University which was a gender assessment.

11. **Where and when** have the output(s) been validated?

Please indicate the places(s) and country(ies), any particular social group targeted and also indicate in which

production system and farming system, using the options provided in questions 7 and 8 respectively, above (max 300 words).

This output was validated in the peri-urban interface of Hubli-Dharwad, Karnataka State. Hubli-Dharwad is located in the semi-arid rainfed zone, although for the output under consideration, agro-ecological zone is not important. Social groups targeted were the poor and very poor living in peri-urban villages, usually from lower castes, and often illiterate and landless.

The mid term assessment of R7959 took place in 2001, in a mid term assessment of the implementation phase (R8084) by NRSP August 2003. The final impact assessment took place by the ITAD team in January 2005 (PD138).

Current Situation

C. Current situation

12. **How and by whom** are the outputs currently being used? Please give a brief description (**max. 250 words**).

At end of project, action plans had been implemented in six PU villages around Hubli-Dharwad.

Various issues were taken up as a result of the action plans which demanded the need for rural urban collaboration. Some issues could be dealt with within the villages themselves. Examples include tank restoration initiatives spearheaded by the local community in Mugad village and then undertaken in other project villages. Other initiatives include agro-forestry in Channapur and forest based initiatives in several project villages.

13. **Where** are the outputs currently being used? As with Question 11 please indicate place(s) and countries where the outputs are being used (**max. 250 words**).

In six PU villages around HD in India thus far.

14. **What is the scale of current use?** Indicating how quickly use was established and whether usage is still spreading (**max 250 words**).

Project estimates are that 40% of the poor and very poor in the six project villages have benefited from some aspect of the project and from the implementation of the action plans. Those who have been engaged in the plans have been engaged in the implementation process from the project villages only.

15. **In your experience what programmes, platforms, policy, institutional structures exist that have assisted with the promotion and/or adoption of the output(s) proposed here and in terms of capacity strengthening what do you see as the key facts of success?** (**max 350 words**).

Success of the project was down to the dedication of the project team, consisting of NGOs and academics, and the willing participation of the primary beneficiaries. Some outputs of the project will endure beyond the lifetime of the project, such as MOVE and self help groups (described in other proformas). However, those outputs which address environmental degradation in the peri-urban interface lack official support because of the lack of a governmental appreciation of the need to manage the PUI as a particular entity.

Issues requiring collaboration between urban and rural administration include provisions for market access for poor producers, access to farmers markets set up for direct interface between rural and urban areas, sewage treatment where the sewage from the cities flows into peri-urban areas and untreated sewage was used for vegetable cultivation which led to *E. coli* being present in the vegetables, rehabilitation of urban watersheds (or those that straddle the arbitrary rural-urban administrative boundary) and so on. Skill building for livelihoods for the periurban poor in nearby urban markets such as retailing and services is also an unaddressed need.

Housing needs of the urban areas and the needs of the construction industry in the form of skilled labour and environmentally friendly materials are needed to meet this demand. Education and skill needs of urban areas need to met through better education services and infrastructure for urban and periurban populations.

The health sector also requires improved facilities to cater to greater volumes especially of the surrounding periurban areas. The local government needs to be able to subcontract its services to self help groups and to non governmental organizations which have to be further trained to meet this need.

This can all happen only if the local government and the Development Planning Committee (DPC, an official body but is nowhere functional yet) officials are sensitized to these new needs, the importance of rural urban collaboration and the need for engaging with civil society.

Some of these issues were discussed in the *ad hoc* District Steering Committee (DSC) set up by the DFID-funded projects and an rural urban task force was set up which did not continue due to the transfer of officials. However these bodies had to be set up because of the absence of a functional DPC. The DPC then was seen as a political body with only advisory powers and no budget. It is constituted of elected officials and the bureaucracy and seen as more of a political body than a planning body. However with Jawaharlal Nehru National Urban Renewal Mission (JNNURM) now in place whose reforms require the setting up of functional DPCs, it is now a need to facilitate the formation and functioning of the DPCs. Thus there may be considerable scope for managing the peri-urban interface as an entity in future.

Current Promotion

D. Current promotion/uptake pathways

16. Where is promotion currently taking place? Please indicate for each country specified detail what promotion is taking place, by whom and indicate the scale of current promotion (max 200 words).

No active promotion at the moment.

Policy briefs on governance and on natural resource management in the peri-urban interface, and videos on CD were distributed to a mailing list of several hundred government and civil society personnel. As these are tangible products, their effect may still be maturing.

17. *What are the current barriers preventing or slowing the adoption of the output(s)? Cover here institutional issues, those relating to policy, marketing, infrastructure, social exclusion etc. (max 200 words).*

- The main barrier is the current ways on which the DPC is constituted and conceptualized. Being seen as a solely political body it lacks legitimacy and cannot execute.
- Current implementing agencies of the government cannot handle the volumes and scale of management of the public goods and services demanded through the JNNURM projects.
- None of the officials are sensitized to dealing with issues that require rural urban interface.

18. *What changes are needed to remove/reduce these barriers to adoption? This section could be used to identify perceived capacity related issues (max 200 words).*

- There is a need to evolve a model for an effective and functional DPC to manage the environment and help poor peri-urban people to take advantage of urban opportunities.
- Sensitization of officials to collaboration with civil society and private sector.
- Sensitization of officials to rural - urban issues
- There currently is no institutional arrangements for working across the rural urban divide.

The National Steering Group (NSG) may consider addition or deletion of cities/ Urban Areas or towns eligible for JNNURM (other than State capitals) based on the suggestions received from State Governments. The total number of cities under the Mission shall, however, remain around 60. Currently proposed cities under 1 million are:

Guwahati, Itanagar, Jammu, Raipur, Panaji, Shimla, Ranchi, Thiruvananthapuram, Imphal, Shillong, Aizawl, Kohima, Bhubaneshwar, Gangtok, Agartala, Dehradun, Bodhgaya, Ujjain, Puri, Ajmer-Pushkar, Nainital, Mysore, Pondicherry, Chandigarh, Srinagar, Mathura, Haridwar, Nanded.

19. *What lessons have you learnt about the best ways to get the outputs used by the largest number of poor people? (max 300 words).*

- At the local level, personal interaction is essential.
- Self help groups (SHGs) of the poor were mobilized and played an important role in bringing the voices of the poor to the *ad hoc* DSC meetings.
- Community officers from the NGO partners lived in villages with the SHG members.
- SHG-Gram Panchayat (village cluster councils) interaction was fostered by which the elected officials also represented SHG issues
- Participation of civil society in planning processes
- Interaction between rural and urban elected bodies on issues of concern to both and training

on participatory planning processes.

- Sensitization of officials to the importance of participatory planning and of rural urban collaboration.
- The institutional arrangement to address the rural urban divide is the DPC on paper and needs to become effective

Impacts On Poverty

E. Impacts on poverty to date

20. Where have impact studies on poverty in relation to this output or cluster of outputs taken place? This should include any formal poverty impact studies (and it is appreciated that these will not be commonplace) and any less formal studies including any poverty mapping-type or monitoring work which allow for some analysis on impact on poverty to be made. Details of any cost-benefit analyses may also be detailed at this point. Please list studies here.

- Impact assessment conducted at the end of R8084 by ITAD in January 2005 (NRSP PD 138)
- Gender in Peri Urban India was an independent assessment done by Cambridge University (PD123)
- Process Documentation of R7959 and R8084
- Before and end of project surveys, conducted by the project
- Participatory monitoring and evaluation by the primary beneficiaries

21. Based on the evidence in the studies listed above, for each country detail how the poor have benefited from the application and/or adoption of the output(s) (max. 500 words):

- *What positive impacts on livelihoods have been recorded and over what time period have these impacts been observed? These impacts should be recorded against the capital assets (human, social, natural, physical and, financial) of the livelihoods framework;*
- *For whom i.e. which type of person (gender, poverty group (see glossary for definitions) has there been a positive impact;*
- *Indicate the number of people who have realised a positive impact on their livelihood;*
- *Using whatever appropriate indicator was used detail what was the average percentage increase recorded*

Examples of benefits at three levels will be given; community, household and self-help group.

Benefits of water feeder channel and tank rehabilitation in Kotur village in 2005 were:

- Farmers alongside channel reported cropping season length doubled
- Mean value of increased crop production was worth £55 per farmer
- Application of 'silt' from the tank bottom worth about £35 per farmer in terms of increased crop production and fertilizers saved (farmer estimates)
- There were also Intangible but important increase in community spirit.

In Kotur, all wealth classes benefited from water channel and tank rehabilitation, as this intervention was implemented at community level.

Soil and water conservation measures in Channapur village (pits and bunds around field perimeters with tree and shrub barriers) three years after establishment resulted in a mean increase in crop yield of 45% (averaged across several dryland crop species; soybean, cotton, sorghum, pigeonpea) and an average monetary increase of £33.75 per farmer per hectare per season. All but one of the farmers sampled in Channapur were in the very poor or poor wealth categories.

SHG formation has had many impacts at the personal as well as at the social level. An independent assessment done by Cambridge University (PD123, p13) found that SHG formation led to various forms of empowerment: personal, social, political and economic Training and exposure visits increased their awareness level. Women said that they were more confident to go out of their houses alone and speak to any man in the village or in any government agency. The SHGs have saved and taken loans for starting income generating activities like dairy, goat rearing, poultry, tailoring, soap making and bangle selling to name a few. Data shows that among the loans taken, 42.2 percent of these loans were taken for production purposes. These production loans were taken to enhance or expand existing livelihoods and some were taken for new livelihood options. This has improved their earning, thus enhancing their livelihoods. Relief from moneylenders is one of the important outcomes of SHG formation where the poor were entangled to the moneylenders. The SHG members there are now moving away from taking loans from moneylenders to taking loans from the SHG. Average savings per poor SHG member increased from £3.80 in 2001 to £28.50 in 2005 (data from PD138).

Environmental Impact

H. *Environmental impact*

24. *What are the direct and indirect environmental benefits related to the output(s) and their outcome(s)? (max 300 words)*

This could include direct benefits from the application of the technology or policy action with local governments or multinational agencies to create environmentally sound policies or programmes. Any supporting and appropriate evidence can be provided in the form of an annex.

Implementation of action plans for agroforestry and catchment rehabilitation had a positive effect upon the environment, in that soil erosion by water was reduced and crop land was in use for longer in the year, so reducing the potential for wind erosion of soil. Implementation of alternative uses for sewage irrigation (non-food crops, trees) would reduce levels of pollution in waterways and negative health effects. Composting (either by aerobic decomposition or using worms) reduces the quantity of municipal solid waste and facilitates access to organic matter by farmers, reducing the need to apply artificial fertilizers. Agroforestry supplies wood fuel, relieving pressure upon the natural forests which are being rapidly depleted. The installation of more fuel efficient, smokeless stoves both reduces the requirement for fuel wood and respiratory diseases and eye conditions of the women who do the cooking.

25. *Are there any adverse environmental impacts related to the output(s) and their outcome(s)? (max 100 words)*

None anticipated.

26. *Do the outputs increase the capacity of poor people to cope with the effects of climate change, reduce the risks of natural disasters and increase their resilience? (max 200 words)*

Implementation of catchment rehabilitation and agroforestry increase the overall resilience of the landscape to adverse climatic effects such as drought (observed during the project) and unseasonally heavy rainfall.
