

# Spotlighting development in peri-urban areas

## Validated RNRRS Output.

Valuable knowledge has been generated about production, livelihoods and poverty at the boundaries between rural and urban areas. This will help policy makers and development agencies target support for the livelihoods of millions in these peri-urban areas—which are growing rapidly as cities expand. The synthesis of lessons learned and future directions covers 10 years of results from DFID-funded research in three city regions: Kumasi (Ghana) and Hubli-Dharwad and Kolkata (India). It found many issues common to all three regions, and tackles concerns ranging from growing higher value crops for sale in urban markets, and start-up training for small businesses, to urban waste-management policy.

Project Ref: **NRSP32:**

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

Lead Organisation: **University College, London, UK**

Source: **Natural Resources Systems Programme**

---

## Document Contents:

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

---

## Description

**NRSP32**

## Research into Use

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

## Geographical regions included:

[Ghana, India,](#)

## Target Audiences for this content:

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

**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.*

Peri-Urban Production, Livelihoods, and Poverty, or  
Less Poverty from Rural to Urban Change

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

Natural Resources Systems Programme

**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.**

R8491; Development Planning Unit, University College London; Michael Mattingly

**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.*

While searching for more knowledge about NR management, the RNRRS has learned that reducing poverty is partly a matter of moving people to production that is not NR based and which is highly likely to be related to urban areas. Furthermore, it has learned something about how to do this. The numbers of poor and potentially poor to which is applies are staggering, possibly greater than the entire population of poor people that can be helped with better NR management. Over one year (2005-6), new knowledge was obtained of peri-urban production, livelihoods and poverty by synthesising findings of separate lines of 10 years (1997-2006) of NRSP research on the peri-urban interfaces (PUIs) of 3 city-regions – Kumasi, Ghana, Hubli-Dharwad, India and Kolkata, India. Previous to these NRSP studies, little was known about the impacts of a **peri-urban interface** on **production**, **livelihoods** and **poverty**. The project brought together this knowledge for the first time, picking up and promoting awareness of important commonalities and differences among the three locations.

Themes of the output include:

- the common effects of a PUI upon **natural resource management** and upon the livelihoods of poor people (for example, the impact of the loss of **land** or of the reduction of water quality on production and income, or the focus of negative impacts upon poor people and **women**),
- the abilities of poor people affected by a PUI to plan for and carry out the adoption of alternative livelihoods (including their tendencies to mix continuation of rural natural resources based production with ventures into urban opportunities, and the difficulties of involving local governments in planning and in trials of alternatives),

- the effectiveness of alternative livelihoods (for example, the potentials of trading or the capacities of renewed traditional productive activities such as farming), and actions of intervention that appear to help poor people change their livelihood activities in response to the effects of a PUI.

The findings may also shed light upon the problems and opportunities of **rural to urban migration** in general and of **urban-rural linkages**.

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
					knowledge

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

There is no focus on a particular commodity.

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

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.

This output is already the result of clustering the outputs of various PUI projects of the NRSP. Furthermore, an attempt was made to cover in the synthesis the outputs of other RNRRS projects. Unfortunately, in general, the small output obtained from other projects that commented on PU matters does not add significantly to the

knowledge obtained by the NRSP of livelihoods and poverty.

The one exception to this conclusion is the output of RNRRS projects regarding urban and peri-urban agriculture that were synthesised by the Livestock Production Programme, but this synthesis does not appear on the circulated list. Moreover, substantial research is being supported on urban and peri-urban agriculture by the International Network of Resource Centres on Urban Agriculture and Food Security (RUAF, [www.ruaf.org](http://www.ruaf.org)) with the assistance of the Canadian government. .

Other research output on PU livelihoods, poverty and production is being carried out in a scatter of individual efforts – as shown in the literature – that could benefit from being brought together with the NRSP synthesis. No other major programme is known that is investigating or has investigated PU livelihoods, and poverty in relation to PU production.

In each of the three locations of the NRSP studies, efforts are being made to apply the findings regarding that location. The overall synthesis output can give added support any of these applications. This could strengthen a case for pursuing the application of the PUI findings in, say Karnataka, another Indian state, or even India, building upon project R8084, as distinct from a global application of the synthesis output.

---

## 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**).*

A degree of validation was achieved the process of synthesis: the outputs are all findings that emerged from more than one PUI. Outputs of the separate studies of PUIs of Kolkata, Hubli-Dharwad, and Kumasi were examined for commonalties. A research team in the UK carried out the synthesis. The findings validated in this way focused on poor people and some relate particularly to poor women.

A small number of elements of the output of this synthesis project were validated by an impact assessment of NRSP PUI research (PD 138), performed by a UK consultant. Although this evaluation preceded the completion of the synthesis project, several conclusions of the synthesis were supported by observations of the separate impacts of the actions of the two PUI research projects. No other formal validation of the output of this synthesis study has been carried out. As noted below, significant use of the synthesis output cannot be expected for some time, so the only opportunities to examine applications occurred during the research in the three locations, when learning by doing was taking place.

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**).

The validation of this project's findings occurred in the three locations of NRSP PUI studies (Kolkata and Hubli-Dharwad, India and Kumasi, Ghana) during the 10 years up to 2006. But this validation was not recognised through the actions of synthesis until 2005-6 in the UK. The impact studies in Hubli-Dharwad and Kumasi were carried out in the PUIs of those cities at the end of 2005 and the beginning of 2006.

Impacts on poor people of peri-urban interfaces were the foci of both the validation through synthesis and of the impact studies in Hubli-Dharwad and Kumasi.

---

## Current Situation

### C. Current situation

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

The outputs of the synthesis itself – as distinct from the outputs of individual NRSP studies of the PUI that were synthesised – are not yet known to be the source of applications by anyone. The synthesis outputs were made generally available to potential users in early 2006. Consequently, their use is not yet discernable in policy decision-making and in practice. Nor will their use be easily traceable, given that they are knowledge outputs.

Some of the synthesis findings continue to be used in the 3 study locations where they emerged during learning-by-doing. They are being used by people and organisations who participated in these projects, as well as by others who have enjoyed proximity to those who participated.

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**).

Given that application of the synthesis output is not yet known, places of use cannot be stated.

Outputs of individual projects from which the synthesis was drawn are being used in the PUIs of Kumasi, Ghana, Hubli-Dharwad, India, and Kolkata, India, as well as in Mangalore, India, and other parts of Karnataka State, India.

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

The scale of application of the synthesis knowledge at this early date is certainly quite small.

The scale of use of the findings of the individual PUI projects is largely confined to their locations, as indicated in 13. above. However, a number of articles have been published regarding research on the PUIs of Kolkata and to Hubli-Dharwad and the researchers involved in those projects have promoted wider knowledge of their findings, especially in the case of Hubli-Dharwad. This has spread knowledge of certain findings to professionals and policy makers in Karnataka State and in India and beyond to the international audience (see <http://www.nrsp.org.uk/pdfs/resources/NSS/Pu%20S1%20UPN%2005-06.pdf> for a rough estimate of the impact of this spread). In these cases, there is as yet only the impact study in Hubli-Dharwad and Kumasi identified above to indicate that this knowledge is being used. Also, a finding drawn from Hubli-Dharwad has been used by the ILO in Mangalore, India. Probably, indications cannot be expected for some time.

*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).*

Outside of the organisations that collaborated in the NRSP's PUI research, there has not been assistance with promotion or adoption from the sources indicated in the question. After creating a strong link with DFID's Urban Rural Change Team at the beginning of the research, support was expected. This did not materialise, probably mainly because the Urban Rural Change Team was dissolved shortly after delivery of the output to it. See 16. below.

Because former members of NRSP PUI research teams and their institutions (i.e. universities in UK, India and Ghana; NGOs in India and Ghana; a state government agency in India) are continuing to use and promote findings, output from the synthesis study is being fed back to them.

---

## 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).*

The principal target for promotion was DFID. Interaction with its Urban-Rural Change Team from the very beginning identified current areas of DFID work which could be informed by research findings about peri-urban interface conditions. Agreement was reached on a knowledge product highlighting specific research messages that could be used to create briefing documents DFID country and region desks. A shorter summary was produced for DFID's Central Research Department for dissemination within DFID as one of several RNRRS synthesis reports.

Individually tailored bundles of short briefing documents, each calling attention to a different research message, were sent to nearly 20 named individuals known to have peri-urban or rural/urban interests in the UNDP, UN-

Habitat, the FAO, DFID, the World Bank, the International Development Research Center (Canada), the International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED), the Resource Centre on Urban Agriculture and Food Security (RUAF), and the Urban Harvest (the CGIAR Strategic Initiative on Urban and Peri-urban Agriculture), as well as academics and researchers in the UK, Denmark, USA, India, Ghana, and Thailand. Also, bundles of briefing documents went to a number of relevant institutions, including the 8 regional offices of UN-Habitat. All knowledge products of the synthesis were placed on <http://www.ucl.ac.uk/dpu/pui/research/previous/synthesis/index.html> in downloadable forms.

*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).*

Probably the greatest barrier to uptake is the division into rural and urban that is entrenched in organisations, in responsibilities, in perspectives and in areas of knowledge. Consequently, rural and urban connections belong to no one and interest few. A second related barrier is the general disinterest among international and governmental agencies in the role of urban activities in development. These circumstances have yet to respond to evidence that most livelihoods now are supported by urban activities, that most people who are poor are probably already in cities and towns, and that urban economies and urban places will have to absorb nearly all of the world's population increases, including the majority of this increase that will be poor. The effect of these circumstances is that there is very little demand for the output of the PUI knowledge synthesis.

*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).*

To the extent that the rural-urban divide and the disinterest in urban development described above are the result of ignorance and/or negligence, more promotion of knowledge of what happens to a vast number of livelihoods during a rural to urban transition and of the consequences in relation to poverty could lead to sufficient recognition or acceptance that current organisations and approaches are unsuitable and require changing.

The global education or marketing exercise needed to remove these barriers is beyond the scope of the RIUP. However, education and marketing directed at staff of DFID is not, and it could have a significant impact on the perceptions and capacities within an organisation that can be a world leader of change. Unfortunately, with the demise of its urban development advisory office and of the Urban Rural Change Team, the last vestiges of DFID's interest in rural-urban links and of competence regarding the urban end of such connections have disappeared. If a significant and sustained demand for PUI knowledge were created first in DFID, DFID would create a demand for the knowledge among appropriate government organisations and NGOs in its client countries.

*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).*

The outputs of the synthesis project are not for use so much by poor people themselves as by those who are formulating or affecting policy. Dissemination of the synthesis output began too recently to learn very much at all about the effectiveness of the ways employed to obtain its use in policy.

That said, some outputs from the individual PUI studies were used by poor people as part of the research that was undertaken. The most prominent lesson from these experiences was that people who participate in planning how they might collectively and individually deal with the changes wrought by a peri-urban interface are more likely to use new knowledge of alternative productive activities and of supports for taking up these activities.

## 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.*

From December 2005 to March 2006, a study of impact on poverty was undertaken at two of the three locations where the NRSP supported PUI research. These were Kumasi, Ghana and Hubli-Dharwad, India. The impacts identified were those on people who had participated in the learning-by doing of the research. Where these impacts were the result of findings common to both places, they were in effect impacts of aspects of the synthesis study output. This impact study is entitled *NRSP impact assessment case studies* (NRSP Project PD 138) and a description which can be found at [http://www.nrsp.org.uk/database/project\\_view.asp?projectid=301](http://www.nrsp.org.uk/database/project_view.asp?projectid=301).

*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*

The abovementioned study undertook to identify and project of the impacts on poverty that resulted by 2005 (after no more than 24 months of learning by doing) or that could be expected to result by 2015 at the two sites. It also aimed to identify the research contribution to meeting relevant Millennium Development Goals (halving poverty and hunger; ensuring environmental sustainability) but found this could not be done.

Key conclusions that relate to the synthesis of PUI livelihoods knowledge were:

- "The overall impact on poverty of project beneficiaries has been positive. In India returns from income-generating activities are more likely to have been realised and incomes have increased; similarly for individual



trader beneficiaries in Ghana. In both countries beneficiaries perceive their overall well-being to have increased with improvement in livelihoods assets. These positive findings are confirmed by a reduction in the number of households being ranked as poor in both countries. Impact on poverty within households is starting to be felt with increased incomes being spent on children's education, for example. However, the outlook for reducing poverty on a larger scale may be limited without further (modest) support to ensure continuing focus on pro poor groups and to retain project innovations. If this is secured (in Ghana particularly) much larger reductions are expected to be achieved." (<http://www.nrsp.org.uk/database/documents/2056.pdf>, p. 1)

- "Women's status has improved, though the existence of a significant proportion of poorly off women remains a major challenge. Impact on women's status has been positive in both countries, with improvements in both well-being and incomes. However, 50 percent of women were still poorly off in Kumasi by the end of the project. Establishment of women's *sangha* in Hubli-Dharwad has been a highly positive development and women are now moving into traditionally male economic activities (trading). Election of women to leadership posts, such as CLFs in Ghana and Gram Panchayat in India, is a significant step." (<http://www.nrsp.org.uk/database/documents/2056.pdf>, page 2.)

## 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.*

If the economic value of natural resources to the livelihoods for so many peri-urban residents is better understood by policymakers and planners and this leads to more sensitive or more careful natural resource management, then the negative environmental impacts of exploitative natural resource use and pollution of the natural resource base may be ameliorated.

There are no other obvious direct or indirect environmental benefits of any significance.

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

There are no obvious adverse environmental impacts related to the outputs.

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)*

The application of the outputs could help poor people to integrate into production processes that are not NR based and therefore possibly less subject to the effects of climate change.

---

