

**DEPARTMENT FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT  
STRATEGY FOR RESEARCH ON RENEWABLE NATURAL RESOURCES**

**NATURAL RESOURCE SYSTEMS PROGRAMME**

***FINAL TECHNICAL REPORT***

***DFID Project Number***

**R7995**

***Project title***

**Implementation Plans for Natural Resource Management Strategies for the Kumasi  
Peri-Urban Interface**

***Project Leader***

**Korsi Ashong**

***Organisation***

**Centre for the Development of People,  
P.O. Box 5601,  
Kumasi, Ghana  
West Africa**

**Tel: 233 051 24581/ 233 051 30881**

**E-mail: [cedep@africaonline.com.gh](mailto:cedep@africaonline.com.gh)**

***NRSP Production System***

**Peri-urban Interface**

***Date***

**May 2002**

# Implementation Plans for Natural Resource Management Strategies in the Kumasi Peri-urban Interface

## NaRMSIP for Kumasi PUI

### Final Technical Report

DfID Natural Resource Systems Programme  
Project No. R7995

#### Project Staff

Mr. Korsi Ashong (Project Leader)  
Ms. Lois Amon  
Mr. Bright Asare-Boadi

#### Principal Collaborators

Professor David Simon	Centre for Development Areas Research (CEDAR), Royal Holloway University of London, Egham, Surrey, TW 20 OEX
Professor Kasim Kasanga	Institute of Land Management and Administration, Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology (KNUST), Kumasi
Dr. J Quashie Sam	Institute of Renewable Natural Resources, KNUST, Kumasi
Dr. K.E. Mensah Abrampah	Department of Planning, KNUST, Kumasi
Dr. Johannes Awudza	Department of Chemistry, KNUST, Kumasi
Mrs. Olivia Agbenyega	IRNR, KNUST, Kumasi

Prepared by:

CEDEP Sustainable Livelihoods Programme  
Community Development Initiatives  
Centre for the Development of People  
P.O. Box 5601  
Kumasi, Ghana

Tel: 233 051 24581/30881

Mobile: 233 024 202185

**Fax: 233 051 26026**

Email: [clcksi@africaonline.com.gh](mailto:clcksi@africaonline.com.gh)

**Team of Field Workers**

<b>Researcher</b>	<b>Address</b>	<b>Status</b>
Kojo Mensah Abrampah	Department of Planning, KNUST	Principal Collaborator, Team Leader, Resource Person
Olivia Agbenyega	IRNI, KNUST	Principal Collaborator, Team Leader
Oppong Nkrumah	ILMAD, KNUST	Team Leader
Joseph Owusu	CEDEP	Team Leader, Resource Person
Vesta Adu Gyamfi	“	Team Leader
Samuel Ofori	“	Team Leader
S. O. Adjare	Technology Consultancy Centre, UST	Resource Person, Beekeeping
Robert Arthur	P.O. Box AS 119, Kumasi	Resource Person, Mushroom Production
Felicia Adusei	CEDEP	Field Assistant
Samuel Opoku Agyemang	“	“ “
Ben Ofosu Adjei	“	“ “
Comfort Awuah	“	“ “
Loretta Tando	“	“ “
Richard Naaso	“	“ “
Beatrice Benuyena	“	“ “
Gabriel Owusu Ansah	KNUST	Junior Researcher
Theophilus Ayugame	KNUST	“ “
Jenkins A. Asaah	KNUST	“ “
Isaac Abunyewa	KNUST	“ “
Frederick Kiston Attabra	KNUST	“ “
Shu-aib Jakpa Sumalia	KNUST	“ “
Emanuel Akwasi Adjei	KNUST	“ “
Joseph Ampadu Boateng	KNUST	“ “
Andrews Kwaku Konduah	KNUST	“ “
Frank Appiah Kubi	KNUST	“ “
Eric Oduro Ofori	KNUST	“ “

## List of Acronyms

BSCE	Basic School Certificate Examination
CEDAR	Centre for Development Areas Research
CEDEP	Centre for the Development of People
CFMC	Community Finance Management Committee
CHIC	Community Health Insurance Committee
CLF	Community Level Facilitator
D/A	District Assembly
DCE	District Chief Executive
DfID	Department for International Development
DPU	Development Planning Unit
FTR	Final Technical Report
GOAN	Ghana Organic Agriculture Network
ICCES	Integrated Community Centre for Employable Skills
ILMAD	Institute of Land Management and Administration
IRNR	Institute of Renewable Natural Resources
JSS	Junior Secondary School
KITA	Kumasi Institute of Tropical Agriculture
KMA	Kumasi Metropolitan Authority
KNUST	Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology
KPUI	Kumasi Peri-urban Interface
MSLC	Middle School Leaving Certificate
MTR	Mid Term Review
NGO	Non Governmental Organization
NPP	New Patriotic Party
NRM	Natural Resource Management
NRSP	Natural Resource Systems Programme
NVTI	National Vocational Training Institute
PEA	Participatory Planning Approach
PMC	Peri-Urban Management Committee
PRA/PLA	Participatory Rapid Appraisal/ Participatory Learning Action
PTA	Parent Teacher Association
PTS	Project Tracking System
PUI	Peri-urban Interface
VIP	Village Infrastructure Project
WATSAN	Water and Sanitation Committee

Table of Contents

LIST OF ACRONYMS		
1.	<a href="#">EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</a>	1
2.	<a href="#">BACKGROUND</a>	2
3.	<a href="#">PROJECT PURPOSE</a>	3
4.	<a href="#">OUTPUTS</a>	3
4.1	<a href="#">Plans Prepared</a>	4
4.1.1	<a href="#">Action Plan 1</a>	4
4.1.2	<a href="#">Action Plan 2</a>	4
4.1.3	<a href="#">Action Plan 3</a>	5
4.1.4	<a href="#">Land Management and Administration</a>	5
4.1.5	<a href="#">Management of Resources</a>	5
4.2	<a href="#">Lessons of experience</a>	6
4.2.1	<a href="#">For a successful community forum</a>	6
4.2.2	<a href="#">Maintaining community enthusiasm (Feedback Expeditions)</a>	6
4.2.3	<a href="#">Project/CLF Community Interface</a>	7
4.2.4	<a href="#">Transparency and Fairness</a>	7
4.2.5	<a href="#">Getting critical actors to participate</a>	7
4.2.6	<a href="#">Background of CLFs</a>	7
4.2.7	<a href="#">CLFs as volunteers</a>	8
4.2.8	<a href="#">The problem of odd numbers</a>	8
4.2.9	<a href="#">The problem of animation</a>	8
4.2.10	<a href="#">Support from other institutions</a>	8
4.2.11	<a href="#">Emphasis on practice</a>	8
4.2.12	<a href="#">A resource centre for livelihood activities</a>	9
4.3	<a href="#">Summary of Outputs</a>	10
5.	<a href="#">ACTIVITIES</a>	11
5.1	<a href="#">Social Mobilisation</a>	11
5.1.1	<a href="#">Principal/ Research Collaborators</a>	11
5.1.2	<a href="#">Junior researchers</a>	12
5.1.3	<a href="#">Collaborators from the District Assemblies and the General Public</a>	12
5.1.4	<a href="#">Traditional Authorities</a>	13
5.1.5	<a href="#">Community Level Facilitators (CLFs)</a>	13
5.1.6	<a href="#">Community-Based Groups</a>	13
CLFs Appendix		
Report in Social Survey of Maase		
5.2	<a href="#">Awareness Creation</a>	14
5.2.1	<a href="#">Meetings of collaborators/staff</a>	14
5.2.2	<a href="#">Preparatory programmes</a>	14
5.2.3	<a href="#">Preparation of Awareness Creation materials</a>	14
5.2.4	<a href="#">Fieldwork</a>	15
5.2.5	<a href="#">Community Hearings</a>	15
5.2.6	<a href="#">District Level Hearing</a>	15
5.2.7	<a href="#">Proposal Preparation</a>	15
5.3	<a href="#">RESEARCH ACTIVITIES</a>	15
6.	<a href="#">CONTRIBUTION OF R7995 TO NRSP GOALS</a>	16
6.1	<a href="#">Impact on capabilities</a>	16
6.2	<a href="#">Impact on Capital Assets</a>	17
6.3	<a href="#">Impact on Activities</a>	18
6.4	<a href="#">Impact on/of Collaborators</a>	19
6.5	<a href="#">Impact on/of Research Partners</a>	20
7.	<a href="#">KEYWORDS</a>	21
8.	<a href="#">LOGFRAME</a>	21
<a href="#">APPENDICES</a>		1
<a href="#">Appendix i</a>	<a href="#">About the KPUI and NaRMSIP Communities</a>	1
<a href="#">Appendix ii</a>	<a href="#">Mobilised Relationships</a>	1
<a href="#">Appendix iii</a>	<a href="#">Interaction with Stakeholders</a>	1
<a href="#">Appendix iv</a>	<a href="#">The Plans</a>	1
<a href="#">Appendix v</a>	<a href="#">Some Insights from Literature by Collaborators</a>	1

## **1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

The Centre for the Development of People (CEDEP), at the instance of the Natural Resource Systems Programme (NRSP) of the British Department for International Development (DFID), facilitated the formulation of plans of action for implementing natural resource management (NRM) strategies for the Kumasi peri-urban interface (KPUI). These plans, which were to benefit the poor, were developed through extended interaction with principal stakeholders on the peri-urban interface, enhancing the understanding of such planning processes.

A participatory process for action planning was instituted, operated and observed, which included social mobilisation, awareness creation, and plan formulation. Emphasis on stronger community participation in the formulation and subsequent implementation of plans was demonstrated with the election of community level facilitators (CLFs). The CLFs, including men and women, became the most important party in the planning process; there was however a strong input by district assemblies and traditional rulers. The later was enhanced through public hearing.

The steps from social mobilisation to plan hearing at the district level were closely observed on videocassettes and written reports and shared with stakeholders. A proposal has been presented for publishing the results into a book together with a twin project in India, which adopted a similar methodology. The videocassettes are also being edited down to a length, which can easily be watched by those who would like to learn lessons from the experiences of the project.

The project investigated some of the changes that have occurred in the KPUI recently in addition to what was made available through six years of peri-urban research. A situational analysis of problems and opportunities arising from these changes and the potential advantages they held was done.

As a national NGO that supports its activities through staff efforts, CEDEP has learnt a lot from R7995 activities. The capacity of CEDEP to deal with peri-urban matters and stakeholders on the peri-urban interface has been strengthened. A research project R8090 called 'Boafo Ye Na' meaning 'a helper is scarce' to answer the question 'who can help the peri-urban poor?' R8090 has been started to study some issues, which arose during the formulation of plans, and to observe the implementation of plans and extract lessons of experience from it. Researchers from the Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology (KNUST) have identified other issues attracting research interest for further investigation.

Finally, the three livelihood-based plans prepared constitute the main aim of R7995. The strongest link with natural resources has been the assumption that when people are gainfully engaged in sustainable livelihood activities whether natural resource-based or not, the pressure on the natural resources would be reduced. The plans focus on three areas; livelihood activities which do not require much land to undertake on profitable bases; traditional farm-based livelihood activities; and processing of products from the first two plans mentioned above. Farmers have gone ahead to clear their fields while waiting for the project to give them a push in form of loans. The interest of the communities to see the plans implemented is overwhelming.

## 2. BACKGROUND

In 1995, the then British Overseas Development Administration (ODA) and now Department for International Development (DfID) commissioned research into the urbanisation of Kumasi and its ramifications. From then, several studies undertaken by researchers from India, Ghana, and Colombia revealed that urbanisation leads to the creation of a mobile interface between the urban and the rural systems. This interface called the peri-urban interface (PUI) is characterised by urban –rural flows of goods and services (*Brooks and Davila* 2000, 27-30)<sup>1</sup> (*DPU 2001 11-13*)<sup>2</sup>. The KPUI like others holds opportunities and threats. Research has revealed that these threats are felt more by the poor who live or have been pushed to the peri-urban communities especially because they are also unable to take advantage of the opportunities (*Brooks and Davila* 2000, 185), (*McGregor et al* 1999 3,4)<sup>3</sup>. See appendix 1a for the summary of the current peri-urban situation, featuring the threats and opportunities.

The research projects carried out on the KPUI facilitated the sharing of research findings with stakeholders. The Centre for the Development of People (CEDEP) emerged as an interested stakeholder and soon started taking assignments from the researchers. Notable among these were the R7330 ‘Natural Resource Management at Watershed Level’ and R7854 ‘Further Knowledge of Livelihoods affected by Urban Transition’. CEDEP resolved to take the research findings forward in a manner that would benefit the communities in the KPUI, who have started showing signs of research fatigue due to little/no action at the community level (KNRMP 2000 33)<sup>4</sup>. Whilst looking for financial assistance to begin a programme for sustainable livelihoods, CEDEP heard of and responded to a call for concept notes by the Natural Resource Systems Programme (NRSP) of the DFID and the interactions that followed resulted into a research project R7995. Under R7995, CEDEP facilitated the formulation of plans for implementing natural resource management (NRM) strategies on the KPUI.

The terms of reference for the proposal that gave birth to R7995 had some useful conditions, which led to

- the mobilisation of some researchers and community members from the previous peri-urban projects as collaborators which became an important human/social capital for R7995
- emphasis on utilisation of knowledge generated by the previous projects, access to which was facilitated by the collaborators
- the collaboration with some contemporary projects also being run by the NRSP of DFID

The goal of R7995 as set out in Section 3 of the project proposal was to take the knowledge that has already been generated down to the communities using the relationships developed in a manner that will benefit the poor within the communities. The research proposal built on the three conditions above, using them as guidelines for formulating plans with participatory processes for the implementation of NRM strategies in selected communities in the KPUI. An enviable, bottom-up participatory planning process that involved the poor in 12 peri-urban communities, traditional authorities, local government decision-making structures, relevant district and sub-district institutions, researchers who have been involved in the past peri-urban research projects, and a range of stakeholders was achieved although not without difficulty. In the process, the

<sup>1</sup> Brook R. Davila J. (2000) ‘Peri-urban Interface, Tale of two Cities’ Gwasg Ffrancon Printers. Bethesda, Gwynedd, Wales

<sup>2</sup> Development planning Unit (2001) ‘Living Between Urban and Rural Areas: shaping change for improved livelihoods and a better environment’ Vol. 1, Development Planning Unit University College of London, UK

<sup>3</sup> *McGregor et al* (1999) Inception Report-Peri-Urban Natural Resources Management at Watershed Level, Kumasi, Ghana

<sup>4</sup> R6799: Kumasi Natural Resources Management Project (KNRMP), Proceedings of final workshop, Urban Natural Resources studies Natural Resources Institute UK

project also created awareness in the KPUI on peri-urban issues and NRM strategies. Additionally, it challenged and strengthened the capacity of selected communities and community members in planning and implementation of plans.

### 3. PROJECT PURPOSE

The first purpose of the project was to formulate plans for implementing NRM strategies through extended interaction with principal stakeholders, to be indicated by the involvement of at least five principal stakeholders or actors in action planning processes that intend to benefit the poor. Natural resources in Ghana have multiple tenancies. Land, for instance, has dual tenancy between the state (statutory) and the public (customary) (*Kasanga and Ashie Kotey* 2001 1, 20; Edusah and Simon 2001; Alden Willy and Hammond 2001 17-19)<sup>5</sup>. Consequently the public and the state must make NRM plans. The state has many functionaries concerned with NRM, so also has the public got groups with interest in NRM. This underpins the need to facilitate interaction between multiple stakeholders in NRM planning. The climax of stakeholder interaction was at the district level hearing; one of which brought about 240 individuals together to discuss NRM issues and plans.

Secondly the project was to extract knowledge from the plan preparation process to enhance understanding of participatory action planning processes for KPUI in NRM and for use in other PUIs, which may engage in similar projects in future. This aspect of the project called for rigorous observation and recording of the processes. The project implementers and stakeholders through workshops, video recording, report writing, public forums and a strong involvement of community members, did this strategically.

By successfully implementing the project, the research team and stakeholders have improved their understanding of participatory processes whilst the target communities have accepted and are ready to adopt the use of practices emanating from the project and to implement the plans that have been formulated.

### 4 OUTPUTS

The process instituted for action planning included social mobilisation, action planning and plan promulgation, done successively with awareness creation and experience sharing. Although the plans have been formulated, the planning cycle is not yet complete because the plans prepared must be implemented through experimentation, reviewed, and evaluated to make room for any adjustments should the need arise. This would lead to a spiral in a manner similar to participatory extension approach (PEA) process of GTZ in appendix 1a, from which the project drew some lessons (*Jurgen Hagman et al 1998, 15*)<sup>6</sup>.

A significant output of the project was the three plans prepared. These plans have been summarised below. A requirement of the project was also for lessons of experience to be extracted. Some lessons to be learnt from the project have also been listed below.

---

<sup>5</sup> Kasanga K. and Kotey N. A., (2001) 'Land Management In Ghana: Building on Tradition and Modernity' International Institute for Environment and Development, London; Edusah, S. and Simon. D. (2001) Land Use and Land Allocation in Kumasi Peri-Urban Villages, CEDAR/IRNR Kumasi Paper 9, December; Alden, W.L. and Hammond, D, (2001) 'Land Security and the Poor in Ghana: Is there any way forward?' DFID Rural Livelihoods Programme, Accra, Ghana

<sup>6</sup> Hagman J., Chuma E., Murwira K., and Connolly M. (1998) 'Learning Together Through Participatory Extension: a guide to an approach developed in Zimbabwe' Department of Agricultural, Technical and Extension Services (AGRITEX) Harare, Zimbabwe.

## 4.1 Plans Prepared

### 4.1.1 Action Plan 1

The first plan was based on livelihood activities which require very little land to undertake, require very little initial capital investment, yield short term benefits to the communities, makes use mostly of waste or unutilised resources, and which the poor can patronise.

The non-farm natural resource-based livelihood activities are those livelihood activities, which do not require large pieces of land to undertake (Brook and Davila 2000 185,186). Such livelihood activities could be done at the courtyard, backyard, and garage or even on one's veranda. They require very little initial capital investments (Nunan *et al.* 2001 h21-h41). Communities came out with the following examples: Beekeeping, mushroom cultivation, weaving & basketry, grass cutter & rabbitry, small ruminants rearing, and snail farming (In fact, communities even classified livestock production at subsistence level as part of this category of livelihood activities). Besides increase in income, the strategy of this plan is to ease pressure on land so that prohibited and protected areas would not continue to attract communities. The plan will also provide alternative sources of livelihood and provide stronger economic linkages between urban and peri-urban communities, thus taking advantage of urban opportunities. See appendix iv b for more details on the first plan.

### 4.1.2 Action Plan 2

The second plan addresses land-requiring activities and will be mostly useful to communities, which still have some land at their disposal. Farm-based livelihood activities are those livelihood activities, which involve land tillage, planting of crops, manual weed control, harvesting, processing and storing; what is traditionally referred to as farming in Ghana or arable cropping in the language of an agricultural scientist, which excludes animal husbandry. Processing and storing are to be handled in the third plan. It is normally poor people who engaged in such farming activities on the peri-urban interface. They are characterised with smallholdings hardly enough even for subsistence.

Traditionally, farming technology was transferred freely; farmers picked up such skills informally from their parents or masters without paying anything. These traditional farming activities have been influenced recently by the extension services offered freely to farmers by the extension services of the Ministry of Food and Agriculture (MoFA) and the Cocoa Services Division, and some NGOs. Having endorsed the traditionally free nature of farming technology transfer, it has become very difficult or almost impossible for farmers to be asked to start paying for such services. Until recently although most crop farmers also kept some form of livestock in his home, livestock production has not received equal attention at policy-making level as crops. In the urban areas, because of population pressure it is more difficult to keep livestock especially when one is a tenant.

Although some cash crops were mentioned, they were not really emphasised probably due to the temporary nature of lands in the peri-urban interface. The operation of nurseries is also a potential source of income, which was also discussed as a farm based livelihood activity although this could be done on a limited area of land.

Generally, communities did not consider livestock production as requiring land and so pushed them to the first plan, with the final agreement that certain types of animals might be considered under non-farm and others as farm-based. See appendix iv c for more details on plan 2.

#### 4.1.3 Action Plan 3

The third plan, focusing on processing and marketing of products from the first two plans will enhance the first two plans by making these products more marketable. It looks at how to package, extend the shelf life, and/or add value to products of farm or non-farm livelihood activities. Processing will help to empower the participants by enabling them to plan sales. Traditional processing activities include pounding, grinding, milling, winnowing, grating, kneading, stirring, drying, sterilising, distilling, drying, frying, roasting, grilling and etc. Some of the requirements for the third plan may be capital intensive and may be community owned and managed.

Recently, new activities like sealing have been added and most of these activities have been mechanised. Sealing has brought improvement in the sale of drinking water, fruit juice, plantain chips in terms of increasing shelf life, improving distribution, improving hygiene, and earning more income. On the other hand, the increased demand for products packaged in plastic threaten the environment. In several ways communities themselves have started recycling plastic, some by using these plastics for beads, others for nurseries. The conclusion is that, any project that considers packaging must also look at what to do with the packaging material after the product has been consumed.

Processing products, using machines, which are the definite choice of all the communities, demand housing and storage under decent shelter for security, and protection against weathering and theft. The initial capital for a processing facility rather high in comparison to the working capital required if the applicant were going to hire the service from close by. On the other hand, the production level of small-scale producers would normally not break-even. Group ownership of the facility therefore appears to be a better alternative if there would be enough applicants to utilise to the full capacity.

Other activities to be considered under processing may not have direct bearing on natural resources but any activity that brings income to communities and prevent them from over burdening the natural resources is relevant to this plan. For this reason, activities like bakery, shoemaking, batik production, *kente*\* weaving and brass work would be considered under processing. See appendix iv d for more details on plan 3.

#### 4.1.4 Land Management and Administration

Land administration and management matters are very sensitive (Simon and Edusah 2001). No plan therefore focuses directly on this. The medium of the plan preparation, which cuts across all plans, makes room for discussing best practices of land management and administration. Already these discussions are having positive effects on the custodians of land as revealed at a forum for traditional authorities and the district level hearing, which formed part of the process for plan preparation. See appendix ii for excerpts.

#### 4.1.5 Management of Resources

Communities evolved a structure for managing resources accruing to the project during the implementation phase. This structure was buttressed with a computerised project tracking system developed together with the project staff and a computer programmer, at the instance of the NRSP. All communities joined hands together with their CLFs and the project staff and collaborators to design the structure, which is a two-tier management structure for the implementation of plans. The first tier is at the community level and, is called the Community

---

\* A Ghanaian royal cloth woven normally on a narrow loom

Finance Management Committee (CFMC) and the second tier is for the entire peri-urban interface including the 12 communities and is called the Peri-Urban Management Committee (PMC). Initially, it was thought that the project could finance the sittings of the management committees. However, with the little money available, this was not possible and the operation of the structure is going to be strictly voluntary. Communities, individuals, district assemblies, unit committees, and rural banks have a role to play on these committees. The parties involved met to discuss how to make this feasible as it is going to be possible only with volunteers. The project budget was not enough for setting up committees, which would be paid sitting allowances. The wrong signals already given to communities on the above is in the process of being corrected. See appendix vi for the management structure and its operation.

## **4.2 Lessons of experience**

### **4.2.1 For a successful community forum**

In mobilising communities especially for the first programme, it is good to go with a well-prepared message and a letter. Give the message orally and hand the letter to the most important community gatekeeper or his/her representative or some one who can surely give it to him/her if s/he was not there at the time of the visit. See other stakeholders because if the gatekeeper forgets they will remind him/her. You may have to go to a community repeatedly until you are convinced that the message has been understood and that the scheduled date has been accepted. In these visits you may have to repeat the same story over and over again sometimes more than thrice the same day before different audiences. If a chief invites other elders to come and listen to the message you are on your way to success. In general, urbanised communities have problems with mobilisation. More rural communities are very cohesive and may be easier to mobilise. Below are the cases of three communities:

- In one community, the chief took the letter and did not discuss it with his elders and other members of the community. At the time of the second visit, he said he has forgotten. It was during the third visit that he said he had minuted the letter to the unit committee to take action. When finally the day of the forum arrived none of these people could be found.
- In another community, the chief was not around and so the letter and message were given to an elderly person at the palace. At the time of the visit, nobody was informed. The project leader went afterwards to meet the chief who had recently lost his daughter abroad. Because of this mishap the chief handed over to the gong-gong beater to rally the people. At the time of the next visit the gong-gong beater has travelled. When the community was visited again he was around to say that for the past three years he has been looking for a job and it was on the day that the chief gave him the assignment that he got a job, which he could not turn down. We could not continue chasing that community because the project works with time constraints, so it ended there.
- An example of one of the successful communities was as follows: At the time of the first visit, the chief called the community elders for a quick meeting. Before the second visit about a week after, he had asked the gong-gong to be beaten twice. There was no need for a third visit.

### **4.2.2 Maintaining community enthusiasm (Feedback Expeditions)**

Signals from communities about research fatigue can be countered by letting communities understand what projects entail and especially the reasons why their participation is necessary, and if they are going to have any direct benefits what these benefits are going to be. It pays to go and correct any wrong impressions, which may arise especially because people with different motives have deceived the targeted communities several times, so they appreciate it when you go back to explain things that are not well understood and changes in programmes. Such explanatory

expeditions though very challenging make room for participatory discussion of alternative opportunities and how they may be harnessed.

#### 4.2.3 Project/CLF Community Interface

Interaction between project staffs, CLFs and communities strengthen community confidence in the project. On other projects, communities have seen their front-liners as stooges, especially when the chief of the community is used as a front-liner. They see them as having taken bribes to push the concerns of the project partners. Direct interaction between the project and the community in the case of NaRMSIP, which saw the mid term reviewer and other collaborators visiting the communities and speaking to the people, removed all suspicion.

#### 4.2.4 Transparency and Fairness

Communication with 15 communities in 5 districts demands a lot of travelling round the KPUI, which increased the cost of running the project. Each time an urgent message needed to be sent, effort was made to reach every community. Dealing with 12 communities, which remained after 3 dropped out, was like marriage to 12 women. There must not because for suspicion that one community is a favourite over the others. All communities had a fair share of visits by external collaborators, partners and project staff.

#### 4.2.5 Getting critical actors to participate

Critical actors on the peri-urban interface include top government official, political government appointees, and the Asantehene. These people include ministers of all the relevant sectors including land and forestry, agriculture, environment science and technology in one category. Members of Parliament (MPs), district chief executives, paramount chiefs, and divisional chiefs also fall in another category. In a chat with one MP who followed up on the project after hearing about it on the radio, he blamed the project seriously for not involving them. He expressed himself as a critical stakeholder who could monitor the district chief executive and make sure they delivered according to their promises. He added that he could raise certain issues, which the project could not handle.

Getting these critical actors to participate is another challenge as they are normally very busy people and they will give excuses when called upon their participation can therefore be limited to individual briefing and consultation. One MP mentioned that, getting them to participate in programmes required planning the programmes with them, giving them a long period of notice and giving them a role to play during the programme because they would not like to be spectators. The project has been advised to deal with political appointees with caution because of the necessarily non-political/partisan nature of the implementers and participants.

#### 4.2.6 Background of CLFs

The CLFs have different backgrounds ranging from security men to retired teachers. Every effort must be made to make sure that they all benefited from workshop programs. The facilitation of sessions was done in *Twi*<sup>7</sup> and in an adult-friendly manner. In all major workshops, they were allowed and encouraged to participate in *Twi*. Even facilitators who could not speak *Twi* fluently tried to do so. They would rather speak *Twi* badly than have the communities struggle to speak English. In very extreme cases, a participant who could not speak *Twi* was allowed to speak English, which was translated. Such participants also had people sitting next to them translating the contribution made in *Twi* so that they could also benefit.

---

<sup>7</sup> Local language used mainly in the Ashanti Region

#### 4.2.7 CLFs as volunteers

The most important players so far as this project is concerned are the CLFs. They remain volunteers and must be allowed to engage in their normal livelihood activities and live their normal lives. Programs must therefore be designed in such a way that they can be accommodated in their daily routines. Some CLFs were security persons and could swap with colleagues at their various places of work to attend programmes during the day. Programmes must however end early so that they would be able to go home and prepare for their night duties. Others may be able to ask permission once a while from their employers and so programs must not be organised continuously for a long period. Some CLFs farm outside the peri-urban in rural communities and must be allowed once a while to be absent from meetings whilst visiting their farms.

#### 4.2.8 The problem of odd numbers

The project asked the communities to select three people to serve as CLFs. The result was that some communities had no female facilitator at all, others had one female facilitator but no community had two or all-female facilitators. An even number, with the specification of two male and two female facilitators would therefore have been better for balancing the gender of CLFs. This also brings home the wisdom/equity idea of having the same number of CLFs from all villages regardless of size.

#### 4.2.9 The problem of animation

Any attempt to cite an example during community animation becomes a suggestion of what the community should do. Where the animator was careful not to cite examples, communities would focus on livelihood activities they are already familiar with. They would normally not think of innovations. The result was that even though there were complaints that arable land was becoming scarce, and noxious weeds have emerged and become a problem, most communities still went for the traditional cassava and maize production, and would rather call for assistance to undertake chemical weed control. Such livelihood activities have been proved unsustainable and call for the implementation of sedentary farming practices, most of which are new and need to be carefully introduced. Land-demanding livelihood activities have to grapple with community conflicts that characterise land transactions on the peri-urban interface but the communities still prefer these activities, even in obviously urbanised areas.

#### 4.2.10 Support from other institutions

Getting the needed support from collaborating institutions such as the District Assemblies and Forestry and Agriculture is unpredictable since this is seen more as a peripheral work than a main activity. The services rendered by these institutions must be priced and paid for; otherwise we would turn round and blame these institutions for inefficiency. The project, however, did not have enough capacity to do this. Hence the project went for the option to engage such personalities on individual basis only when their services were required.

#### 4.2.11 Emphasis on practice

The project emphasised the use of resource persons with practical backgrounds rather those with academic qualifications or certificates. Such resource persons then had to be given some training in organising their materials and making presentations at workshops. They become friends of the project, more able to respond to the needs of the communities, and were relatively more available for consultation at lower cost. Two such resource persons are those assisting with mushroom production, grass-cutter rearing and bee-keeping. They may not have certificates in these fields

but have practised and gained recognition and continue to derive livelihood from these activities which they are promoting. This makes their delivery real and adds credence to what they say.

#### 4.2.12 A resource centre for livelihood activities

The awareness creation programs on livelihood activities were done at CEDEP office premises whereas a better effect would be realised if this were done at the site where these livelihood activities were being run. A challenge foreseen for the next phase, which the plans have not addressed, is the need for a place where the livelihood activities to be taken up by the communities could be run on a pilot bases for them to consult. Can such a demonstration project run on its own, generating income from its activities to survive as well as sharing technology with communities? This is a question the CEDEP Sustainable Livelihoods Programme seeks to answer when it moves to its plot of land at Ampabame II ear marked for such a resource centre for promoting discussions on best sustainable livelihood practices.

### 4.3 Summary of Outputs

#### SOCIAL MOBILISATION

- Research Collaborators
- District Assembly Staffs
- Sector Departments
- Unit Committees
- Chiefs and Elders
- Community Level Facilitators
- Community-Based Groups
- Community Members
- Non-Governmental Organisations
- Projects
- Trade Associations

#### AWARENESS CREATION

- Community Forums
- Forum for Traditional Authorities
- District Level Hearing (emphasis on communities)
- District Level Hearing (emphasis on District Assemblies)
- Workshops for CLFs
- Workshops on Mushroom Production and Beekeeping
- Pilot Projects on Mushroom and Beekeeping in the Communities
- Reports on Project Activities
- Distribution of Literature on Peri-Urban Interface (Tale of Two Cities, Environmental Leaflets and manuals from DPU, UCL)

#### PLAN FORMULATION PROCESS

- i. Create awareness on peri-urban issues
- ii. Select community CLFs
- iii. Build a team with CLFs and Project Staff and researchers
- iv. Agree on a method
  - Get the communities' perception on poverty
  - Get the natural resource profile of the community
  - Identify problems causes and effects (use a tree)
  - Develop objectives (ends and means)
  - Group problems into development themes
  - Facilitate the preparation of a logical framework
  - Harmonise the plans
- v. Give communities a hearing of the plans
- vi. Give the district stakeholders a hearing of the plans
- vii. Prepare proposals for implementing plans

#### PLANS FORMULATED

1. An Action Plan for implementing Non –Farm Natural Resource-Based Livelihood Activities
2. An Action Plan for Implementing Farm-Based Livelihood Activities
3. An Action Plan for Processing Products of Farm-based and Non-farm Livelihood Activities Above

#### OUTCOMES TO BE PURSUED

The project postponed the preparation of simple do-it-yourself manuals to the plan implementation phase, where communities would be engaged in the livelihood activities and so can contribute their experiences, to make the manuals user friendly.

An outcome of awareness creation in the 12 participating communities are mushroom production projects being run in 5 communities, beekeeping projects in 5 communities and a mushroom production project in one community. These projects are being run by the CLFs, like a drop in a pool of water, we expect that each project will have a rippling effect, spreading to other members in the communities and to other communities near-by. The project, which will implement the plans prepared, can observe the impact of each of these projects on the communities.

The communities mobilised and the numerous stakeholders are waiting to see if this project will be different from numerous others, which ended with talk.

## 5 ACTIVITIES

### 5.1 Social Mobilisation

Human beings and the groups in which they operate are very crucial to any decisions made concerning natural resources in any location. These two forms of capitals were captured in the sustainable livelihood framework of DFID (*Brook and Davila 2000, 168*), (*DPU 2001, 8*), and (*Wedgwood and Tetley 2002, 4*)<sup>8</sup>, which is also the framework used for the plan preparation. It involved looking for the support of community members, community-based institutions, those outside the community whose decisions can affect the communities and looking for those with the necessary expertise to help run the project smoothly. CEDEP's role therefore has been to build an alliance with academia, to bridge the gap between researchers and the communities, in favour of the poor in the peri-urban interface who continue to feel the brunt of urbanisation.

The project started well by re-entering the communities, to reshape their expectations, build trust and re-establish their support for the project, which has waned because of the long period of research. Once the support of the communities was guaranteed through the election and submission of three community representatives for use as Community Level Facilitators (CLFs) the project was ready to take off. In selecting the CLFs, the communities were asked to look for someone who could fairly read and write, who is permanently resident in the community and who the community supports. Some communities did elect their representatives democratically; others were just named by the chief. Before the communities could be re-entered, chiefs and unit committees, as gatekeepers, had to give their approval. District Chief Executives, District Planning Officers and Directors of Agriculture, Forestry and Education sector departments were also mobilised. Sand and stone winners, small-scale carpenters association, and saw-millers association, were also mobilised. In another category, NGOs and projects like Ghana Organic Agricultural Network (GOAN), Kumasi Institute of Tropical Agriculture (KITA), the Village Infrastructure Projects (VIP) were also mobilised. See appendix ii for details on mobilised relationships.

Gatekeepers of twelve communities (including the chiefs, queen-mothers elders and Unit committee members) out of fifteen entered approved the project by co-operating in organising the first community forums. This shows the extent to which the decision of one or two leaders in the community can positively or negatively affect the community. The remaining three communities were not responsive and the re-entry was not achieved. It was hoped that implementation of plans would serve as demonstration for these and other communities to sit up and participate in KPUI NRM activities.

#### 5.1.1 Principal/ Research Collaborators

When preparing this project's Terms of Reference, the NRSP management emphasised the need to build upon the substantial research base compiled by a suite of other NRSP projects in undertaking the preparation of NR livelihoods plans. The baseline had been established by R6799, Kumasi Natural Resources Management Project, completed in early 2000. Liaison with several projects under way at the time was required:

- R7330, Peri-Urban Natural Resources Management at the Watershed Level, Kumasi, Ghana – a project arising out of R6799 and addressing the potential of community-level action to

---

<sup>8</sup> Wedgwood H. and Tetley J. (2002) 'Ghana Rural Livelihoods Programme' DFID, 14 Seventh Avenue Extension, North ridge P.O. Box 296, Accra- Ghana

improve their local environmental quality in co-management with relevant NGOs and statutory institutions.

- R7854, Further knowledge of livelihoods affected by the urban transition in Kumasi
- R7132, Informal Irrigation on the Kumasi Peri-urban Interface

In these regards, collaboration was built into the NaRMSIP design at the following levels:

- External Collaborator: Prof. David Simon (Royal Holloway, University of London), one of the R7330 researchers, was appointed on account of his relevant local experience and access to international literature and ability to provide lessons of experience elsewhere;
- Local Collaborator: Dr. James Quashie-Sam, joint Kumasi Co-ordinator of R7330, is one of the local collaborators, combining that experience with expertise in agroforestry;
- Research Staff: Mr. Bright Asare Boadi of CEDEP, a key community level facilitator in R7330, has been retained on NaRMSIP with complementary responsibilities. Mrs. Vesta Adu-Gyamfi (College of Art) has also worked on both projects, while Mrs. Olivia Agbenyega and Mr. Oppong Nkrumah have previous experience on R6799 and have attended R7330 workshops.

The project engaged two more researchers from institutions with the relevant expertise, to buttress the efforts of those mentioned above. Although they were dealt with in their private capacities, they came from the Planning and Chemistry Departments of the KNUST.

#### 5.1.2 Junior Researchers

Junior researchers were probably one of the most important human resource the project had, taking the opportunity arising from the proximity to the Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology. At a minimal cost, the junior researchers who were mobilised by the collaborators could be trained and sent out for assignments. They were motivated because they had the opportunity to practice some of the things they studied at the University, also because they had free access to CEDEPs skill in participatory methodology, and finally because they earned some income from it. The junior researchers together with some staff of CEDEP formed teams and visited communities to carry out assignments. The presence of such teams in more communities at a time made it possible to give equal attention to all the communities at the same time. Although the first batch soon completed their national service and left, the second batch is still available and could be used for one or two more years.

#### 5.1.3 Collaborators from the District Assemblies and the General Public

CEDEP and collaborators jointly mobilised the following relationships whose role in the project was mainly to attend the hearing of plans and make inputs:

- The regional Minister of Ashanti Region and the Regional Planning Officer.
- The leadership of five district assemblies in the PUI. These include the District chief executives, the district Co-ordinating Directors, and the District Planning Officers.
- Traditional authorities and Unit Committees of 12 communities in the PUI,
- Twelve communities in the PUI who selected 3 CLFs each to represent them
- Staff of district assemblies and close to 20 other stake holders drawn from sector departments, industries, women groups, trade associations, the universities and NGOs were invited to two workshops for hearing and discussing plans prepared (*see appendix ii for a list of stakeholders*).

The Regional Minister, and the District Assemblies were briefed about the project and presented with background materials including the project proposal, the inception report, the 'tale of two cities' and posters on environmental management produced by the Development Planning Unit (DPU) of the University of London. The Regional Minister and the Kumasi Metropolitan Authority (KMA) Chief Executive, could not attend any of our functions, they were represented. Some District Chief Executives attended and participated fully in the workshops

#### 5.1.4 Traditional Authorities

These people include the chiefs, queen mothers and community elders who are crucial so far as community mobilisation is concerned. The traditional authorities and the Unit Committees together constitute the community gatekeepers and it is not possible to work without them. In communities where there was agreement between the unit committees and the traditional authorities, things moved very smoothly. Whichever party is contacted first looked for the other party.

The project organised a special workshop for traditional authorities. At this workshop, the chief, one elder and one queen mother from each community were invited participate in a one-day discussion of the project. It gave them the opportunity to carry out a trend analysis of the natural resources in their communities. Their attendance and participation in this exclusive workshop and subsequent stakeholders' workshops was overwhelming.

The Asantehene commands respect and power, and he could have assisted in raising resources for the next phase if his office were to be mobilised. Mobilising him however demands a lot of careful planning. Appendix II contains a list of all chiefs, queen mothers, and elders the project interacted with.

#### 5.1.5 Community Level Facilitators (CLFs)

The CLFs became the most important human/ social capital mobilised, which will continue to exist after R7995. Coming from different backgrounds, varied level of literacy, different ages, and different skills, they were picked by the communities through voting. The only criteria given them were the ability to read and write, and being resident in the community. *See Appendix ii* for the profile of the CLFs. After taking them through a series of training programmes, those with high assimilation rates have become very powerful, and a tool for developing the weak ones. One district chief executive in the last stakeholders' workshop made reference to the resistance posed by one community when he tried to impose some unit committee members on them. He said the community resisted him and insisted on electing their own Unit Committee members; finally he had to give up. He understood at that workshop why that happened, after having observed the performance of the CLFs, especially those from the community under reference.

#### 5.1.6 Community-Based Groups

The CLFs mobilised community-based groups, churches, rural banks and other community members. Representatives from community based groups played a major role in the plan formulation, serving as key informants. *See appendix V a.* for groups mobilised in every community. Later they facilitated the formulation of AP2 and AP3. The Churches were represented at the two district level workshops.

## 5.2 Awareness Creation

Awareness creation started at the workshop climaxing R7854 at which CEDEP joined other researchers to discuss research findings on the characteristics of the peri urban poor and the effects of urbanisation on peri-urban livelihood activities. At this workshop, CEDEP also presented the follow-up project, justifying the reason why CEDEP should implement the project. During the community re-entry a participatory rapid appraisal (PRA) exercise was performed to verify some of the previous findings. The findings of these exercises were shared together with the previous research findings at stakeholders' workshops creating further awareness on peri-urban issues. Specially designed workshops were also organised for focused groups and key informants to create awareness on peri-urban issues. Finally at public hearings, speeches by special guests, general discussions and display of photographs added to the above. For those who knew about KPUI and its NRM it was a refreshing exercise to revamp, but for the many who were lost in the objectives of the projects and the start of this new project it was a great and necessary awareness creation exercise. Awareness creation cuts across all activities associated with the operation of the plan preparation process. The meetings held among project staff and with collaborators provided the opportunity for cross-fertilising ideas and were useful for updating and refreshing the project facilitators.

### 5.2.1 Meetings of collaborators/staff

Collaborators met monthly on average to discuss progress of the project and to plan for future actions. Minutes of eight of such meetings can be found in *appendix vi*. Internally within CEDEP, several meetings were held with the directorate, administrative and finance staff to strategize for satisfying all parties of the project. Feedback from collaborators meetings was also given at these meetings to those who needed them. Meetings were also held with junior researchers where necessary to coach them on what to do on the field and to evaluate their work after executing assignments.

### 5.2.2 Preparatory programmes

Preparatory programmes often took the form of workshops and were done before every major engagement with the communities and the public. It started with training of junior researchers and staff of CEDEP for community entry. Then after community entry, an orientation programme was organised for the group of CLFs, which was an output of the community entry. Some of the training programmes lasted for at most five days and were non-residential. All programmes observed the principles of adult learning and participation, and ended with evaluation sessions.

### 5.2.3 Preparation of Awareness Creation materials

The collaborators and CEDEP prepared the following awareness creation materials. The collaborators and resource persons provided the technical information and CEDEP put them together.

- Extracts from the previous research
- A manual for plan preparation
- Manuals on the role of CLFs, facilitation and on participatory rapid appraisal tools

Contrary to what was said in the logical framework of the proposal, not all the researchers prepared the manuals as it was discussed that manual preparation was too early at the stage of plan preparation. Resource persons who were not necessarily researchers were assisted to prepare awareness creation materials. Three such awareness creation materials were prepared one each for beekeeping, mushroom production, and grasscutter rearing. Posters were also prepared for beekeeping and grass cutter rearing.

#### 5.2.4 Fieldwork

This consisted of activities carried out in the communities. They included initial scouting visits in preparation for the community entry, the community forum, plan preparation work, mid-term review visits, presentation of plans to communities, emergency visits to summon CLFs for meetings, and final feedback visits. To facilitate quick execution of some of the above activities, groups were often constituted with a well thought out blend of members with the relevant knowledge, skills and abilities. Only non-residential fieldwork was carried out even when more than a day was required.

After the fieldwork, information received was brought to CEDEP, where groups were allowed to present their findings. After such presentations, similarities and differences in findings were taken note of, and a harmonised result distilled out of the presentations. In case of the plans, the harmonised plan, together with the community plan, were presented to the communities during the community level hearing.

#### 5.2.5 Community Hearings

Community hearings were the first stage of the plan promulgation. These hearings provided the opportunity for community members to review plans prepared by their delegates, before presentation at a larger forum.

#### 5.2.6 District Level Hearing

After presenting the plans to the communities, the next in the process was to present them again to the general public and this was done by granting district level hearing in a one-day workshop. The purpose of the hearing was to provide other stakeholders the opportunity of knowing what was happening and to solicit their support. The first of these was organised on September 27, 2001 at Kokoado, a small community overlooking Lake Bosomtwi, close to Kuntanase the capital of Bosomtwi-Atwima-Kwanwoma District. The second was organised at La Vikus Hotel on February 21, 2002 in Kumasi.

At the district level hearings, participants were invited from all the major stakeholder institutions, including traditional authorities, district assemblies, sector departments, NGOs and the private sector- both groups and individuals, and individual community members. *See appendix iii* or the reports of how the project interacted with stakeholders in these workshops.

#### 5.2.7 Proposal Preparation

The plans presented at the district level were put together in the form of proposals and sent to the NRSP through the programme managers. At the request of the NRSP, the first plan was restructured to fit the format of a bidding document. The plans have been approved for implementation one after the other, between now and February 2005. The agreement reached with the managers of the NRSP makes room for implementing the three plans together in consonance with the NRSP cash flows.

### 5.3 RESEARCH ACTIVITIES

At the last workshop that climaxed R7854, which was held at Levin Hall, Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology, when the project facilitators proposed the investigation of

some issues before carrying out the plan preparation, the invited stakeholders were unanimous that the project should go straight into the plan preparation. In fact communities and some stakeholders even felt that the plans should not be prepared at all but we should go straight into implementation of actions. It was difficult to say which actions they wanted implemented anyway. Some researchers even warned that if the project goes into the communities to ask yet more questions, the communities would beat them up. The emphasis of the assignment was therefore not to go into further investigations but directly going into the facilitation of plan preparation. Despite this, because it is not possible to start plan preparation without investigating past trends and current situation with the communities, the project adopted a strategy, which still revealed some background information of the communities and their perceptions on wealth, natural resources, and effects of urbanisation on peri-urban communities, worth observing. The details of the above information can be found in appendix I c and Va.

## **6. CONTRIBUTION OF R7995 TO NRSP GOALS**

As stated in the programme logical framework, the goal of NRSP, which became the mission of R7995 is to improve the livelihoods of poor people through sustainably enhanced production and productivity of renewable natural resource (RNR) systems; in this case the peri-urban systems. This action is to be measured by changes in capabilities, assets and activities. Although this project spanned only nine months, it is possible to see some impacts that have been made from the earlier portions of this report, which will be summarised below:

### **6.1 Impact on capabilities**

Human beings and the groups in which they exist and operate remain undoubtedly the first point of call in implementing interventions on natural resource management. Literature has shown that on the peri urban interface, hindrances exist from the household through policy implementing institutions to the policy-making institutions. Urbanisation has adversely affected the extended family system and promoted individualism (Nunan 2001 H9)<sup>9</sup>. This individualism is already one of the reasons why of 15 communities 3 had to fall out. The communities, which fell out, are highly urbanised. Even among the 12 twelve mobilised communities more urbanised ones like Abrepo, Atafoa and Esreso continue to exhibit signs of lack of cohesion. Leadership development in favour of community action is therefore necessary and that was the first thing the project tackled at the community level by facilitating the election of CLFs and training them. CLFs from all 12 communities have become an institution about to be registered, which will spearhead community natural resource management issues. The next point of call is the traditional authorities that have also participated in the process and at several forums and workshops. Successful communities among the twelve like Maase, Ampabame II and Swedru have been meeting regularly to discuss issues. Football clubs have been established by some CLFs in the interest of the natural resource environment. By the time the footballers grow up to become adults they would have become environmentally conscious. In some communities, female and male teams were formed.

The communities, through their existing groups have been taken through plan preparation and they have acknowledged the importance of participatory action planning. Discussions have been promoted at the district level, bringing people from different disciplines to discuss issues. Communities have therefore been empowered to voice out their views and room has been made for them to do this. Through these discussions, members of parliament have been attracted to the project and the one from Kwabre District has asked for a proposal to enable more communities to

---

<sup>9</sup> Nunan, F. S (2001) Further Knowledge of Urban livelihoods Affected by Urban Transition, Kumasi, Ghana. Final Technical report, Natural Resource Institute, IDD School of Public Policy, University of Birmingham, Birmingham B15 2TT

benefit from the project. The CLFs from Kwabre, if the proposal is accepted will be promoted to district level facilitators (DLFs).

Government institutions are also handicapped in several areas including shortcomings in the decentralisation process, biased commitment of government appointees towards government than the public, delays in budgets, lack of public participation in planning, ignorance or feigned ignorance of plans to mention a few *Adakwa (2001 188-192)*<sup>10</sup>. The operation of these institutions, as against the operation of volunteers like the CLFs, in the development of the KPUI would be studied during the implementation of action plans.

Interventions for implementing natural resource management strategies in the peri-urban interface require capabilities in the use of appropriate/relevant technology. The technologies required have been identified as those necessary for recycling waste, those for optimising the use of natural resources and those for processing products from natural resource-based livelihood activities. Selected community members were taught how to undertake two such livelihood activities. Livelihood activity experts at the community level were also assisted to be able to transfer their skills easily to interested community members.

## 6.2 Impact on Capital Assets

The project explained the sustainable livelihood framework of the Dfid to all the communities. This raised their awareness on the five capital assets available, and challenged them explore all of them for opportunities. This was done to make sure that communities mobilise resources from all possible sources to buttress what will be made available by NRSP. This was necessary because of emphasis on research, which limits what goes directly to the communities. The following assets have been looked at

**Natural capital:** Communities have been psyched up not to look down on any natural resource, even grass because of their importance in building assets. They also understand that their business plans stand a higher chance of being selected if they demonstrated the sustainable utilisation of natural resources. Apart from land, there are other natural resources available for the poor to access. One is free, for instance, to harvest straw anywhere whether one is a stranger or an indigene. Bamboos may be cut but permission would have to be obtained from the landowner if larger quantities are required. One can almost fish in any stream if not over polluted without obtaining permission from anybody although the law requires that one should obtain a licence to fish or hunt. Unlike in the olden days in the rural areas where one has to give a portion of game hunted to an elder, people hunt any type of wildlife at any time without paying anything to anybody, disregarding the hunting laws. Recently the game and wildlife society has stepped up their education campaigns, educating the public to observe the game and wild life laws, some of which ban hunting during certain periods of the year.

**Human Capital:** This is the most promising resource as some communities have started making headway by involving their members of parliament. The Member of Parliament from Kwabre has expressed interest in sponsoring about 30 individuals in the Kwabre District, to undertake livelihood activities of R7995 plans. The project encouraged the use of practical resource persons from resource persons that were raised. The CLFs have become the central point for spreading mushroom production and beekeeping. Some women in one community have started collecting snails; three men in another community have used their own resources to dig trenches for

---

<sup>10</sup> Adakwa K. K. and Post J. (2001) 'The fate of the tree; planning and managing the development of Kumasi, Ghana' Woeli Publishing Services, Accra, P.O. Box NT 601, Accra Newtown, Ghana

fattening snails. All these people could be used in further spreading the skills involved to other people.

**Social Capital:** Individuals in communities and the groups in which they exist are also every important. Communities have seen the potential of membership of groups as collateral for taking loans from some non-financial banking institutions. The already existing groups were used in formulating the plans as each group sent one or two representatives to join the plan preparation. Most of these groups are not registered, an issue to be considered the next phase. Women's groups work very well in Ghana better than all the other types of groups. Women are therefore more likely to be able to mobilise themselves into groups and so benefit more from this capital to reduce their vulnerabilities and handicaps in getting access to the other capital assets.

**Physical Capital:** Most communities have motorable roads linking them to Kumasi. Some roads especially the Adagya and Asaago roads are very bad. Apatrapa, Kyerekrom, Esreso, and Abrepo have telephone services. All communities are within the mobile phone coverage area. Only Swedru and Ampabame II the farthest communities from Kumasi are not on the national electricity grid. Water is a problem in all communities except Atafua and Abrepo. All communities have primary and junior secondary schools. The understanding was that they could take advantage of these assets to improve their living standards.

**Financial Capital:** Susu collection goes on in almost all the communities. The Susu collectors operate with the rural banks, sending their daily collections to the nearest rural banks. Moneylenders operate some of the communities but it is possible to take a soft loan from a friend when the need arises. The project would also make about a thousand Pounds (£1000) available in every community for use as start-up capital, or for pushing projects. Communities have been encouraged to look critically and not let any of these opportunities pass by. The project is also making every effort to tap from the various projects available at the district assemblies, to tap resources for the benefit of the communities.

The communities now understand that whatever the project brings should not be looked at only in terms of money but in terms of all the five capitals. Are groups being formed? Are the traditional authorities and government employees putting their services at the disposal of the poor? Are benefits derived from natural resources being enhanced sustainably and equitably distributed? Is everybody learning something and sharing experiences with the rest? Are government facilities being utilised to the maximum? Are people in influential positions being mobilised to help the poor? Has everybody got equal access to the project's financial resources?

If these things are happening, then the project implementation is benefiting the communities, and they would not complain about the research.

### **6.3 Impact on Activities**

The focus of R7995 plans was on livelihood activities. These activities were carefully selected to respond to the findings of the peri-urban research activities. Firstly to address the diminishing spate of natural resources especially land, secondly how to increase the productivity and sustainability of traditional livelihood activities and finally to add value to products.

Farmers have expressed interest in traditional activities like maize and cassava production. Most farmers spoken to have not thought carefully about the kind of assistance they were looking for and how they were going to repay. The project has emphasised the need for careful planning, carrying out a very careful input and output analysis, which would be convincing enough that the applicant can repay money taken and still earn a bit of profit.

At the tail end of the project, farmers and the CLFs have been made aware of livelihood activities that make use entirely of residual inputs of time and raw materials, need very little financial push, but which brings benefits to the owner, and the entire community including the poor. An example was given of planting acacia trees on residual plots. This starts with nursing acacia seeds, which would make use of disposed polythene bags, freeing the environment of polythene. Some of these seedlings may be sold for cash and the left over planted on residual land. The trees will grow to filter the air in the community, making it rich in oxygen; the poor can pick dried fallen branches for firewood. The branches and undergrowth would provide shelter for birds, other wildlife and maybe beehives. The negative sides were not overlooked, as these areas may become brooding grounds for dangerous reptiles. The positive sides, however, outweigh the negatives and communities are still considering such livelihood activities, which can be done leisurely, along side full time activities. Tree-planting demonstrations for this purpose and for shade production formed an important element of the final phase of R7330. The CLFs from R7995 were mobilised to assist in the final phase of planting and care, thereby both gaining useful experience in leading community management and raising their profiles and standing within the communities concerned.

#### **6.4 Impact on/of Collaborators**

The word collaborator according to friends of CEDEP from UK, carries with it bad memories of the first and second world wars when some countries joined other countries to fight the British and their allies. Collaborator in this sense is a positive requirement of the NRSP in an attempt to tap from previous findings and relationships.

The external collaborator made contributions in the following ways:

- Contributed to the Project Memorandum and subsequent amendment to the logframe in the light of NRSP feedback;
- Participated in Collaborators' Meetings on two visits to Kumasi;
- Provided written contributions and comments on documents at various stages of the project, including the MTR and FTR, covering policy, implementational and administrative issues;
- Supplied relevant project documents, conference papers, articles and books from the international literature;
- Provided inputs on best practice in relation to participatory methods, community institutional issues and the like;
- Visited four communities – two of which are also R7330 study villages – with project staff in January 2002;

Local collaborators in addition to what is bulleted above took part in most of the activities and they all agreed that the project provided the opportunity for them to observe each other at work and has set the pace for more of such collaborative work in Future. Innovations like the selection of CLFs, giving feedback to the communities and in-house training for project staff and junior researchers have been demonstrated as feasible. The easy access to communities resulting from the participation of CLFs, which led to many activities and stronger involvement at the community level, has also impressed the collaborators.

Suggestions given by research collaborators were useful. Anytime these suggestions were carried out, the outcomes were applauded. At the community re-entry for instance, the collaborators suggested that re-entry should start from the community level before it comes to the district level. This was observed and it strengthened the work at the community level. Following lessons learnt from the participation of collaborators in programmes; a clear difference has been established

between collaborators as part of the project steering group and collaborators as part of the project implementation.

Some collaborators have picked up issues attracting research interest for further investigation. Examples include the effect of urbanisation on peri-urban livelihood changes; Sustaining decaying peri-urban communities; and rural communication methods in effective community development. Students of the planning department are investigating some of these issues as part of their final year project work. Others are using skills picked up when they participated in the project activities in their work; teaching and research.

### **6.5 Impact on/of Research Partners**

R7995 has demonstrated that it is possible for a private, voluntary, overseas (Ghanaian) NGO, to develop a project proposal in collaboration with NRSP consultants, and manage a project from Ghana. These feats have not been without hitches but the project has provided an invaluable learning experience to both CEDEP and the HTS who are managing the NRSP, and the NRSP itself. The problem areas have been in timely submission of reports, which arose mainly because participatory processes take time and the timing is not easily predictable, especially for stronger involvement of communities. The project was scheduled to end in January 2002 but ended officially in March, with the final technical report being submitted in May.

### **7. Key Words:**

Community management; knowledge; land tenure; livelihood strategies; natural resource management; participatory research; planning strategies; poverty; stakeholders

### **8. Project Logframe:**

*DFID R7995: NaRMSIP for Kumasi PUI  
Final Technical Report*

<b>Narrative Summary</b>	<b>Objectively Verifiable Indicators</b>	<b>Means of Verification</b>	<b>Important Assumptions</b>
<b>GOAL</b>			
Benefits for poor people in Kumasi PUI generated by application of knowledge generated in the previous peri-urban interface research.	By mid-2001 in Kumasi city-region, key stakeholders (including at least two target institutions) regularly participating in the formulation of plans of action for at least two aspects of natural resources management for peri-urban areas, which will benefit the poor. By 2002 appropriate strategy options created for the Kumasi city-region.	Reviews by programme Manager.  Reports of research team and collaborating/target institutes. Appropriate dissemination products	Institutional collaboration obtained Target beneficiaries adopt and use strategies and practices. Enabling environment exists. Budgets and programmes of target institutions are sufficient and well managed
<b>PURPOSE</b>			
1. Plans of action to implement natural resources management strategies for peri-urban areas, which benefit the poor, formulated through extended interaction with principal stakeholders.	By project end, at least 5 principal stakeholders or actors in action planning processes that intend to benefit the poor.  At least 3 plans of action proposed for improved peri-urban natural resources management that benefit the poor; the first by end of July, Second by end of October and third by end of January 2002.	Launching of the project proposed by communities in February 2002  Community based project management committees  Review by NRSP Project Manager	Target communities accept project, adopt and use practices emanating from discussions  Enabling environments exist  Budget and programme sufficient and well managed.
2. Understanding enhanced of participatory action planning processes for peri-urban natural resource management that benefit the poor	By project end, understanding by research team of participatory processes for action planning improved.	Final technical report	
<b>OUTPUTS</b>			
1. Participatory processes instituted for planning action to implement natural resources management strategies for peri-urban areas which benefit the poor	By end of May, 2001 at least 3 research institutions of the KNUST, 3 district and sub district institutions, and the relevant wings of the district assemblies contacted and their willingness to are participate expressed  By end of May, 2001 Research institutions have developed manuals and fact sheets and user friendly materials on at least two strategies each	Project activity reports Training manuals Letters of willingness to participate Awareness creation and planning workshops Minutes of team meetings	Community and stakeholders and schools groups willing and able to participate  Stakeholders consider participation worth while Collaborative & accountable co-management established.  Personal, political and institutional interests balanced by needs/priorities of poor
2. Participatory planning processes operated for planning action to implement natural resources management strategies for peri-urban areas, which benefit the poor.	Livelihoods of the poor identified and interest groups formed around them 1 <sup>st</sup> plan end July 2 <sup>nd</sup> plan end October 3 <sup>rd</sup> plan end January  By 31/01/02 Plans of action for implementing selected natural resource management strategies developed  Dialogue between urban resource management structures and peri-urban structures	Evidence of whipped up interest of the poor reflected in participation at meetings  List of interest groups and attendance at meetings	Poor people agree priorities & participate. PUI communities agree to prioritise poor.  The poor are able to assert/defend their interests.

*DFID R7995: NaRMSIP for Kumasi PUI  
Final Technical Report*

<b>OUTPUTS continued</b>			
3. New knowledge produced from the experiences of instituting and operating participatory processes for action planning in outputs 1 and 2 above	By 2002 the external collaborator would have visited, and observed at least 2 field activities  Project steering committee and research team would have met to review the processes and planned forward at least 6 times each  New knowledge shared at 2 workshops	Project reports Training manuals Video documentary Written documentation Observation reports	
<b>ACTIVITIES</b>			
Social Mobilisation (Preparation of 1 <sup>st</sup> Plan)  Visiting of district and sub district Institutions in the PUI  Re-entering communities	Communities, Research team, Collaborators mobilised by 31/05/01	Reports List of mobilised communities	
Awareness creation on PU issues (Preparation of 1 <sup>st</sup> Plan) Preparation of materials  Facilitation and PRA training for CLFs  Awareness creation workshops for CLFs  Awareness creation in the communities	CLFs, Stakeholders, and target communities for 1 <sup>st</sup> plan are aware of issues and strategies by 31/06/01	Manuals and fact sheets Reports for training of CLFs Reports on work in the communities	
Action Planning (Preparation of 1 <sup>st</sup> Plan)  Plan preparation workshops for CLFs  Plan preparation in the communities	1 <sup>st</sup> plan ready by 30/07/01	Plans and proposals prepared by the community	
Social Mobilisation (Preparation of 2 <sup>nd</sup> Plan)  <i>(Repeat activities as for 1<sup>st</sup> plan above)</i>	Communities revisited, interests renewed, and facilitators ready by 31/08/01	Reports List of mobilised communities	
Awareness creation on PU issues (Preparation of 2 <sup>nd</sup> Plan)  <i>(Repeat activities as for 1<sup>st</sup> plan above)</i>	Materials used for 2 <sup>nd</sup> plan revised by 31/07/01 and CLFs, Stakeholders, and target communities for 2 <sup>nd</sup> plan are aware of issues and strategies by 31/09/01	Manuals and fact sheets Reports for training of CLFs Reports on work in the communities	
Action Planning (Preparation of 2 <sup>nd</sup> Plan)  <i>(Repeat activities as for 1<sup>st</sup> plan above)</i>	2 <sup>nd</sup> plan ready by 30/10/01	Plans and proposals prepared by the community	
Social Mobilisation (Preparation of 3 <sup>rd</sup> Plan)  <i>(Repeat activities as for 1<sup>st</sup> plan above)</i>	Communities revisited, interests renewed, and facilitators ready by 31/11/01	Reports List of mobilised communities	
Awareness creation on PU issues (Preparation of 3 <sup>rd</sup> Plan)  <i>(Repeat activities as for 1<sup>st</sup> plan above)</i>	Materials used for 3 <sup>rd</sup> plan revised by 30/11/01 and CLFs, Stakeholders, and target communities for 1 <sup>st</sup> are aware of issues and strategies by 30/12/01	Manuals and fact sheets Reports for training of CLFs Reports on work in the communities	
Action Planning (Preparation of 3 <sup>rd</sup> Plan)  <i>(Repeat activities as for 1<sup>st</sup> plan above)</i>	3 <sup>rd</sup> plan ready by 31/01/02	Plans and proposals prepared by the community	

## **APPENDICES**

***Appendix i About the KPUI and NaRMSIP Communities***

***Appendix ii Mobilised Relationships***

***Appendix iii Interaction with Stakeholders***

***Appendix iv The Plans***

***Appendix v Some Insights from Literature by Collaborators***