



## Final Report to IDRC: Urban Poverty and Environment (UPE) - External



Patricia McCarney

Riadh Tappuni

Axel Drescher

December 9, 2008



## Table of Contents

PART ONE: OBJECTIVES OF THE REVIEW .....	3
I    INTRODUCTION .....	3
II   BACKGROUND PREPARATION .....	4
PART TWO: METHODOLOGY .....	5
I    DESIGN, METHODS AND PROCESS FOLLOWED .....	5
II   DATA SOURCES AND FIELD WORK UNDERTAKEN .....	6
PART THREE: FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS .....	7
A    ON UPE OBJECTIVES .....	7
I    EFFECTIVENESS IN ACHIEVING OBJECTIVES .....	7
II   CLEAR AND COHERENT STRATEGY .....	10
III  EVOLUTION IN PROGRAM OBJECTIVES .....	12
IV   RISK IDENTIFICATION, MITIGATION AND MANAGEMENT .....	13
B    ON UPE RESULTS .....	14
I    DOCUMENTATION .....	14
II   INFLUENCE OF OUTPUTS .....	17
III  PARTICIPATORY PRACTICES AND STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT .....	19
IV   NICHE .....	20
V    RESEARCH CAPACITIES .....	20
PART FOUR: RECOMMENDATIONS AND ISSUES FOR IDRC CONSIDERATION ON THE FUTURE WORK OF UPE .....	21
I    RISK .....	22
II   PARTICIPATION, STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT AND OWNERSHIP ISSUES .....	24
III  LOCAL COMMUNITY INCLUSION, ADVOCACY, INFORMATION DISSEMINATION .....	25
IV   VISIBILITY, LOCAL INFLUENCE AND GLOBAL REACH .....	25
V    POST PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION MECHANISM .....	26
VI   COOPERATION WITH INTERNATIONAL PARTNERS AND BUILDING EXTERNAL FUNDING .....	26
VII  THEMATIC COVERAGE AND THEMATIC NICHE FOR UPE .....	27
ENDNOTES .....	29
APPENDICES .....	
1. List of Projects Evaluated through Site Visits (May and June 2008) .....	29
2. List of Research Partners Interviewed on Site .....	31
3. Sample Interview Questions Used .....	38
4. Desk Review of Projects .....	42
5. List of Participants in Focus City Ottawa Learning Forum .....	43
6. Thematic Distribution of UPE projects .....	46
7. Biographies of the reviewers .....	49
8. List of Documents Consulted .....	51
9. List of UPE team members interviewed .....	59
10. Photos from the Projects .....	60
11. List of Acronyms .....	65

## **PART ONE: OBJECTIVES OF THIS REVIEW**

### **I INTRODUCTION**

As provided in the terms of reference, this External Review focuses on two aspects of the Urban Poverty and Environment Program:

1. the extent to which the program is meeting its objectives; and,
2. the results and effectiveness of the Program.

This Report is written with a view to promoting dialogue about program effectiveness and to inform decisions about current and future programming. The Reviewers are conscious of the fact that while we might provide information on specific research themes or issues, our primary concern here is how UPE can support development research more effectively.

The Objectives of this Review as defined in the Scope of Work for the External review of IDRC Programs are as follows:

#### **ON UPE OBJECTIVES --**

1. To describe and assess the extent to which the UPE Program is meeting its objectives as set out in the UPE Prospectus
2. To assess how risks to the achievement of the program objectives were identified and the effectiveness of the risk mitigation strategies put in place to support progress towards meeting the UPE objectives
3. To identify any evolution in program objectives and/or interpretation of program objectives, and any adaptations that the Program is making to changing contexts, opportunities and constraints

#### **ON UPE RESULTS --**

4. To document the UPE Program's outputs (including research reports, publications, websites, electronic lists, conferences, workshops and their proceedings, videos, etc.)
5. To comment on the quality of this output ((consideration of their scientific merit in relation to the relevant disciplines, their relevance to the intended audience and users and to their stakeholders and to their objectives
6. To analyze the influence of these results and the UPE Program's reach (the effectiveness of the Program at promoting the dissemination, communication and utilization of research findings; the contribution of the Program to influencing policy; the contribution of the program to building or strengthening capacities of researchers, organizations, research users, and institutions; the influence on technology development; influence on shaping relationships among project partners and stakeholders, researchers and networks; impact on changes in environmental conditions, state of urban poverty, etc.; impacts on increasing understanding of gendered perspectives in the field)
7. To analyze the Program's findings on the research questions and key themes as defined in the UPE Prospectus
8. To assess the quality of these research findings and their contributions to international, policy and academic debates, discourse, understanding.
9. To comment on whether the UPE Program occupies a niche in the urban field

#### **ON RECOMMENDATIONS --**

10. To provide key recommendations of the support of research for development
11. To provide recommendations on issues for IDRC to consider for this UPE Program

## II BACKGROUND PREPARATION

This Final Report for the External Review of the IDRC Urban Poverty and Environment UPE Program was submitted in draft on September 4th 2008 and is submitted November 19<sup>th</sup>, 2008 following comments received from the Evaluation Unit.

By way of background preparation, a number of steps in the evaluation process have been followed. During the initial Design and Planning Phase, the UPE Evaluation Team attended the Ottawa Workshop and undertook a preliminary review of the IDRC and UPE documentation.

Also, over the past six months as part of this external evaluation exercise, this UPE external review team prepared a number of reports. The UPE External Review Team received feedback on each of these reports, usually from both the UPE Program staff and the Evaluation Unit.

The first of these was the *Workplan* that was submitted to the Evaluation Unit on March 7<sup>th</sup> 2008. Following approval of the *Workplan*, the UPR External Review Team then undertook travel itinerary planning in cooperation with the IDRC Grants Administration and IDRC's travel agency, researched background information on the projects to be visited, prepared project desk reviews, prepared survey questions for multiple stakeholder groups, and then undertook site visits.

The UPE External Review Team visited nineteen projects in eight countries including Kenya, Uganda, Ghana, Indonesia, Sri Lanka, Argentina, Peru, and Jordan. These projects are listed in Appendix 1. IDRC international partners were also visited at FAO in Rome and UN-HABITAT in Nairobi. A representative of the WHO regional office in Amman was also interviewed.

Approximately 190 people were interviewed as part of this external review, the majority being conducted with IDRC's research partners, including researchers, government and community leaders. The list of research partners interviewed is presented in Appendix 2. The sample interview questions are provided in Appendix 3. The review of a sample of projects (both RPs and RSPs) through desk research was also completed during July and August and is detailed in Appendix 4.

Also as part of this external review process, the External Evaluators attended the Focus Cities Workshop in Ottawa, June 18-20, 2008. In addition to all FC interviews on site during travel to Colombo, Kampala, Lima and Moreno, interviews (and follow-up interviews) were also completed in Ottawa with the following Focus City teams: Ariana Soukra (Tunisia team); Cochabamba (Bolivia team); Lima (Peru team); Dakar (Senegal team); and Jakarta (Indonesia team). The list of participants at the FC Ottawa meetings that we had the opportunity to meet with both in the form of formal interviews and informal discussions is contained in Appendix 5.

Interviews with UPE Program Officers and staff have also been conducted while in Ottawa on June 20<sup>th</sup>.

A *Progress Report* was filed on June 30<sup>th</sup> 2008. The review of a sample of projects (both RPs and RSPs) through desk research was completed during July and August. Conference calls were conducted across the team members during August as well as with the Evaluation Unit during the final drafting stages of this *Final Report*.

## **PART TWO: METHODOLOGY**

### **I DESIGN, METHODS AND PROCESS FOLLOWED**

In order to address the objectives in the Review, the approach of the UPE Review Team aimed to:

- (a) Achieve an appropriate balance between breadth and depth in the review, considering desk-review, interviews and in-depth project reviews including project visits, in a balanced way.
- (b) Address within the in-depth studies not only individual projects but also key program themes and strategies that flow from UPE's objectives so as to determine how the program as a whole is performing.
- (c) In consultation with the UPE Program Team and the Evaluation Unit, select and undertake a number of in-depth project reviews that cut across the themes of the UPE Program, including, urban agriculture, urban water and sanitation, waste management, and vulnerabilities to natural disasters, with land tenure as a cross-cutting issue and that also cut across the four key geographic regions in which UPE works (Latin America, Middle East and North Africa, Asia and Sub Saharan Africa).
- (d) Understand the evolution of the UPE and assess its evolution and growth as a new program in IDRC, in particular its evolution and re-focusing strategy to date and the evolution in the program's objectives.
- (e) Examine the current corporate, strategic and global factors influencing the development of the UPE.
- (f) Assess the overall project portfolio in terms of thematic distribution, geographic coverage, purpose, and evolution as set out in the UPE aims and objectives.
- (g) Identify results of the program, including outputs (including research reports, publications, websites, electronic lists, conferences, workshops and their proceedings, videos, etc.), networking successes, capacity building and policy influence, substantive research findings and conclusions on the core UPE themes being addressed.
- (h) Assess the quality of these results, their scientific merit, and their contributions to international, policy and academic debates, discourse and understanding through a review of publications (both peer reviewed and non-peer reviewed), communication products used for dissemination of findings and experience, conference presentations and strategic international partnerships.
- (i) Assess the effect the UPE projects are having on the environments and livelihoods of targeted beneficiary communities.
- (j) Examine the extent by which UPE projects and project formulation are benefiting from feedback from the field and mechanisms used for that, including post implementation evaluation.
- (k) Assess the effectiveness of participatory practices used in the formulation and implementation of projects.
- (l) Assess the extent to which the Focus Cities Research Initiative is achieving the intended outcomes and how these large projects are helping to define the new UPE Program and re-define its evolution from past programming.
- (m) Comment on the significance of the UPE Program within the urban field in the context of international development.

## II DATA SOURCES AND FIELD WORK UNDERTAKEN

Data is drawn from multiple sources for this review including:

1. review of documentation from the UPE Program
2. interviews with program team leaders and program members and senior managers
3. interviews with a sample of project leaders through site visits to projects
4. interviews with other program stakeholders such as government and community leaders as well as IDRC's funding partners
5. in-depth review of a sample of projects (both RPs and RSPs) through both site visits (19 in total) and desk research (23 in total) and review of related project documents including PAD, progress and final reports, trip reports, PCRs, evaluations, publications as well as interviews with relevant program staff, as well as field visits and interviews with project researchers, and those expected to be influenced by the project

The selection of projects for in-depth review was stratified, covering a range of projects geographically, by significance in size, and by theme and by type.

### UPE Project Review

There are 60 projects in total in the UPE Program approved after April 1<sup>st</sup>, 2005. In consultation with the UPE Program Team and the Evaluation Unit, a selection of projects was made that allowed for in-depth project reviews. This selection included 19 projects that were included in the program of site visits by the reviewers. Another 23 projects were desk reviewed.

In all, the UPE Review team examined 70 per cent of the UPE projects that were approved since April 1<sup>st</sup>, 2005.

These projects were all selected so as to cut across the themes of the UPE Program, including, urban agriculture, urban water and sanitation, waste management, and vulnerabilities to natural disasters, with land tenure as a cross-cutting issue and so as to also cut across the four key geographic regions in which UPE works (Latin America, Middle East and North Africa, Asia and Sub Saharan Africa).

### Interviews

Interviews were conducted with UPE Program team leaders and program members and senior managers; with a sample of project leaders through site visits to projects; and with other program stakeholders such as government and community leaders as well as IDRC's funding partners. In all, interviews and discussions were held with 190 people.

The UPE documentation review was in large part facilitated by the reviewers' access to Livelink and IDRC's intranet. The documents reviewed include a range of documents including the corporate and program area documentation, in particular the UPE Prospectus report; project documents including PAD, progress and final reports, trip reports, PCRs, evaluations and final publications; lists of UPE projects and research support projects, focus cities reports; the list of UPE staff and their biographies to better understand their disciplinary and professional interests; a sampling of project outputs, other evaluation reports (ex RUAF external evaluation report); and staff trip reports and correspondence on projects; and any previous external review reports.

## PART THREE: FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS<sup>1</sup>

### A ON UPE OBJECTIVES

The objectives of the Urban Poverty and Environment Programme are identified in its prospectus and are stated as follows:

“The **specific objectives** are to support research, capacity building, and networking that help poor urban communities partner with local and national governments, the private sector and other relevant stakeholders to:

1. understand the nature of environmental burdens and constrained use of natural resources, investigate their impact on poverty, and identify potential solutions;
2. test interventions and assess policies in low-income urban neighbourhoods that seek to ease environmental burdens and enhance the use of natural resources for food, water, and income security; and
3. contribute to the integrated planning, development, and implementation of sustainable and equitable urban environmental and natural resources practices and policies.”

(Urban Poverty and Environment Proposed Prospectus 2005-2010, page v)

Building on the fact that the UPE program demonstrates a high level of homogeneity in how it performs in achieving its objectives through its projects, and also in light of the observation that the UPE projects have substantial similarities in being highly grounded, action oriented, and aimed at reaching communities directly, the review teams’ strategy was to adopt a bottom up approach by assessing outcomes as seen from the ground up. While the objectives identified in the UPE Prospectus were clearly formulated within firm research frameworks, the program tends to employ an “action research” orientation in its projects, with solid linkages to development. It was thus considered important to identify and use assessment criteria that are field-responsive and that would reconcile the two. The reviewers also considered it commensurate with the UPE field orientation to include whenever appropriate, more explicit descriptions and examples from the field. These are demonstrations of project outcomes that we see contributing to achievement of objectives.

Among other issues, the reviewers considered successes in building capacities, policy influence, contributions to technology development, environmental improvement, community strengthening, tenure security and disaster vulnerability. With the absence of performance indicators and available assessments this review adopted a simple assessment method by number of projects achieving each of these components.<sup>2</sup>

The following assessment results from evidence taken from field visits, interviews and reviews of UPE outputs, activities and modalities. This evidence is compiled largely from 19 projects that were all visited on site by the reviewers, another 23 projects that were desk reviewed, and notes from interviews and discussions that were held with 190 people and based upon pre-designed questionnaire formats (Appendix 3).

### EFFECTIVENESS IN ACHIEVING OBJECTIVES<sup>3</sup>

The first of the UPE objectives, to understand the nature of environmental burdens and constrained use of natural resources, investigate their impact on poverty, and identify potential solutions, is a very broad objective and indeed, all of the projects could be assessed under this objective. Here UPE’s main contribution is through specific project activities related to awareness creation, stakeholder mobilization, and capacity building. Almost all reviewed

projects succeed in meeting this objective, though to varying extents depending on the design of the project and its implementation success rate. One of the main contributions of the UPE projects is creating the important link between community action and the quality of the environment of its settlement. If these projects help to convince the community of the importance of their action in reducing environmental burdens, and putting in place a mechanism to sustain it, then definite progress is made in achieving this important objective.

With 42 projects reviewed in total, 19 were thoroughly assessed through site visits, and 18 qualified for review under this first objective. This was considered a good representative size sample for this assessment.

The extent to which the projects, examined as part of this review, were successful in improving the environment for poor communities was assessed. Taking into account that some projects were not designed to deliver this outcome, it was found that four out of six focus city projects (66%) and five out of twelve non-FC projects (42%) did deliver improvements.

The following closer look at selected projects demonstrates the evidence and analysis that led to the above assessment.

In the case of “Greywater Treatment and Use for Poverty Reduction in Jordan (Phase II)”, the use of greywater for irrigation is achieved through saving domestic greywater by using it for farming, which is particularly valuable in a country like Jordan, one of the poorest countries in terms of water in the world.

The Tangerang and Denpasar *“Integrated Decentralized City Solid Waste Management”* project is a good example of how a community can successfully be mobilized and be made aware of how to manage its solid waste and recycle it, suggesting a pilot case on how to reduce the environmental consequences of waste.

The *Jakarta Focus City Project: “Economic Incentives for Improved Water, Sanitation and Solid Waste Services”* offers a broader approach by addressing the three environmental issues of water supply, sewage and solid waste, and aims to meet this objective on all three components. The sewage and solid waste components have substantially been implemented and contributed to alleviating environmental burdens.

Another successful project of the UPE Program in meeting this objective on understanding environmental burdens is the Kumasi Project *“Non-treatment options for maximizing public health benefits of WHO guidelines governing the use of wastewater in urban vegetable production in Ghana”*. Others include the sustainable neighborhood approach in Kampala, the environmental initiative in Moreno and the two projects on Urban Vulnerability and Prevention of Natural Disasters and Municipal Disaster Prevention Information System for Latin America and the Caribbean.

While some projects have been successful in achieving this objective, others are exhibiting problems and facing difficulty. In some instances, it was found that this objective is beyond the financial and technical capacity of the project alone, or even in terms of the broader UPE Program and its partner organizations. This is particularly true when it comes to technical questions and investments, e.g. relating to flood prevention or slum upgrading (the FCRI Kampala and Lima projects are informative). In both cases major investments are needed, which go far beyond the program and project budget and the expertise of the project members (see picture 1 and 2 in Appendix 12).

With regard to the second objective, to test interventions and assess policies in low-income urban neighbourhoods that seek to ease environmental burdens and enhance the use of natural resources for food, water, and income security, the reviewers found some overlap with the first objective. It was felt to be important to look at the economic benefits resulting from the



projects and the establishment of the important link between economic well-being and environmental improvement.

Twelve projects directly and indirectly related to this second objective, have been examined. Of this total, ten (or 83 per cent) were seen to bring economic benefit to the community through income generation or in savings. Our findings indicate that UPE's main contribution is to be seen in the initiated small-scale projects within poor communities, which allows these communities to make better use of the available limited resources to improve their livelihoods. Also, a frequent theme in UPE projects that contributes to this objective is technology development, which was achieved in two out of the six focus city projects visited (33%), and four out of twelve non-focus city projects (33%) visited.

Again, a few examples are presented here to illustrate these findings:

The FC Kampala Project and "*Strengthening producer organizations in Lima*" are two good examples which show that effective use of limited resources in the urban environment can directly contribute to improving livelihoods, by creating new spaces for vegetable production (Lima) and reducing environmental burdens through waste collection and recycling (Kampala).

Water is a precious natural resource in many countries and specifically in Jordan where its enhanced use is of benefit to households. The greywater reuse units supplied to rural houses in Karak are a good demonstration for local communities on how the use of domestic water can be enhanced by directing it for farming. The project in Kumasi ("*Safe reuse of untreated waste water*") constructively addresses the risks and benefits related to wastewater use and demonstrates approaches that prevent negative impacts on health and the environment.

The third UPE objective, to contribute to the integrated planning, development, and implementation of sustainable and equitable urban environmental and natural resources practices and policies, is especially evident in the UPE projects that stimulate partnerships between communities and municipal authorities, and that allow more participatory approaches to city management. Local stakeholder mobilisation is a key element in achieving this objective. Of all the projects reviewed, it is the Focus City projects in particular that address this objective, aiming to foster dialogue between the different stakeholders, this being the basis for integrated urban management.

Capacity building contributes directly to this objective. Eighteen projects directly and indirectly related to this third objective, have been examined. Four out of six<sup>4</sup> focus city projects (66%) were found to have been successful in capacity building. Ten out of the twelve (83%) non-focus city projects assessed on this objective have succeeded in building capacities.

Overall, UPE has been very successful in achieving capacity building objectives with fourteen out of eighteen projects, i.e. 78 per cent, demonstrating success.<sup>5</sup>

Involving and strengthening communities also contributes directly to achieving this objective. On this basis, three focus city projects (50 per cent) were seen to clearly achieve positive results. Of the non-focus city projects five of the twelve (or 42 per cent) were assessed as positively contributing to community strengthening. The following closer look at selected projects demonstrates the evidence and analysis that led to the above assessment.

Two examples illustrate progress on achieving this objective related to capacity building and community strengthening. First, the Jakarta Focus City project succeeds in achieving this objective by devising appropriate techniques that integrate environmental services solutions for the poor community of Kelurahan Penjaringan in North Jakarta (see pictures 3 and 4 in Appendix 12). The project involves the community in three activities: water supply, sewage gutter cleaning and solid waste collection and recycling. Through participating in cleaning open gutters from solid waste, a sense of responsibility is created amongst the community and awareness of the importance of keeping such waste out of these channels,

allowing for its fluidity and reducing its pollutant capacity. Families from the same community who used to scavenge on solid waste were assisted in formalizing solid waste separation for recycling and composting techniques and equipment was made available to them.

Stakeholder participation was stimulated successfully in Moreno, using participatory mapping methods to identify the problems and foster dialogue with local authorities and planning units. Another important component here is the stakeholder platforms that have been established on two levels of the communities in Moreno, first within communities (“zonal”) to get agreement among them and then between communities (“inter-zonal”), to exchange information and learn from each other. This is necessary to create a “critical mass” to be able to communicate with the local authorities.

## II CLEAR AND COHERENT STRATEGY

This review assesses if there is a clear strategy that operationalizes the work of the UPE Program. The UPE Program is a new program within IDRC and is in its very early stages of evolution. Its first Prospectus (2005-2010) reflects a major re-focusing strategy to date and an intended evolution in the program’s objectives. Due to the timing of this review, this evolution is still somewhat limited in scope. The UPE’s Focus City strategy, a new component of the overall Program for this 2005-2010 cycle, that takes up about half of the overall UPE budget, is especially very young and is still evolving. New FC projects have been added just in the past eighteen months.

From the information available, the reviewers calculated a total budget of CAD \$17,731,687 for the 60 projects approved since April 1<sup>st</sup>, 2005:<sup>6</sup>

- Ten of these are Research Projects (RPs) and the budget total is CAD \$4,274,271;
- Eight are Focus City Projects (FCs) and the budget total is CAD \$9,353,926; and
- Forty-two are the smaller Research Support Projects (RSPs) with a budget: CAD \$ 4,103,490<sup>7</sup>

It is worth noting here that upon inspection of these numbers, it came as some surprise that when the eight new, large Focus Cities (FC) Projects and the numerous smaller Research Support Projects (RSPs) were separated out from the overall portfolio, there were only ten Research Projects (RPs) in the UPE portfolio approved since April 2005. This represents 24 percent of the total budget.<sup>8</sup>

The reviewers have examined the clarity and coherence of the UPE strategy according to three aspects: thematic, geographic and international cooperation.

### UPE working themes

The UPE prospectus identifies four working themes plus one crosscutting theme in their strategy. All reviewed projects fall under one or more of the following themes: urban agriculture, urban water and sanitation, waste management, vulnerabilities to natural disasters, and land tenure (cross-cutting issue).

In the RP category, the Urban Agriculture theme is dominant, with 5 of the 10 projects funded falling under this theme, representing 57 percent of the total research project budget.

The following table lists UPE numbers of projects according to their dominant themes and shows that the largest group of projects (19 of the 60 that were funded after April 1<sup>st</sup>, 2005) falls under the Urban Agriculture theme. Ranked simply by number of projects, approximately 32 per cent of UPE’s project portfolio thus falls under the theme Urban Agriculture. Water and Sanitation projects make up the second largest thematic cluster followed by waste management. It is noted that the important issue of Land Tenure does not appear as a

dominant theme in any one project, though identified as a crosscutting issue in the Prospectus.

<b>Dominant Theme of Project</b>	<b>Number of Projects</b>
Urban Agriculture	17
Urban Agriculture + WatSan	1
Urban Agriculture + Waste Management	1
WatSan + Waste Management	10
WatSan + Vulnerability to Natural Disasters	1
WatSan	1
Waste Management	10
Vulnerability to Natural Disasters	8
Multi Thematic	11
<b>Total</b>	<b>60</b>

Thematic distribution of post April 2005 UPE projects<sup>9</sup>

#### Geographic distribution of post April 2005 UPE projects

Since 2005, UPE projects are globally distributed with a main focus on Latin America and the Caribbean (25 projects), SSA (9 projects), Asia (6 projects), MENA (6) and with 14 global projects.

#### Cooperation with International Partners and External Funding

As part of the UPE strategy as expressed in the Prospectus, forging new international partnerships with other international organizations is an important objective. Partnering with specialist international organizations in implementing projects can have important advantages like complementing competencies, benefiting from the partners experiences and allocating more resources, including financial. Such partnerships, however, can be a hindrance if not well planned for and managed. Since 2005, the UPE Program undertook a few approaches<sup>10</sup> to cooperation with international organizations like FAO, WHO and UN-Habitat. Looking at the limited UPE budget it would seem that a co-funding structure for projects would be appropriate. However, this review has found that co-funding with other donors is not practiced. Instead, based on the data available on the cooperation projects with other donors, all of these projects were arranged such that total (100 percent) funding is being provided by UPE to these other donors to administer the funds and to manage the projects. For example, the budget (\$425,000) for the WHO supported project on “Application and Adaptation of WHO Guidelines for the Safe Use of Wastewater, Excreta and Greywater in low-income Urban Settings” came entirely from IDRC and was channelled through WHO. Similarly, funding for the FAO came from IDRC in the amount of \$299,030 representing 100 percent of the project funds. So also in the project to develop Housing Sector Profiles with UN-Habitat, the project was funded 100 per cent by IDRC. In reviewing these three cooperative projects, the WHO project (IDRC funding is (\$425,000) was found to be suffering from serious delays in project execution due to delays in funding from the partner organization and the research team that was interviewed expressed concern about a loss of their credibility. The UNH project was progressing well but the UN staff interviewed did cite the need for IDRC to improve their profile internationally, to become better known within UNH, and advised this could be done, at least as a start, through a stronger partnership and more hands-on approach built into this particular project (as opposed to simply just more funding from IDRC to UNH).

### III EVOLUTION IN PROGRAMME OBJECTIVES

Ideally, program objectives will evolve to meet changing contexts, opportunities and constraints. Considering that the UPE Program is a new program coming through a reorganization of previous programs in 2005, the reviewers consider it too early to reflect on evolution in program objectives. The UPE would benefit from its own internal assessment, over the next few years, of the extent to which its projects, inclusive of the still evolving Focus Cities projects, are benefiting from feedback from the field. In this context, it will be important for UPE to identify systematic mechanisms for feedback, including post implementation evaluation.

The reviewers recognize that the initiation of the *Focus Cities Research Initiative (FCRI)* is an attempt by UPE to test new modalities of operational research in the provision of environmental services for the poor. This is an interesting modality for an integrated approach that has the potential to address a number of municipal services in a sustainable environment context. The management of such projects is challenging due to their complexity and size. Looking at the current state of the FC projects we can see in at least two of the six FC projects site visited that they risk being placed within a more conventional mode of municipal service provision.

The reviewers benefited from some preliminary feedback from the field in the course of site visits and interviews that can assist UPE in identifying prospects for future evolution of the program that is thought to be of benefit. These are described here in the following two examples.

In the Jakarta FC project the research team conducted a Spatial Anthropology Survey. This interesting survey attempts to look at the community that uses the water and produces the waste that other project components look at, and to build needed knowledge for sustainable development in general, and community development in particular. A similar approach was taken in the Moreno Focus City project. This could be harnessed by UPE for future evolution of the program.

A second example is the project titled "*Non-treatment options for the safe use of wastewater in irrigated agriculture*" being implemented in the Gaza Camp near Jerash in Jordan. Although the overall context of the project is the use of greywater in agriculture, which has a strong economic component, its roots and target lie in testing the application of the WHO guidelines for the use of greywater in irrigation. The broad objective is improved health protection. This project would benefit from addressing the physical development component. Much of the hazard emanates from the dumping of solid waste in the open gutters of greywater, creating a health risk and significantly reducing the efficiency of the greywater collection system (see Photo 5 in Appendix 12). Due to the extreme poverty in the camp, it would be beneficial to the project to establish a link between health and economic return. This project may benefit from the experience of the sewage component of the Jakarta Focus City project. The Focus Cities learning workshop that was held in Ottawa last June is a very good example on how knowledge can be transferred between projects and stakeholders. This forum can be emulated for other UPE projects where lessons can be learned from successes and failures, and discussion can be initiated that leads to the evolution of objectives.



#### IV RISK IDENTIFICATION, MITIGATION AND MANAGEMENT

This review assesses the magnitude of risk, possible consequences and impact on the projects' success and that of the UPE Program. Identifying risks is a vital component in successfully achieving objectives and has significant bearing on the effectiveness of ensuing mitigating strategies.

The program has had to manage risk at two main levels. Circumstances that are beyond the capacities of the project to foresee like natural or man-made disasters are difficult to account for. Countries and regions that suffer from instability and lack of security are hard to work in and it is understandable when that reflects negatively on UPE involvement. The reviewers felt this first hand when their itineraries had to be adjusted at the last minute due to evolving security situations in some countries.

The second category of risk is associated with the attributes of the project, including the partners and stakeholders. The approach in addressing this issue has to vary according to the characteristics of the project and its development circumstances. Trip reports by POs and the TL reflect a thorough understanding of these issues and successful identification of some of the main risks associated with projects. They also discuss measures to mitigate them. Risks in the Focus Cities projects have been clearly identified and ranked, ensuring an admirable spread of risks (low, medium and high) across the eight focus cities projects.

However, in the course of this review, it was found that the Focus Cities are confronting risks that are often very difficult to overcome. While most projects seeking social change or empowerment are bound to raise conflict and this in itself can be a necessary part of reaching positive outcomes, the Focus Cities projects, relative to other projects in the portfolio, demonstrated a higher level of conflict, particularly in those projects that generated contestation over assets and livelihoods. Such risks are harder to overcome and without timely and skilled mitigation, such conflict can escalate. As a result of this observation, an assessment of conflict was undertaken across the Focus Cities projects. The six older Focus City projects were used in this assessment, as Ariana-Soukra and Lima were considered too young to assess. The detailed overview table includes notes about risk for each project. As provided below, conflict is identified as a recurrent trait in five of the 6 focus cities projects assessed, so the risk of conflict is rated at 83 per cent. Modes of conflict are varied and occur between stakeholders or interest groups at the community level, or in a few cases conflict was identified as a consequence of the research-development tension.

Focus City Projects: Risk Associated with Conflict

Projects type	No. Considered	No. of qualifying projects	No. of projects with conflict risk	% of conflict risk from qualifying
Focus cities	8	6	5	83

This identification of risks and conflict bears watching as it poses challenges for the IDRC research partners but also raises challenges for the IDRC officers responsible for these projects.

In reviewing the UPE portfolio of projects, it was found that risk potential could be compounded by the size and level of complexity of the project. The Focus City projects, being both very large (\$1.2 million each) and multi-faceted and complex, are more susceptible to risk. With the Focus Cities projects representing 53 per cent of the UPE project portfolio

budget approved since April 2005, risk is a growing characteristic in the program and strategies need to be adopted to mitigate its possible consequences.

In some projects disagreement and conflicting interests between participating institutions regarding responsibilities and project strategies also create a different kind of risk. For example, one of the key challenges confronting some projects is in getting the municipalities to feel more ownership over the project, as in the Dakar FC and the Moreno FC Projects.

There is ample evidence on how UPE officers have been successful in meeting the challenge of risk identification. However, mitigating the consequences of the risks as identified proved to be harder to achieve. For example successful risk identification was seen in the Colombo Focus city project concerning its leadership, in the Temesi Gianyar/Bali project concerning the overdependence on an expatriate resource person, and in Karak concerning the damaging conflict between two local partners. However, mitigating risk consequences were not successful.<sup>11</sup> The suggested measures were either not adhered to in the field or led to project/budget reorientation away from the project. In such cases this has reflected negatively on achieving basic objectives, particularly in the stakeholder partnership and community participation domain.

Another challenge is how projects can best translate their research results to the authorities. The challenge for researchers in moving their findings forward for policy discussion lies in how they perceive risks associated with how their data gets used. For example, the provision of data could lead to unwanted policy reactions that may have negative impacts on the city dwellers. In the Dakar FCRI, the researchers are in a difficult position of managing potential conflict among the varied sets of vested interests in the project and in its findings and eventual outcomes. These risks are by no means easy to address by the researchers. It is a challenge they face in running a research project that is connected to action, policy, implementation and investment. The need for the project to be conceived of as a dynamic process without too much rationalization in the early stages was considered a principle that could help to overcome these challenges. Other challenges the researchers are facing is the proper differentiation between research and development intervention, the risk of raising expectations in the community (especially around project investments), and the problem of avoiding conflicts in the broader community that surrounds the project area but is not included.

One further finding on risk management concerns project realisation. Many teams interviewed cited the limited time frame being given to implement these projects. Participatory projects need more time to be completed and the process of building trust and communication networks requires extensive effort, distinguishing these projects from classical research projects. Finally, a basic risk for all projects is the absence of clear project exit strategies.

## **B ON UPE RESULTS**

The UPE results are summarized under the following subjects: documentation; influence of outputs; participatory practices and stakeholder engagement; niche; and, research capacity.

### **I DOCUMENTATION**

Documentation outputs are the channels through which UPE disseminates information at two levels. Internationally the targeted audience is the development research community and development and donor agencies. At the national level the audience is policy and decision makers, local researchers and the targeted community. The quality and nature of outputs vary greatly particularly when they are dependant on partner institutions of IDRC-UPE. This might be related to technical capacities and access to Internet facilities as well as to the nature of

the projects themselves. The approach in this review was to focus on a selection of outputs in order to provide a critical evaluation. Data had not yet been compiled by UPE for many of these categories of outputs so the review team has had to build this assessment from various sources. These outputs as reviewed, are as follows.

### Web Sites

UPE coverage under the IDRC website is within the overall organizational context and needs to be assessed through a close look at the whole website. The team decided to use the time allocated for this part of the evaluation to a more focused look at project related websites. Twelve in all were examined. Three examples are informative.

One example of a website reviewed is the website built for the project *1103076 RUAF II: "Cities Farming for the Future (CFF)"*. This is a very comprehensive web site, with many downloadable documents, links and full versions of the highly demanded *Urban Agriculture Magazine*. All partners host a regional web site, however, the degree to which the sites are informative varies. The RUAF II evaluation states: Some of [the web sites], such as IPES are very informative, updated and with an easy navigation system. The selected documents both from the program and from other sources are quite useful.<sup>12</sup>

A second example of a website examined as part of this review is that of *CIP Urban Harvest*, the partner in the "*FCRI Kampala*" and urban agriculture projects in Lima. This is an excellent web site, providing detailed information on the initiative. This Focus City Project is called "*Sustainable Neighborhood in FOCUS (SNF)*", which makes it a bit difficult to connect to IDRC's Focus City label. The UPE project is not mentioned on the Kampala City Council (KCC) webpage, whereas the competing Belgian funded project: *Kampala Integrated Environmental Management Project (KIEMP)* is included. This project has a much higher visibility in KCC.

A third website examined as part of this review is that of the Regional Disaster Information Center for Latin America and the Caribbean (CRID) involved in the *Project 103408 "Strengthening the Municipal Disaster Prevention Information System for Latin America and the Caribbean,"* which is closely linked with *Project 103307 "Municipal Training Course in Urban Vulnerability and Prevention of Natural Disasters."* This is an excellent webpage. It provides comprehensive information with links to many other initiatives for disaster prevention and includes a large section for children. The project homepage on the SIGA is well integrated into the CRID webpage. The SIGA Manual captures important aspects of risks, especially the two basic components of geophysical and socio-economic risks.

Beyond these three successful examples, the reviewers found weaknesses in a number of others. For example, the IIED in Buenos Aires while having a useful web site, the link to the Focus City web site does not function. In addition, the City of Moreno web page does not mention the FC project at all. Space limitations in this report prohibit further commentary on the other websites reviewed. However, by way of summarizing, of the 12 partner websites examined, 5 were effective at disseminating UPE project news and links, while 7 of these websites or 60 per cent of those reviewed were weak and/or unsuccessful at dissemination.

These findings indicate a need for UPE to pay close attention to its project coverage on their partners and on other related websites. Provision by UPE to partners of for example, the IDRC cover page of documents with links to the IDRC website for downloading would be a strong addition to the information dissemination goal.

### Videos

A total of nine outputs were reviewed under this category. The Focus City videos are all of professional standard and very high quality. Although they appear promotional, they offer an excellent opportunity for awareness creation and policy impact if properly used.

The 15 min SIGA video, available on the Internet - but with low resolution - gives an excellent overview on the tool.

In addition, the reviewers noted that a television script has been written about the project 103075 titled “*Health Risk Analysis of Cryptosporidiosis and other Hazards in Urban Smallholder Dairy Production, Dagoretti, Nairobi, Kenya*” at the University of Nairobi. This will be used in an upcoming television production in Kenya. We view this as a positive outcome and recommend that UPE encourage such local initiatives.

The team was unfortunately not able to access the *Greywater Video for World Water Forum (WWF)* and thus could not review it as previously planned.

On the whole, UPE projects outputs in this category of videos has been very effective. No doubt there are still others, but these outputs are not well calculated for the overall Program.

### Publications

Total numbers of publications resulting from the UPE projects were not available. With this limitation, the review team has been able to assess output by publications only in an ad hoc way. The Reviewers positively noted that peer reviewed scientific publications have been produced by IWMI Ghana and CIP Uganda with high international presence. Examples to mention here are the *Journal of Water and Health*, the *Journal of Environmental Science and Health*, *Tropical Medicine & International Health*, *Arch. Environ. Contam. and Toxicol.* Findings from the project “*Benefits and Risks of Wastewater Reuse for Agriculture in Urban and Peri-Urban Areas in Nairobi*” (#103204) have been published in two major peer reviewed international journals and a story on the project was published in the *New Agriculturalist*.

The *Urban Agriculture Magazine* offers a wide range of information and is available online. The Magazine is not a scientific publication but targets a broader public, including local authorities. The feedback received by the RUAF II evaluation on the UA Magazine indicates that it is valued in many regions, with some criticisms on its presentation and contents that should be addressed (e.g. photos do not stand out with the current colour scheme). Similar criticism can be found in the *RUAF Mid Term Evaluation*. The RUAF II Reviewers suggest a refereed journal specializing in UA related issues and establishing a strong dialogue with urban researchers. Some of the researchers could be invited to be part of the editorial board of the journal and /or be peer reviewers.

Data to measure effectiveness in this output in particular needs to be better gathered as part of the UPE Program’s own monitoring task. The reviewers recognize that UPE is a young program and as it matures, we would expect to see better results monitoring that would consolidate research outputs.

- UPE Publication Series: These are the easiest accessible documents because they are readily available on the IDRC web site and form an efficient window to the global scientific community. However it would be useful to have more peer reviewed publications on this window as well.
- Manuals and Information Bulletins: The *UPE Newsletter* published on the IDRC website is fairly comprehensive and informative. The reviewers found irregular publication of the newsletter after February 2007 to the end of the review period in August 2008.<sup>13</sup> Regularly issuing such a newsletter, and also having it posted on partner websites globally, can strengthen the dissemination of information and keep active the development networks UPE is part of internationally. A good dynamic website with continuous updates does serve the purpose efficiently, especially if complemented with e-mail notifications to bring to the attention of those interested, new accomplishments and developments with the UPE projects. The newsletter is important for communities that have no access to the Internet and such printed material should be prepared and delivered as needed.



The *SIGA Manual* is an excellent work providing all necessary information on how to set up an integrated environmental planning tool in the urban context. It is however targeted to specialists with good knowledge in GIS and related tools. Both *Kampala and Moreno FCRI* produce Bulletins.

The project “*Benefits and Risks of Wastewater Reuse for Agriculture in Urban and Peri-Urban Areas in Nairobi*” has produced an important publication that, unlike other formats for publications, helps to make the stakeholders feel ownership over the findings. A declaration by stakeholders on re-use of wastewater was written, signed and disseminated by the stakeholders. In addition, a draft set of guidelines for gender responsive research have also been produced that includes advice on how to invoke gender analysis tools in wastewater projects. This project has also produced posters to disseminate information and findings in the city. These outputs reflect significant accomplishment and effectiveness in output and reach.

- Conferences: The UPE Program has been actively pursuing international conference venues to disseminate their research.

Again, the total number of conferences UPE participates in per year, is a figure not available to the review team. Like publication lists, video production, website affiliations, etc. UPE conference organization and participation would be an important measure of outputs for the Program that should be gathered annually.

The Review Team has noted a few conference activities, as discussed below, that do demonstrate some positive UPE output, but we are unable to assess actual volume on an annual basis.

The UPE took part in the last UN-Habitat World Urban Forum that was held in Vancouver and they are planning to participate as well in the upcoming World Urban Forum in Nanjing China this November. They have also participated in the World Water Week in Stockholm. These venues present excellent opportunities to highlight IDRC’s initiatives in urban development.

The *Focus Cities Learning Workshop* convened in Ottawa in June 2008 is a good example of how such meetings can help with the exchange of information on the experiences of teams in the field. If effectively followed up, such events serve as benchmarks in the networking progression, a mechanism that is essential to the success of development. This workshop was well prepared for, managed and attended. The success of such an event can only be fully assessed after monitoring the follow-up to the event and its effect on projects performance. At a local level, the May 2008 *North Jakarta City Consultation* is a very good example on how to engage stakeholders in dialogue and the community in the development project.

Of the commendable achievements we noted that recently IWMI Ghana attended and presented at the *33rd WEDC International Conference, the Sanitation Challenge Conference and 6th IWA Specialist Conference on Wastewater Reclamation and Reuse for Sustainability*, Belgium, October 2007, where the authors received the Best Policy Paper Award.

- Other dissemination strategies: The Reviewers recognize the various impressive activities of the program in television and printed press. However, the program is encouraged to strengthen other dissemination channels to convey information, especially at the grass roots level. Local language leaflets, community gatherings that allow criticism and feedback, radio shows, and working with DJ’s in public music halls are just a few strategies that help to get messages across locally.

## II INFLUENCE OF OUTPUTS

- Influencing Policies: Output influence mapping was seen in only some of the individual projects examined in this Review, and at a program-wide scale, this exercise was not being implemented in any comprehensive way. We would also expect that as the UPE Program

matures and grows, influence mapping will become even more of a strategic tool for the Program.

In order to assess policy impact achieved by the UPE Program through the performance of its projects, the reviewers searched for material evidence in the form of changing policies, new regulations and legislation. Such achievement was considered solid positive evidence and was credited accordingly. It also entailed evaluating the degree of success of projects in attaining a mind shift among policy and decision makers, or in taking steps that would lead to policy change, which were recognized as possibly leading to policy influence in the future.<sup>14</sup>

#### FC Projects

Only six out of the eight Focus City projects qualify for this assessment.<sup>15</sup> To date, two of the six projects (Moreno and Kampala) were seen as having clear policy influence while one (Jakarta) is demonstrating potential to meet this objective, if the project is well managed and challenges are overcome. Considering this partial success the overall assessment is that the achievement rate here is about 42 per cent.

#### Non-FC Projects

Twelve non-Focus city projects reviewed qualified for this assessment.

The score of success in influencing policy change was nine, including four that achieved partial or incremental success that have the potential to build up to effective policy impact, depending on future management of the project. The rate of success in influencing policies by these projects is thus rated at 75 per cent.

#### Full list

An overall picture can be drawn on how effective the UPE program has been in influencing policy change. Overall eighteen were considered to qualify for this assessment. Those qualified projects achieved a score rate of 11.5 out of a possible maximum of 18. Therefore, based on 18 projects assessed on policy impact, it was found that UPE was successful 64 per cent of the time in achieving policy influence.<sup>16</sup>

Projects type	No. of qualifying projects	Success score	% of successful from qualifying
Focus cities	6	2.5	42
Non-Focus cities	12	9	75
All projects	18	11.5	64

- Influence on technology development: In the context of the UPE Program, technology development is often a requirement to identify, test and prove the effectiveness of new solutions to environmental problems. Evidence for success in achieving this will be when these solutions or parts thereof are adopted or replicated. Although many of the reviewed projects have successfully progressed in introducing technologies, it was considered too early to assess the final achievement in this field. A post project implementation evaluation would be better placed to conclude on this issue. However, a few examples from the field demonstrate the effectiveness of this track in achieving influence in technology development in the UPE program so far.

The “*Replicable Waste Recycling in Temesi, Gianyar Bali*” demonstrates how hands on operational research can result in the development of technologies that are suitable for the process and the circumstance. The specially designed and constructed sifting machine is a clear example of that achievement, as well as the whole facility planning (see Photos 6 and 7

in appendix 12). Introduction of forced aeration composting as a technique is new to Indonesia at this scale and can be considered a success in transfer of technology.

The success rate of technologies used in the Jordan Karak Greywater reuse is not as clear and needs to be quantified (see picture 8 in appendix 12). The process, however, is simple enough to use by the rural locals but the return on investment is probably too slow for them to feel its impact. It is important to differentiate between the motivation to acquire and utilize donor assistance and the conviction by the community of the benefit of such an investment.

The Kampala FCRI is perhaps a most valuable example of these small-scale interventions, by supporting small enterprise development in the sector of waste management and recycling and improved fuel brick production for household consumption (see picture 9 and 10 in appendix 12). This directly reduces the environmental burden and creates income. The same applies to the planned projects within the FCRI Moreno program. Simple but useful, is another approach in Kampala to facilitate waste segregation and recycling. This method has helped the local NGO involved to teach the community on how to sort the waste properly. Yellow colour is for metals and ceramics, blue is for plastics and green for the biodegradable wastes (see picture 11 in appendix 12).

The examples that the Reviewers had the opportunity to see in the field proved the effectiveness of the practical, often trial and error approach in these types of projects. The challenge remains as to how to replicate these projects and use such results in influencing policy change.

Developing technologies has two main objectives; finding solutions to environmental problems faced by a community and testing prototype solutions that can be adapted or replicated. Although the first is a positive outcome of a project the broad objectives of UPE would only be met by achieving the second. This notion differentiates the commendable IDRC research type projects oriented towards policy change from the more common development and assistance projects implemented by donors in developing countries. In looking at technology development through the above analysis and examples the reviewers are attempting to highlight the critical line that separates these two models.

### III PARTICIPATORY PRACTICES AND STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT

Participatory practices can be assessed at two levels. Effective partnership among stakeholders is a vital element in the success of a project, and active participation of the beneficiary community is a prerequisite for its sustainability. The *Focus Cities* projects, being larger and more complex, exemplify the importance of participatory practices and effective stakeholder engagement, a great deal of which depends on the institution leading the project. This is exemplified in comparing the way the Jakarta and Colombo Focus city projects are led, as reported elsewhere by the evaluators.

From the selection of projects reviewed that qualify for this assessment, four focus cities (50 per cent) and five out of twelve non-focus city projects (42 per cent) were seen as performing well in terms of community participation. Therefore overall, 44 percent of the UPE projects examined were performing well on community participation. The examples given below have been selected for inclusion here in order to help diagnose how the project approach can affect this highly sensitive factor.

The Karak project suffered from the problem of conflict between INWRDAM and Plan-net; two organizations that were hired simultaneously by IDRC for different components of the project. It seemed that there was not enough clarity on the division of roles, and both partners aspired to play the role of leader towards the community. This conflict had its negative impact at the

community level and resulted with delays, eventually a scaling down of the number of units from 300 to 120, creating a disappointment in the community for not achieving the original target. Community representatives said that the project raised expectations in the community and later created a sense of injustice since not all households were given the opportunity to benefit from it.

The Colombo Municipal Commission, which leads the Colombo Focus City project is yet to demonstrate the intended mind-shift towards partnership in development and to engage more fully the local project partners. The formal approach emanating from a highly centralized government system seems to make community involvement in this project hard to achieve.

The “*Jakarta FC*” project and the “*Denpasar Bali Integrated Decentralized City Solid Waste Management*” project are better examples of stakeholder partnership and participation where local authorities give clear support to the project and the communities are actively involved.

Projects interviews also raised important issues of the costs of partnership and stakeholder engagement. Gaps in funding to support specific activities for building multi-stakeholder teams were identified. For example, in Kenya, interview findings suggest that the number of meetings required and the capacity building efforts required for team building are under-resourced. Additional funding targeted to training and capacity building and to workshop participation can help to overcome the “fatigue” associated with these projects. One project leader cited the “sustainability of participatory approaches” in the UPE projects – and that “urban farmers get fatigued and move on to other projects where they can derive some financial benefit for their participation.” Workshop honorarium could help to ensure some sustainability of these participatory projects.

Due to the direct intervention in the field approach adopted by UPE, the issue of participation and partnership assumes greater importance than in the more conventional modalities of development projects. This issue and the way it should be approached links closely to cultural attitudes of the community and call for strengthening project elements that aim at better understand the beneficiaries from a socio-cultural aspect.

#### IV NICHE

The approach and themes covered by the UPE projects can be defined as limited and focused. The Program addresses the environmental problems faced by the poorest of communities in a practical and direct manner. Although this is often the target of international development agencies, UPE will occupy a credible niche if these projects lead to models of development that can be learned from in other parts of the developing world.

The Reviewers found that UPE occupies one clear niche in urban development, namely, urban agriculture, where hardly any other organization competes. Urban and peri-urban agriculture (UPA) is in some cases a practical way to integrate urban planning, waste management, food security and environmental aspects in one project, as in the example of Lima. Only now local and national governments are beginning to adopt the idea of UPA in their legislation. This is mainly due to IDRC’s long-standing initiative in this field. This has become a traditional niche of development work for IDRC where policy impact can now be measured.<sup>17</sup> New initiatives by the World Bank and Rockefeller Foundation, and SIDA’s interest in UPA and in collaboration with IDRC are positive signs to encourage continuous involvement of IDRC in the field of UPA and they open up new possible alliances.

#### V RESEARCH CAPACITY

Building capacities was covered earlier in this report although specifically building the capacity of researchers was not addressed. This objective was not uniformly achieved in the UPE



projects examined and summary data was not available from the Program. A number of projects have successfully strengthened research capacity through the projects. For example, the “*Replicable Waste Recycling Project in Gianyar, Bali*” succeeded in attracting university staff to write a scientific paper for the benefit of researchers and students. Research capacity is being successfully developed by MercyCorps in its management of the Jakarta FC project where team members benefit from the project while doing their PhD work, and young local staff are actively engaged in community based research. Similarly, university students were engaged in the projects in Kenya, including the three projects: Health Risk Analysis of Cryptosporidiosis; Research Information Services for urban Agriculture and Environment in Kenya; and, Benefits and Risks of Wastewater Reuse for Agriculture in Urban and Peri-Urban Areas in Nairobi. In the latter, two Masters Students wrote their theses as part of the research project and graduated from Yomo Kenyatta University in Nairobi. Involvement of university students in IDRC projects is one of the most effective research capacity building components. Young researchers are being trained and becoming acquainted with the importance of multi-stakeholder teams in the research process. They are also becoming acquainted with UPE and IDRC as a whole for future partnerships.

The achievement of better research capacity was confirmed from all interviews carried out in Kampala, Ghana, Moreno and Lima. This is due to different factors and mechanisms firstly influenced by teamwork across the disciplines, secondly by involving students in the research process, thirdly through attendance at international events, and last but not least through the involvement of “community research” as it is practised in Kampala. In Ghana many young scholars are involved in a well-coordinated research program, where each of the single components goes into a broader scheme of interdependent questions. This offers a broader view perspective. The day to day involvement in the projects includes teaching, training, business plans, marketing, support of vegetable production and animal husbandry, as well as community interaction and exchange, which is new for some of the researchers. Capacity is improved on a number of levels - in conducting research, in managing research and in dissemination of research. The communities are involved in identifying research questions, proposal writing, including budgeting and time planning which is new to them (e.g. in Moreno) and they are thus gaining in their overall capacity in the research enterprise.

Building the capacity for gender awareness in UPE funded research projects is still developing and requires more attention. Building capacities of women in the community is more overtly recognized as an objective in UPE and it is one that appears to be quite successful though an effective set of indicators for progress monitoring was not found. Adopting gender analysis tools in research has been a strong emphasis in the urban agriculture body of projects and in some projects the researchers are publishing these findings and sharing them with other global partners.

## **PART FOUR: RECOMMENDATIONS AND ISSUES FOR IDRC CONSIDERATION ON THE FUTURE WORK OF UPE**

This in-depth review of selected projects on site and through desk reviews resulted in many recommendations and ideas that relate to particular projects, objectives or themes. These were mentioned in the body of the report in direct relation to where they were deduced. In addition to these, a number of strategic recommendations and issues are being suggested here to assist in directing the future evolution of the UPE program.

## I RISK

"Conducting research in developing countries is an inherently risky business. The Centre's mandate and the context in which it works require a tolerance of risk. This context both poses threats to success and offers opportunity for innovation. To achieve its objects, the Centre must evaluate both risks and opportunities in a manner sensitive to where it works and what it is trying to achieve while exercising good stewardship over the resources entrusted to it." (IDRC, *Corporate Risk Profile for 2007-08*)

The External Review was asked to examine risk from a number of viewpoints and with respect to a number of activities. Specific attention was paid to the element of risk in interviews with researchers and stakeholders in the field visits and also in interviews with IDRC staff. The element of risk considered by the External Review team includes the following categories established by the ER team which were considered important enough to report on in the ER:

- Potential to significantly diminish success of the project
- Potential to cause failure of the project
- Potential to cause failure to meet objectives
- Potential to diminish IDRC credibility in the field
- Potential to create conflict with partners
- Potential to weaken relations with partner governments
- Potential to lead to conflict amongst partners where livelihoods are being threatened

Stakeholders in the UPE projects, and particularly in the Focus Cities projects, cited a frequent imbalance between the force of the community and the force of the politicians involved in the projects. As evidenced in Part III above, conflicts identified as arising across various protagonists in the projects suggest a number of recommendations. Five more general recommendations have emerged over the course of this review:

**First**, a better understanding of the local governance dynamics at the project outset can help to identify risks of conflicts, stakeholder rigidities and insecurities, preferable and effective fora for dialogue across the communities of interest and government bodies of concern.

**Second**, once this governance framework is well understood by the research leaders, a greater emphasis on building platforms of dialogue in the projects in this governance arena can help to alleviate conflict over the course of the project.

**Third**, involving the media to help influence competing interests to come to terms with the overriding public interest, with a common vision and a common set of hopes can also be beneficial if carefully planned.

**Fourth**, risks could also be mitigated by providing more seed funding for the project formulation phase, which would allow more time allocation for negotiation, partnership building and participation in this important phase of a project. At this early stage, care must be given to avoiding overestimation of possible impacts with little investment.

**Fifth**, the design of every operational project should have a practical exit strategy that ensures the security of the project benefits when the funding ceases.

More specifically for the Focus City Research Initiative (FCRI), with each of these eight projects in the UPE portfolio being in the area of \$1.2 million, and given the complexity of these projects, and the challenges faced in running a research project that is also connected to action, policy, implementation and investment, strategic management is required to mitigate risks. Two recommendations on managing risks in the FCRI have emerged over the course of this review:

**First**, one recommendation has to do with the need for boundaries and clear definition on where the role of researchers ends and the role of the municipal authorities begins, particularly vis a vis these conflicts and vested interests in the project outcomes and deliverables.

**Second**, the teams as a whole expressed the difficulties in following a rigid structure when these differing interests across the community of stakeholders were becoming more overt over the course of the project. In terms of adjustment to the approach of the project, one recommendation concerns the need for the project to be conceived of as a dynamic process without too much rationalization in the early stages. The diagnostics and research phase can lead to potentially different and unexpected conclusions and point to different development and/or policy implications. At this point, the teams need to adjust to these unexpected outcomes that have implications for the administrative model governing the FCRI, specifically whether there is a need for a phasing of contracts and a mid term review of contracts.

Over the course of this review, a core question has arisen in our examination of the Focus Cities projects, one that raises the question of how the FCRI fits within the broader IDRC mandate and corporate strategy. From the review process to date, a tension has been recognized between a “Research vs. Development” position for the Centre. While the reviewers recognize that this is never a clear or decisive line and that it is incorrect to cast these as two mutually exclusive polarities, nonetheless, this tension has been repeatedly noted in field visits and interviews and further review and observation by IDRC over the next few years is thus recommended. We have found that in some instances of the review of the eight FCs, research is almost a second priority in some projects (e.g. Colombo) and planning and negotiating for development investments poses new challenges and risks for both research partners and also for IDRC staff accustomed to managing research projects. Recognizing that the FCRI is a new initiative and that it is pushing the frontiers within IDRC, and given that this set of eight projects is moving into the phase of preparation for financial investments in buildings, infrastructure, waste management facilities, and other development projects, the reviewers felt it important to raise the question of fit in the broader IDRC mandate, direction and strategy, as this is beyond the capacity of this review team to do so. The reviewers feel that these FCRI projects deserve attention by IDRC so as to assess these investment components against the objects and powers of the Centre as outlined in the International Development Research Centre Act and General-Bylaw. Therein, the team did review the objects and powers of the Centre as listed in two parts:

“Section 4 (1) The objects of the Centre are to initiate, encourage, support and conduct research into the problems of the developing regions of the world and into the means for applying and adapting scientific, technical and other knowledge to the economic and social advancement of those regions and, in carrying out those objects; and,

Section 4(2) The Centre, in furtherance of its objects, may exercise any or all of the following powers in Canada or elsewhere, namely, the power to (as listed in 4 (b)) initiate and carry out research and technical development, including the establishment and operation of any pilot plant or project, to the point where the appropriate results of the research and development can be applied.”

The Focus Cities projects are novel, interesting approaches for IDRC that are currently positioned along a critical line between development and research. They represent a significant body of funds (approximately \$10 million and growing). While the reviewers recognize the fine balance in this set of projects, they also recognize the potential for the balance to shift in any one of these projects, with the weight shifting possibly towards development and municipal service provision with less weight to research.<sup>18</sup>

In addition, these financial investment components of the eight Focus Cities Projects may well require a different skill set for the UPE staff and possibly for the research partners. We take seriously a statement by one UPE staff person interviewed that “sometimes we (the program

officers) feel that we are in over our heads in these projects.” The researchers and the UPE staff are engaged in building permit applications, committees of adjustment, zoning variance hearings, planning ordinances, etc. This issue was raised in other subsequent interviews to test whether this was anecdotal evidence or more of a shared view held by other team members. The external review team was advised that this was a shared concern that had been raised and was being discussed internally by the UPE team. With this in mind, the reviewers ask IDRC to consider whether these FCRI projects require backstopping by external consultants and technical experts over the period of the project to relieve some of the pressure on IDRC POs. Often development problems are caused by institutional confusion in local governments resulting in conflicting responsibilities of different departments. Careful institutional network analysis dealing with governments and communities could help IDRC POs and their partners in the FC projects. Working with policy makers implies new thinking and strategies and the capacity of FC teams in this regard is understandably low. Workshops on planning and policy related issues could be useful. Coordinating community, researchers, and municipal authorities with very different mindsets often leads to unexpected problems. In addition, it raises conflicts and risks as these projects enter into seriously contested sectors such as waste and landfills, land tenure, housing risks and relocations, livelihoods, union labour rights, contested land uses and health risks associated with the project sites.

Finally, given the findings and evidence on conflict and risk presented in Part Three above, and given the challenges identified by the researchers and IDRC staff in managing both potential and real conflict among the varied sets of vested interests in the FCRI projects, it is recommended that a more focused attention to these risks be considered with a view to building in risk mitigation strategies and specific monitoring of their execution. While this external review team has reviewed the FCRI monitoring program, the concerns over risk point to the need for a more specified monitoring and management response. Conflicting interests, particularly those pitched between competing livelihoods of the poor, municipal government interests, trade unions and private commercial interests create risks for IDRC, both in terms of safety on the project sites for all stakeholders and IDRC officers, but also for IDRC’s relationship with the local authority and national government. We believe these eight projects deserve careful oversight by IDRC as they grow and evolve.

## II PARTICIPATION, STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT AND OWNERSHIP ISSUES

If the UPE Program is to achieve policy influence in the future, then a clear process needs to be established at project appraisal. Invitations to participate in workshops are not sufficient. Successful stakeholder engagement across communities, researchers and government officials depends upon early buy-in whereby all stakeholders are assigned tasks and responsibilities over the entire process of the project. Responsibilities lead to ownership of the project and in the end, advocacy for policy change.

In many cases, and this was especially vivid in the Focus City projects, the stakeholders are operating on very different levels. Extra work is often needed to help build and/or strengthen community institutions to effectively engage in this process. Institution building is seen as a gap in a number of projects examined. In addition, stakeholders are often operating with very different agendas that, especially when livelihoods are being affected under IDRC project processes, lead to conflict. In the Dakar Focus City project for example, IDRC’s solid waste project targets the dumpsite where 400 people in two villages are living on the site scavenging as part of their livelihood. Urban farmers are composting from the dumpsite. Where health risks and livelihood risks meet head-on, conflicts invariably arise. Conflict resolution workshops and training could help to alleviate these situations and ensure the sustainability of stakeholder engagement locally. More importantly is to avoid arriving at positions of conflict in the first place. Indeed, problems with partnerships, expectations and responsibilities in some cases result from

a lack of participation and information sharing during project planning. It is recommended that UPE consider drafting a set of guidelines designed to guide participation, stakeholder engagement and ownership in projects, as a way to avert conflict in their project development.

### III LOCAL COMMUNITY INCLUSION, ADVOCACY AND INFORMATION DISSEMINATION

Local poor communities are the first targeted beneficiaries of operational projects and their buy-in and understanding of the importance of this information being disseminated is essential for the projects' success and sustainability. Many of these projects are designed as prototypes that can be learnt from or replicated to solve similar problems in other locations within the same city or country. Project design should ensure effective local and community-level visibility of the project, communicated in the most appropriate means. It is recommended to put more emphasis on, and allow a budget for the dissemination in the local language and through the local media. This would include translating outputs, using radio programs and public meetings.

While it is recognized that advocacy is best done locally and by local stakeholders themselves, the role of IDRC program officers is nonetheless critical. For example, in one interview with one Kenyan project team, the researchers cited the UPE Nairobi Program Officer as "not just a donor but a participant" who "helped to bring in policy makers (the National Environment Management Agency, City Council and the Nairobi Water Company) throughout all of the process, including the initial sensitization workshop, mid way seminars and completion workshop." Therefore, it is recommended that UPE staff whenever possible assist the research team to engage the policy community throughout the project cycle.

It was also recognized that bringing these communities of stakeholders together imposes serious time constraints on the project. In site interviews, it was reported that these trans-disciplinary urban projects are very time consuming and require that the UPE Program more closely consider the timeframes allocated for projects and the critical need to more reasonably reflect the extensive time involved in projects of this nature. It is also noted that sometimes these trans-disciplinary and multiple stakeholder approaches collapse and have to be re-built so flexibility in structuring the project timeframes is also recommended. Hence, attention to the budgetary and timeframe requirements associated with building these approaches is recommended.

### IV VISIBILITY, LOCAL INFLUENCE AND GLOBAL REACH

UPE, and other programs in IDRC, need to come together and discuss strategy for increasing local and global visibility. From the extensive interviewing in the field, the reviewers received suggestions on specific paths to improving visibility and getting the work of IDRC, and more specifically UPE, more in the public eye. While there is potential to explore this issue with local companies (e.g. through telecommunications assistance) funding to increase local visibility needs to be built into the projects so that the research teams on the ground are aware of their responsibility and willing to move this agenda forward for each and every project. More local lobbying for media and website presence is critical. It is recommended that the UPE projects build in technical and financial assistance components for municipal government to support media, website and other electronic communication on those projects that are being funded in those cities. It is also recommended that a higher presence of the projects in the local universities be achieved. Suggestions include: the use of UPE videos/ DVDs as teaching tools in the classrooms, support for university research assistantships as clear line items in projects even if the project funding is with NGOs and other non-university recipients; and support for the involvement of city planning students and teaching faculty in the projects.

Especially with respect to the FCRI: the Focus Cities projects are living laboratories for students and Faculty and they should be encouraged to participate directly in them. Funding support such as Research Assistantships (RAs), and core funding for the development of studio projects for course credit, design charettes, city planning studios and workshops attached to the FCRI are all recommended. All of these suggestions lead to higher visibility for IDRC and build a broader base of stakeholders for future project development.

Searching the internet for the phrase "Focus City Research Initiative" turns 14 main results and 48 extended results. The majority of links are from IDRC itself. The UPE project is not mentioned on the Kampala City Council (KCC) web page, but the competing project is there, the Kampala Integrated Environmental Management Project (KIEMP). The FCRI cannot be found on the Dakar web site (there is instead the project "Dakar Ville Verte" mentioned). FCRI cannot be found on the Colombo City web site, nor on the Moreno web site. This indicates a lack of local visibility of the program, which is a pre-requisite for international visibility as well.

Discussions with other international donors as part of this review regarding their knowledge of UPE also leads to the same recommendation for heightening the Program's visibility, showcasing its outputs, and improving its global reach.

## V POST PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION MECHANISM

The full impact of an operational project is achieved after its full implementation, but project documents consider a project closed once implementation is completed and funding disbursements are finalized. It is recommended that the concept of project closure be made more flexible and that a post implementation mechanism be instilled in the project cycle that ensures a revisit and evaluation of performance at appropriate periods after the conclusion of a project. Ex post evaluations are one such mechanism that contributes to:

- assessing the impact and sustainability of projects and programs
- identification of conclusions that require follow-up, or incomplete findings that deserve further investigation
- improving the planning, selection and design of future projects and programs
- fostering organizational learning within IDRC through the dissemination of lessons and good practices with a view to improving future performance of projects and programs

## VI COOPERATION WITH INTERNATIONAL PARTNERS AND BUILDING EXTERNAL FUNDING

The UPE has been building cooperation with a few other international donors over the period (FAO, WHO, UN-HABITAT for example) but progress on this front is limited not only in volume but also in modality. The form of cooperation is limited and reflects only flow through funding or direct support to other donors' programs. This type of cooperation, as opposed to co-financing of joint projects and activities for example, does not lead to joint ownership over the results, which has further limitations in terms of reach and influence. Some progress is being made in building new partnerships with UN-Habitat. It was learned from interviews at the UN-H Headquarters in Nairobi, that over the past 14 months or so, and following the UN-H World Urban Forum (WUF) in Vancouver, a few of the UPE staff have visited these offices in the hopes of building partnerships. Recent UPE projects support a role for IDRC in the UN-Habitat World Urban Forum (both the recent Vancouver and the upcoming WUF in China). Another project funding UN-Habitat in the support of housing sector profiles provides a further linkage. IDRC has also funded FAO for a project on Organizations of Small Peri-Urban Agricultural Producers and is funding the WHO Guidelines for the Safe Use of Wastewater, Excreta and Greywater.

It is recommended that UPE broaden and deepen its international partnerships with other donors through extended activities that include membership on other donors research committees, attending conferences, and initiating donor roundtables on thematic development. It is suggested that the base of existing partnerships (for example FAO, WHO and UN-Habitat) be broadened to include a multiple of other donors already active in the urban sector, including the World Bank, UNDP, UNEP, DFAID, GTZ among others.

## VII THEMATIC COVERAGE AND THEMATIC NICHE

Given the findings on UPE's thematic concentrations noted in Part Three above, this UPE External Evaluation team recommends consideration be given to thematic niche and coverage in future discussions within IDRC. As a new Program, this first five-year cycle presents a critical moment for the UPE staff and IDRC leadership to assess its current status and future direction in terms of thematic coverage.

Having reviewed 42 UPE projects over the past six months, it is the recommendation of this External Review that for the UPE Program to become more robust in the future, and to extend its credibility in the urban field, an expansion of themes is critical. While the prospectus does address an opening to new themes and progress is certainly being seen in this regard and with respect to the FCRI, this review exercise indicates the thematic focus remains narrower than necessary.

It is recognized that the Urban Poverty and Environment Program has inherited a large portfolio of projects and staff that are heavily environmentally oriented. While the reviewers recognize fully that team composition is not part of the Terms of Reference for this review, nonetheless, it is noted that disciplinary backgrounds of the UPE staff remain narrowly focused on technical and environmental backgrounds. The External Reviewers recognize in the Prospectus and in the urban assistance field in general, the complexity of addressing urban poverty and therefore recommend that IDRC consider future staffing of its UPE Program to include more staff with social science backgrounds. In a similar vein, it is also recommended that UPE expand its recipients/partnership base that was built from the old program and that is still being funded under the new program, so as to open the program up to new partners. This situation will be assisted as thematic breadth is gained. Both of these recommendations are important if UPE is to better build beyond the environment focus into research fields and themes that can help address the broader challenges confronting cities in the twenty-first century.

This is not to suggest that the environment focus should be abandoned, since many of the key emerging challenges confronting cities indeed include food security, climate change and climate adaptation. However, land use, urban economy, urban finance and urban politics are also critical fields in which to build new knowledge and influential policy agendas. The future well being of the world's urban populations depend on it. While urban governance has been downplayed in the current UPE Program, cities are at the pivot of governance debates worldwide, in terms not only of multi-jurisdictional and inter-governmental relations, but in the global economy of trans-national relations. Explicitly recognizing urban governance in the FCRI for example can not only enhance local governance but also render a more deliberate and targeted policy influence. In addition, access to urban land, security of tenure, weak planning and under-financed municipal governments are root causes of poverty in the slums and squatter settlements of cities. Land tenure is a cross cutting theme in the prospectus of UPE but is not clearly addressed as an objective in the program projects. Land, governance and urban planning and management can contribute greatly to alleviating urban poverty. It is recommended that they be better addressed in the program so as to support the goal of policy influence across the existing core themes. This re-focusing exercise can occur through



appropriate staffing, and by forging stronger linkages with other specialist organizations like UN-Habitat, the World Bank and UNDP.

This review has given particular attention to the crucial role IDRC has played in the field of urban agriculture, and its established niche. As urban food security becomes higher on the world agenda in response to the world food crisis, the role of UPE research in this field can become central on the world stage. Despite a large body of research and knowledge in the field, urban and peri-urban agriculture are still subject to numerous constraints, such as lack of suitable land, insecure land tenure, outdated legislation, the absence of municipal by-laws to protect the practices, insufficient access to irrigation water of appropriate quality, inadequate know-how, and generally low investment levels in the sector. This review team recommends that the next generation of urban agriculture projects need to take on a more global role and a scaled up approach in which critical policy and governance issues associated with urban agriculture are addressed. The researchers interviewed in fact addressed these very questions themselves and came up with similar conclusions that were discussed in some detail in our site interviews. “Why do we not have broader outputs and why have we not been successful in policy change to support our findings? ... We have not seriously addressed policy and governance issues as part of our urban agriculture research.” One recommendation arising is to establish broader parameters on urban agriculture worldwide that answer broader strategic questions whose answers can influence policy. For example, what percentage of urban residents consumes food that is produced in the urban and peri-urban areas of their city? Does urban agriculture feed 80 per cent of the city dwellers or 20 per cent? The answer to such broader scale questions is critical for making the case on municipal by-law reform governing urban agricultural practices in cities. Another recommendation arising is to create a model city on urban agriculture, supported by IDRC research that generates broad city-wide evidence, that generates by-law reform to protect and strengthen the practice, and that helps to establish the role of national government in building food security for cities in a country, and finally that bridges relevant sectors (urban management, infrastructure investment, health, water, fertilizer, waste management, urban poverty and livelihood improvement, and other sectors) to build a sounder approach to urban agriculture for the future. It is recommended that the role of UPE in such an effort be to bring relevant and interested donors together to support the effort (as Rockefeller and other Foundations do), to showcase research and such model cities, and champion the evidence-based policy change platform the researchers have developed.

Finally, benefiting from the wealth of information generated by the UPE projects in particular and other IDRC program projects, IDRC may consider sponsoring studies of a cross cutting thematic nature, based on comparative analysis of projects and their results. Such themes as communities and researchers, stakeholder leadership in development projects, economic sustainability, multi-level governance and development, conflict and risk in high profile projects, performance indicators on IDRC projects to better measure the successes and failures of a project, are all potential topics emerging from this Review.

## ENDNOTES

1 Overall progress was cited as stated in the general assessment of individual objectives, building on the thorough assessment for individual projects.

2 This report includes discussion and analysis in as much as the reporting space allows. In addition, the reviewers used the opportunity of their in-depth review of a good number of projects to make a quantitative assessment where straightforward values were produced. The percentages can help to inform the reader on type of influence a project has and indicate its character.

3 Development outcomes and research outcomes overlap greatly in what is called here action research. With this type of work the more operational research is the more costly it becomes, as it involves physical implementation, leading to push the budget envelop further.

4 Two FCs - Ariana Soukra in Tunis and Lima in Peru - were considered too young to assess.

5 A more detailed assessment can be found where individual projects are discussed.

6 Figures and calculations used here were taken from Excel budget sheets provided by IDRC and designed to cover IDRC budgetary cycles.

7 Excel budget sheets provided by IDRC in fact show 9 projects classified as FCs but one of these ("Focus City Capacity Building for Monitoring Outcomes" totaling \$52,500) was a focus city workshop and has therefore been moved to RSP classification here for clarity in that there are in fact eight FC projects not nine as indicated on the excel sheets.

8 While FCs are considered RPs, the classification is split in the UPE project tables, and this composition of the portfolio minus the eight new large Focus Cities projects is important to note.

9 In attempting to identify thematic weights within the program the reviewers made a numerical analysis of the numbers of project, or project lines as listed in the UPE table of projects approved since April 2005. Projects were then categorized according to themes as assessed through the evaluation. Projects that were not individually evaluated were listed as per the categories assigned in the UPE table of projects.

10 As a new program, the reviewers recognize that partnerships with other agencies are still under development in UPE and new partners, both strategic partners and funding partners are being built. While this review did not cover the RUAF project (due to another separate evaluation being conducted just prior to this review), it is worth mentioning that parallel funding has been generated for the RUAF project. However, the projects that were available for review at this time and within the reviewers time constraints, do reflect a need to broaden the scope and modality for partnerships with other agencies.  
11 In the Temesi case the same risk described earlier in the same paragraph was evident when the EE visited the site and interviewed the team. Thus although it was identified by the UPE team and mitigating measures were suggested the problem persisted.

12 The increase of hits and of visitors in all cases, including the RUAF site, is a clear indicator of the importance of this part of the Knowledge and Information Management (KIM) component and of its contribution. In some cases, the situation could be improved. The IWMI-Ghana web site is very informative, although full details are only given for Accra. The IWMI-India also presents a lot of information, but could be improved by breaking long pages into several sub-pages, and have indices to help navigation and finding specific information. The MDP site has been completely updated and gives precise information on the CFF program. The IAGU web site needs updating. The problem seems to be the fact that US based Webmaster is not performing the needed maintenance. RUAF II partners have been engaged in the production of a variety of interesting information and communication materials, with different regional emphases, ranging from manuals to local bulletins and newsletters, from radio programs to information posters and leaflets.

13 UPE comment on this report's draft was that "The electronic UPE newsletter ...did not stop in February 2007 and the 8th issue was sent out last September 2008" However this was after the ER was conducted. Regularity and reasonable periodicity are essential components for information dissemination and outreach. The ER team is happy to know that the UPE newsletter is continuing however.

14 A simple score was assigned. Where material evidence was found for policy influence (from documentation, from interviews with project staff and policy makers) a score of 1 was assigned. When evidence of potential influence was identified, a score of .5 was assigned.

15 FC projects in Ariana-Soukra, Tunis, and Lima, Peru were considered too young to assess.

16 Percentages are simply based on number of projects. It should be noted that different projects have different weights and other more complicated methodologies may result in different assessment.

17 The following more recent UPE projects indicate that their systematic research on greywater is being positively integrated with other environmental urban services;

- solid waste management that meets our prospectus commitment to explore this theme<sup>17</sup>, including the Decentralized Urban Solid Waste Management in Indonesia (1030074) and Replicable Waste Recycling Project in Gianyar, (103797), as well as several projects in LAC. Three of the FC projects (Dakar, Cochabamba, and Lima, also take solid waste management as a main entry point;
- water and sanitation (water and sanitation in small towns in the Lake Victoria region (104453) Water Dialogues (Indonesia) and the Jakarta Focus City project (103796);
- a new initiative to bring the new theme of housing into our work, which also serves as an umbrella for our other themes (International Workshop on Housing, Urban Poverty, and the Environment (103798) and Housing Sector Profiles (104970);
- urban design (including a planned project on research for design in the current year's pipeline, the new the Ecopolis Graduate Research and Design Competition (103710) and the Atelier d'intégration de pratiques et activités productives au cadre bâti des quartiers populaires de Dakar, au Sénégal (104398).

18 This risk is well demonstrated in the Colombo Focus city project where the process lead to municipal services provision through conventional implementation.





## Annexes: Urban Poverty and Environment (UPE) - External Review



Patricia McCarney

Riadh Tappuni

Axel Drescher

December 9, 2008



## Table of Contents

### APPENDICES

1. List of Projects Evaluated through Site Visits (May and June 2008) .....	29
2. List of Research Partners Interviewed on Site .....	31
3. Sample Interview Questions Used .....	38
4. Desk Review of Projects .....	42
5. List of Participants in Focus City Ottawa Learning Forum .....	43
6. Thematic Distribution of UPE projects .....	46
7. Biographies of the reviewers .....	49
8. List of Documents Consulted .....	51
9. List of UPE team members interviewed .....	59
10. Photos from the Projects .....	60
11. List of Acronyms .....	65

### Appendix 1 - List of Projects Evaluated Through Site Visits (May and June 2008)

Project Name	Project Number	Location	Completed	Timing of Field Visit
Decentralized Urban Solid Waste Management in Indonesia	103074	Tanjerang (near Jakarta)	Yes	May
Decentralized Urban Solid Waste Management in Indonesia	103074	Denpasar in Bali	Yes	May
Replicable Waste Recycling Project in Gianyar, Bali	103797	Gianyar, Bali	Yes	June
Focus City – Economic Incentives for Improved Water, Sanitation, and Solid Waste Services	103796	Jakarta	Yes	May
Focus City – Community-based Assessment and Improvement of Living Environment in Underserved Settlements	103795	Colombo	Yes	June
Organizations of Small Peri-Urban Agricultural Producers: Towards a better understanding of low-income producer organizations	102681	Rome, Madagascar	Yes	May
Non-Treatment Options for the Safe Use of Wastewater in Irrigated Agriculture	102732	Accra, Kumasi and Tamale, Ghana	Yes	April
Focus City - Building a Sustainable, Cohesive Community Through Waste Recycling and Agro-Enterprise	103794	Kampala	Yes	April
Making the Edible Landscape: Participatory Planning, Design and Development of Garden Neighbourhoods	102440	Kampala	Yes	April

Focus City - Easing Environmental Burdens in Informal Settlements and Peri-Urban Zones: From Diagnosis to Collaborative Action in Moreno, Argentina	<b>103554</b>	Moreno Argentina	Yes	June
Enhancing Capacity for Innovation, Increasing Productivity and Access to Markets by Peri-Urban Producer Organizations in Latin America	<b>104347</b>	Lima, Peru	Yes	June
Health Risk Analysis of Cryptosporidiosis and other Hazards in Urban Smallholder Dairy Production, Dagoretti, Nairobi, Kenya	<b>103075</b>	Nairobi	Yes	May
Benefits and Risks of Wastewater Reuse for Agriculture in Urban and Peri-Urban Areas in Nairobi	<b>103204</b>	Nairobi	Yes	May
WUF Nanjing	<b>104464</b>	Nairobi UN-H	Yes	May
Housing Sector Profiles	<b>104970</b>	Nairobi UN-H	Yes	May
Research Information Services for urban Agriculture and Environment in Kenya	<b>103208</b>	Nairobi	Yes	May
Application and Adaptation of WHO Guidelines for the Safe Use of Wastewater, Excreta and Greywater	<b>102732</b>	Rome	Yes	May
Greywater Treatment and Use for Poverty Reduction in Jordan (Phase II)	<b>101536</b>	Karak, Jordan	Yes	May
Non-Treatment Options for the Safe Use of Wastewater in Irrigated Agriculture	<b>102732</b>	Jerash, Jordan	Yes	May
Grey Water Treatment & Reuse in West Bekaa	<b>100980</b>	West Bekaa, Lebanon	No (travel warning)	May

## Appendix 2 List of Research Partners Interviewed on Site

### Kenya

- A. Professor Nancy Karanja, Regional Coordinator Sub Saharan Africa, Urban Harvest-CGIAR and Project Coordinator “Benefits and Risks of Wastewater Reuse for Agriculture in Urban and Peri-Urban Areas in Nairobi” (#103204)
- B. Farmers in Kibera (#103204)
  - Chege Wanjau
  - Michael Kamau
  - Mary Mutora
  - Eunice Ambani
  - Susan Wairimu
  - Ruth Wanyoike
  - Helen Wanjiku
- C. Mary Njenga, Urban Harvest-CGIAR (#103204)
- D. Violet Kirigua, Kenya Agricultural Research Institute, Co-project leader: “Research Information Services for Urban Agriculture and Environment in Kenya” (#103206)
  - 1. Mr.F. Ole Sinket - met him on behalf of the Director KARI
  - 2. Dr. Festus Murithi - Assistant Director -Socio-economics and Biometrics Research
  - 3. Dr. Lusike Wasilwa - Assistant Director - Horticulture and Industrial Crops Research Division
  - 4. Dr. John Onyatta - Director of Research - National Council for Science and Technology.
  - 5. Mr John Macharia - Provincial Director of Agriculture Office - Nairobi Province
  - 6. Peris Mugo -Provincial Director of Livestock Production - Nairobi Province.
  - 7. Purity Kaburu - Programme Officer - Agricultural Research Investment Services - KARI
  - 8. Violet Kirigua - Co- Principle Investigator of project and Programme Officer - Horticulture and Industrial Crops Research Division.

On farm interviews:

Extension officer - Margaret Yatich

Friends Church Group in-charge-----Geofry Kijedi

Kabete Young farmers Association. Chairman---Francis Adika

- E. Alain Grimard Senior Human Settlements Officer UN-HABITAT “WUF Nanjing” (#104464)
- G. Mohamed El Sioufi, Head, Shelter Branch, UN-HABITAT “Housing Sector Profiles” (#104970)

---

F. Professor Erastus Kiambe Kang’ethe, University of Nairobi, Kabete Campus Project Coordinator, Health Risk Analysis of Cryptosporidiosis and other Hazards in Urban Smallholder Dairy Production, Dagoretti, Nairobi, Kenya (#103075)  
Interviews were held with:

---



Name	Institution
Monica Kiragu*	Ministry of Agriculture
Alfred Langat *	Ministry of Health
Gabriel Mbugua**	Kenya Medical Research Institute
Peninah Ombutu**	Ministry of Livestock Development– Extension Officer
Tom Randolph*	ILRI
Brigid McDermott*	University of Nairobi
Alice Njehu**	University of Nairobi
Violet Kimani *	University of Nairobi
Grace Mitoko **	Ministry of Livestock Development
Erastus Kang'ethe* <sup>b</sup>	University of Nairobi
Rose Ndungu	Farmer –Riruta Location
Lucy Macharia	Farmer – Uthiru Location
Rahab Ngigi	Farmer – Ruthimitu –Location
Jane Ndungu	Farmer – Mutuini Location
William Gitura	Farmer – Waithaka Location
Evanson Mikiri	Farmer – Uthiru Location
Battai Kinuthia	Farmer – Uthiru Location

\*Investigators

\*\* Research Team

<sup>b</sup> Principal Investigator

NB, Investigators are part of the Research team

Italy (Rome – FAO)

1. Dr. Sasha Koo-Oshima, FAO Water Quality & Environment Officer, FAO Land & Water Development Division “Application and Adaptation of WHO Guidelines for the Safe Use of Wastewater, Excreta and Greywater” (#102732)
2. Emmanuel Chengu (ESWD) FAO
3. Ms. Florence Egal FAO
4. Eve Crowley (ESWD) FAO
5. Michelle Gauthier (FOMC) FAO
6. Francesca Gianfelici (NRLA) FAO
7. Berndt Seiffert (ESWD) FAO
8. Clarisssa Ruggieri (ESWD)FAO
9. Paul Munrofaure (NRLA) FAO

## Uganda

### A. Researchers

Urban Harvest/CIP: Dr. Shuaib Lwasa, Project Leader, Kampala FC project  
 Suzzanah Benett, Student Intern from Canada.  
 Margaret Semwanga, Project leader, Edible Landscape Project (KCC)  
 Placid Nyamutale (KCC Project assistant)

**B. City Government**

Kampala City Council (KCC):

Mr. Joseph Ssemambo (Head of GIS section)

Mr. John Mpambala (Deputy City planner, Urban Planning and Land Management sub Directorate, Kampala City Council.

Betty Rusoke Onok, Agricultural Extension Officer, KCC

**C. Community Members and leaders**

Citizens in the project area (Stakeholders)

Moses Nadiope (Community Leader)

## **Ghana**

**Accra:**

**A. Researchers**

Dr. Liqa Raschid-Sally, Head IWMI West Africa

Dr. Pay Drechsel Theme Leader – Agriculture, Water and Cities

Hanna Karg Interim Student working on Food Safety

**B. International Partners**

Modeste Lawakiléa Kinané (APO Water Resource use in periurban Agriculture), FAO, Regional Office West-Africa

Ines Beernaerts, Land and Water Officer, FAO Sub-Regional Office West Africa

Prof. Anthony Youdeowei, consultant FAO and Forum for Agricultural Research in Africa (FARA), Accra

**Kumasi:**

**A. Researchers**

Ben Keraita, Sanitation Engineer (IWMI)

Maxwell Akic, MSc. Env. Sciences (KNUST)

Grace A. Ziem, MSc. Env. Sciences (KNUST)

Lesley Hope, Research Assistant, Agric. Economist (IWMI)

Abdul Samed Amponsah, MPhil Agric. Economist (KNUST)

M.T. Asiamah, Agric. Economics (KNUST)

**B. Local Government**

Eli Kumatse, Acting Metropolitan Director of Agriculture (MoFA-AMA), Kumasi

**Tamale:**

**A. Researchers**

Dr. Gordana Kranjac-Berisavljevc (UDS)

Mr. Shaibu Abdul-Graniyu (UDS)

B. Local Community

Periurban Farmers using Faecal Sludge

C. International Partners

Dr. Robert Bos WHO, Geneva (by Telephone)

## **Indonesia**

### **JAKARTA**

The following members of the Jakarta city team were interviewed in Ottawa:

A. MercyCorps Indonesia:

Ms. Haryanti Koostanto, Team Leader

Mr. Juan Christie, HP3 Admin. Program Assist.

B. North Jakarta Municipality

Mr. Budi Santoso, Head of sub-district Penjaringan

### **TANGERANG**

A. BEST (Integrated Economic and Social Development Institute):

Hamza Harun AlRasyid, Director

Ilhamsyah Lubis, Social Development Expert,

B. BORDA Bremen Overseas Research and Development Association in Yogyakarta

Surur Wahyudi, Program Coordinator

### **BALI**

Denpasar

A. BALIFOCUS

Yuyun Yunia Ismawati, Director

B. Planning Board of Denpasar

A.A. BGS. Sudharsana, Chair

Temesi

A. GUS Foundation:

Budi Wirayadnya, project leader

Made Kushandari, assistant project leader

Ani Yulinda, research/program officer

Made Nurbawa, socialization staff

Ari Astiti, research staff

B. Rotary Club of Ubud:  
David Kuper, project leader from

## **Sri Lanka**

A. Colombo Municipal Council

Gamini Chandrasena, Deputy Municipal Commissioner (Professional Services)  
Visaka Dias, Deputy Municipal Commissioner (Engineering Services)  
Thamara Mallawaarachchi, Director Engineering (Development)  
Chaminda Gankewala – project coordinator

S.G.V.H. Gunasekara, Director Engineering (Water Supply and Drainage)

Dr. Mahinda Balasuriya, Deputy Chief Officer of Health  
Dr. Ruwan Wijayamuni, Deputy Chief Medical Officer of Health (Environmental Health)  
Public Health Department

B. CEPA Centre for Poverty Analysis

Azra Abdul Cader, Poverty Assessment & Knowledge Management Program  
Development and Rural Livelihoods

KIH Sanjeevanie, Junior Professional, Poverty Impact Monitoring Program  
Arunika Meedeniya, Professional, Knowledge Management Program

C. SEVANATHA Urban Resource Centre

H.M.U. Chularathna, Executive Director

K.A. Jayaratne, President

## **Argentina**

A. Researchers

Ana Hardoy (Project Team Leader) IEED-AL  
Gaston Urquiza (Field Project Manager) IEED-AL  
Joreglina Hardoy (Project Assistant) IEED-AL

B. Community project Partners

Sergio Cara (Moreno Citizen)  
Olga Mambrini (Moreno Citizen)  
Sergio Ireba (NGO, Moreno Citizen)  
Isvoldo Barrovena (Casa de Rosita, Moreno Citizen)  
Gauna Silvia (Mujeres al Frente, Moreno Citizen)  
Mapel Zapata (Asociacion Civil Labranza de Moreno)

Valeria Pennone Centro Cristiano Victoria)

C. Local Government: Municipalidad de Moreno:

○ Obras Publicas:

Julio Alberto Lequizamon (Team leader)

Guillermo Roig (Team member)

Romero Diego (Team member)

Boquete Hernan (Team member)

○ Planning department:

Liliana Martucci

Marta Geada (Planning department)

D. Local NGO

Elsa Arias (Casa de Mujeres)

Silvia Duarte (Casa de Mujeres)

## **Peru**

A. Researchers

Jorge Price (Director, IPES)

Cecilia Castro (Team Leader)

Alain Santandreu (Team member)

Gunther Merzthal (Team member)

Gordon Prain (CIP/Urban Harvest Director)

B. Local Community

Stakeholders (Villa María del Triunfo, Llanavilla: Lima periurban area)

C. FCRI Lima Project Team:

Gabriel Soplin (Sociologist)

Blanca Contreras (Communicator)

Miguel Guisado (Economist)

Juan Carlos Calizaja (Architect)

## **Jordan**

### **Amman (9)**

Jerash project:

A. Royal Scientific Society

Moayed K. Assayed

M.Sc. Environmental Science and Management

Royal Scientific Society – Environmental Research Centre

Sahar Dalahmeh

M.Sc. Environmental Eng.

Royal Scientific Society – Environmental Research Centre

Nisreen D. Al-Hmoud, PhD  
Head of Water Studies Division  
Royal Scientific Society – Environmental Research Centre

B. WHO

Mazen Malkawi  
Technical Information Officer  
WHO / Regional Centre for Environmental Health Activities

Karak project:

A. INWRDAM:

Dr. Murad Jabay Bino  
Executive Director  
The Inter-Islamic Network on Water Resources Development and Management  
An Autonomous Intergovernmental Organization

Shihab Najib Al-Beiruti  
Head of Services and Programs Section  
The Inter-Islamic Network on Water Resources Development and Management

Fyrial E.N. Rabadi, Engineer

B. Community representatives and beneficiaries:

Ms. Iman Al Amer, Elected president of the Women Cooperative Association of the Amer and Jadaa Villages in Al Moujib, Talal Municipality.  
Dr. Ibrahim Al Amer, local coordinator and activist.

List of IDRC Staff Interviewed:

1. Francois Gasengayire, Senior Program Officer IDRC, EARO
2. Naser Faruqi
3. add

## **Appendix 3 - Sample Interview Questions Used**

### **PART ONE: INTERVIEW QUESTIONS FOR FIELD STAFF**

#### History of Project Development

1. Who proposed the project – how was the idea developed?
2. Any previous history to the project – earlier phases? other donors support in past?
3. What role have you played in the project /RSP / activity to date?

#### Communication

4. Interaction and Collaboration with IDRC - how does this work?
5. Problems with Communication and language issues?
6. Coordination with government? yes/no/how?
7. Coordination with non-governmental groups? yes/no/how?
8. How is information disseminated/shared, with stakeholders? With government? With communities? With IDRC?
9. What sorts of outputs are you envisioning for this project? What sorts of outputs have already been produced?

#### Benefits of the Project

10. How would you describe the benefits of this project overall? To you? To the city and communities? To government? To IDRC?
11. Policy relevance – do you see this project as having impact on policy? If so how? If not, why not?
12. How would you describe the project results in terms of building capacity? (for example in yours and your research teams? In community organizations you might be working with? In local government? etc.)
13. What impact do you anticipate?
14. Is there influence on technology development as a result of this project?
15. Are there any changes in relationships between the research community and government as a result of this project? Community? Can you describe this?
16. Are there any specific improvements you can point to that are directly related to the prospectus of the UEP? Which are those?

#### Problems and Successes

17. How would you judge the success of this project? What are the most outstanding successes you see?
18. What are the most critical problems arising?



19. Have there been adjustments in the research as a result? Adjustments in the objectives of the project? Adjustments in timeframe/completion
20. Can you identify any risks associated with the project?
21. What might you do differently next time?
22. Is the timeframe sufficient?
23. Is the site selection correct? Are there other better sites you might have chosen?
24. What are/will be the major research findings? How will these be communicated and what kind of reach will they have in the city/country/region?
25. Who is the intended audience for your research results?
26. Do you foresee new ideas emerging from this work ? Can you describe these?
27. Will this research have policy influence? If so how will this link to policy occur?

What actions should be taken as a result of this interview?

---

## **PART TWO: INTERVIEW QUESTIONS FOR KEY INTERNATIONAL PARTNERS**

1. What have been the main areas of collaboration between your organization and IDRC's Program, "Urbanization, Environment and Poverty (UEP)"?
2. What role did UEP play in the collaboration? How successful has UEP been in this particular case? What do you think are the main successes or constraints for UEP?
3. How familiar are you with the overall program of UEP and its objectives (research, capacity building and policy development)? Do you have any comments on how well UEP is achieving its objectives?
4. What is your overall assessment of the UEP program? What are its main successes and failures? What should it do differently in the future?

---

## **PART THREE: INTERVIEW QUESTIONS FOR TEAM (TL) AND PROGRAM OFFICER (PO)**

### History of Project Development

28. Who proposed the project – how was the idea developed?
29. Any previous history to the project – earlier phases? other donors support in past?
30. What role have you played in the project /RSP / activity to date?

### Communication

31. Interaction and Collaboration with Local partners - how does this work?
32. Problems with Communication and language issues?
33. Coordination with government? yes/no/how?

34. What sorts of outputs are you envisioning for this project? What sorts of outputs have already been produced?

#### Benefits of the Project

35. How would you describe the benefits of this project overall? To you? To communities? To government? To IDRC?
36. Policy relevance – do you see this project as having impact on policy? If so how? If not, why not?
37. What impact do you anticipate?
38. Is there influence on technology development as a result of this project?
39. Are there any specific improvements you can point to that are directly related to the prospectus of the UEP? Which are those?

#### Problems and Successes

40. How would you judge the success of this project? What are the most outstanding successes you see?
41. What are the most critical problems arising?
42. Have there been adjustments in the research as a result? Adjustments in the objectives of the project? Adjustments in timeframe/completion
43. Can you identify any risks associated with the project?
44. What might you do differently next time?
45. Is the timeframe sufficient?
46. Is the site selection correct? Are there other better sites you might have chosen?
47. Who is the intended audience for your research results?
48. What actions should be taken as a result of this interview?

---

### **PART FOUR: INTERVIEW QUESTIONS FOR FOCUS CITY PROJECTS**

#### History of Project Development

49. Who proposed the project – how was the idea developed?
50. Any previous history to the project – earlier phases? other donors support in past?
51. What is the main focus of this project related to the prospectus of the UEP Program?

#### Communication

52. Interaction and Collaboration with IDRC - how does this work?
53. Problems with Communication and language issues?

- 54. Coordination with government? yes/no/how?
- 55. What sorts of outputs are you envisioning for this project? What sorts of outputs have already been produced?

#### Benefits of the Project

- 56. How would you describe the benefits of this project overall? To you? To communities? To government? To IDRC?
- 57. Policy relevance – do you see this project as having impact on policy? If so how? If not, why not?
- 58. What impact do you anticipate?
- 59. Is there influence on technology development as a result of this project?
- 60. Are there any specific improvements you can point to that are directly related to the prospectus of the UEP? Which are those?
- 61. How exactly does the project contribute to poverty alleviation?
- 62. How does the project contribute to improve the urban environment?

#### Problems and Successes

- 63. How would you judge the success of this project? What are the most outstanding successes you see?
- 64. What are the most critical problems arising?
- 65. Have there been adjustments in the research as a result? Adjustments in the objectives of the project? Adjustments in timeframe/completion
- 66. Can you identify any risks associated with the project?
- 67. What might you do differently next time?
- 68. Is the timeframe sufficient?
- 69. Is the site selection correct? Are there other better sites you might have chosen?
- 70. Who is the intended audience for your research results?
- 71. What are the current and the anticipated challenges faced by the project?
- 72. What actions should be taken as a result of this interview?

## APPENDIX 4 – List of Desk Review Projects

Project number	Project title
102769	Urban Greening Partnership Project in Sri Lanka : Outcomes and Lessons Learned
102730	Scoping Study on Urban Agriculture Research in Asia (Focus Cities Selection - 2005)
103204	Benefits and Risks of Wastewater Reuse for Agriculture in Urban and Peri-Urban Areas in Nairobi
103307	Regional Training Course in Urban Vulnerability and Prevention to Natural Disaster for Municipalities
104453	Integrated Approach to Research on Water, Sanitation, and Solid Waste Management in Small Urban Centres in Lake Victoria Region of Kenya
103801 (FC)	Villes ciblées - Décharge de Mbeubeuss: Analyse des impacts et amélioration des conditions de vie et de l'environnement à Diamalaye (Malika), Dakar
103798	International Workshop on Housing, Urban Poverty and Environment
103871	International Meeting for the Presentation of Municipal Integrated Solid Waste Management (ISWM) Plan and Project Proposals for Cities of LAC
104395 (FC)	Focus City - Urban waste management in the city of Cochabamba, Bolivia
103866	Successful Research Experiences of Municipal Environmental Management Policies Suitable for Small and Medium Sized Cities in LAC
103684	Moreno Focus City Video (Argentina)
103408	Strengthening a Municipal Disaster Prevention Information System for Latin America and the Caribbean
104777	Grey Water Use in the MENA Region - Proceedings of the Aqaba Meeting
103982	Focus Cities Phase II: Support for Selection of MENA-LAC Focus City Projects
103868	Book: Integrated Urban Vulnerability and Risk Management in Latin America and the Caribbean
102757	Graywater Use in the MENA Region - Experts Meeting
100980	Grey Water Treatment & Reuse in West Bekaa, Lebanon.
103318	Greywater Video for World Water Forum (WWF)
104457	Dissemination of Research Results for Urban Poverty and Environment PI Funded Projects
104464	IDRC-UPE Involvement at the Fourth World Urban Forum, Nanjing, China
103799	Dissemination of Research Results for Urban Poverty and Environment PI Funded Projects
103710	ECOPOLIS Graduate Research and Design Competition
103076	Capacity Building for Cities Farming for the Future (RUAF II)

## Appendix 5 List of Participants in Focus City Ottawa Learning Forum

NOTE: While informal discussions and participation in plenaries allowed for the team to meet all the FC representatives, in addition, formal interviews (marked \*) were also held with five Focus City Research Teams

FC PROJECT	NAME		TITLE	AFFILIATION
FC Ariana Soukra *	Monsieur Moez	Bouraoui	Chargé du projet	Fédération Tunisienne des clubs UNESCO/ALECSO
FC Ariana Soukra *	Monsieur Boubaker	Houman	Coordonateur du projet	Fédération Tunisienne des clubs UNESCO/ALECSO
FC Ariana Soukra *	Madame Amel	Triki Mzah		Vice-Mayor Soukra
FC Cochabamba*	David	Mamani Cano	Vice-President	Scavengers of K'ara K'ara Land Fill
FC Cochabamba*	Gregory	Paz Balderrama		Sociedad de Gestión Ambiental Bolivia (SGAB)
FC Cochabamba*	Marco Antonio	Pérez Luna		EMSA (Municipal Waste Collection Company)
FC Colombo	Mr. Gamini	Chandrasena	Project Leader	Colombo Municipal Commission, Deputy Commissioner
FC Colombo	Mr. Senarath	Gunasekara	Director of Eng. Drainage	Colombo Municipal Commission; Water supply & drainage
FC Colombo	Ms Visaka	Dias	Municipal Commissioner Engineering Services	Colombo Municipal Commission
FC Colombo	Ms Thamara	Mallawaarachchi,	Director Engineering Development	Colombo Municipal Commission
FC Colombo	Mr. Chaminda	Gankewala	Project coordinator	Colombo Municipal Commission
FC Colombo	Dr. Mahinda	Balasuriya	Deputy Chief Officer of Health	Colombo Municipal Commission

FC Colombo	Dr. Ruwan	Wijayamuni	Deputy Chief Medical Officer of Health	(Environmental Health) Public Health Department
FC Colombo	Ms Azra	Abdul Cader	Poverty Assessment & Knowledge Management Program	CEPA Centre for Poverty Analysis
FC Colombo	Ms KIH	Sanjeewanie	Junior Professional Poverty Impact Monitoring Program	CEPA Centre for Poverty Analysis
FC Colombo	Ms Arunika	Meedeniya	Professional, Knowledge Management Program	CEPA Centre for Poverty Analysis
FC Colombo	Mr. H.M.U.	Chularathna	Executive Director	SEVANATHA Urban Resource Centre
FC Colombo	Mr. K.A.	Jayaratne,	President	SEVANATHA Urban Resource Centre
FC Dakar *	Dr. Oumar	Cissé	Project Leader	Institut Africain de Gestion Urbaine (IAGU)
FC Dakar *	Mr. Ibrahima	Diagne		Urban Community of Dakar (CADAK)
FC Dakar *	Pape Mar	Diallo		Environment and Development Action in the Third World (Tiers Monde/Ecopole) (ENDA-TM)
FC Jakarta *	Mrs. Haryanti	Koostanto	HP 3 Project Manager	Mercy Corps
FC Jakarta *	Mr. Indrawan	Prabaharyaka	HP 3 Technical Field Assistant	Mercy Corps
FC Jakarta *	Mr. Budi	Santoso	Head of sub-district Penjarangan (HP3's project's target area)	Mayor of Jakarta
FC Kampala	Mrs. Semwanga Margaret Joy	Azuba		Member of Kampala City Council

FC Kampala	Shuaib	Lwasa	Project Leader	Consultative Group on Int'l Agricultural Research (CGIAR)
FC Kampala	Moses	Nadiope	Community leader/representative	
FC Lima*	Gina Gabriel	Chambi Echegaray	Project Leader	Metropolitan Planning Institute, Lima
FC Lima *	Carlos	Esteban Escalante Estrada	Co Director	Urban Development Institute-CENCA CF Lima, Margen Izquierda del Río Rímac
FC Lima *	Ms Yris	Silva Mantero		[Representative of Mayor's office in MIRR]
FC Moreno	Ms Ana	Hardoy	Team Leader	Int'l Institute for Env't & Dev't (IIED)
FC Moreno	Mr. Julio	Leguizamon	Head of Solid Waste Management Unit of the Municipality	Moreno Municipality Public Works
FC Moreno	Mr. Gaston	Urquiza	Researcher	Int'l Institute for Env't & Dev't (IIED)



## Appendix 6: Thematic Distribution of UPE Projects

Dominant Theme	Project Title	Project Number	Location
Urban Agriculture  <u>Total 17 projects</u>	Scaling-up Urban Agricultural Innovations and Food Security Systems in The Gambia and Sierra Leone	103202	Gambia and Sierra Leone
	Greywater Video for World Water Forum (WWF)	103318	Global
	Non-Treatment Options for the Safe Use of Wastewater in Irrigated Agriculture	102732	Jerash, Jordan
	Greywater Use in the MENA Region - Experts Meeting	102757	MENA
	Greywater Use in the MENA Region - Proceedings of the Aqaba Meeting	104777	MENA Region
	Organizations of Small Peri- Urban Agricultural Producers: Towards a better understanding of low-income producer organizations	102681	Rome, Madagascar (Global)
	Health Risk Analysis of Cryptosporidiosis and other Hazards in Urban Smallholder Dairy Production, Dagoretti, Nairobi, Kenya	103075	Nairobi
	Benefits and Risks of Wastewater Reuse for Agriculture in Urban and Peri-Urban Areas in Nairobi	103204	Nairobi
	Enhancing Capacity for Innovation, Increasing Productivity and Access to Markets by Peri-Urban Producer Organizations in Latin America	104347	Lima, Peru
	Capacity Building for Cities Farming for the Future (RUAF II)	103076	Global
	Research Information Services for Urban Agriculture and Environment in Kenya	103206	Kenya
	Guidelines for Presenting the Governador Valadares' Case Study at an International Conference	103249	LAC
	Guidelines for Marwan Owaygen's Participation in the Short Course on Urban Agriculture	103458	MENA
	Support for Publication of Urban Agriculture: Food, Jobs & Sustainable Cities (2nd Edition)	103620	Global
	Resources on Gender and Urban Agriculture	103803	Global
	Rainwater and Greywater Harvesting in Urban and Peri-Urban Agriculture in Ariana-Soukra, Tunisia	104396	Tunis

	Atelier d'intégration de pratiques et activités productives au cadre bâti des quartiers populaires de Dakar, au Sénégal	104398	Dakar
Urban Agriculture WatSan	Non-Treatment Options for the Safe Use of Wastewater in Irrigated Agriculture	102732	Accra, Kumasi and Tamale, Ghana
Waste management Urban Agriculture	Focus City - Building a Sustainable, Cohesive Community Through Waste Recycling and Agro-Enterprise	103794	Kampala, Uganda
WatSan Waste management  <u>Total 10 projects</u>	Focus Cities Phase II: Support for Selection of MENA-LAC Focus City Projects	103982	MENA-LAC
	Focus City – Economic Incentives for Improved Water, Sanitation, and Solid Waste Services	103796	Jakarta
	Focus City – Community-based Assessment and Improvement of Living Environment in Underserved Settlements	103795	Colombo
	Focus City - Easing Environmental Burdens in Informal Settlements and Peri-Urban Zones: From Diagnosis to Collaborative Action in Moreno, Argentina	103554	Moreno, Argentina
	Support for Focus City Teams at the World Urban Forum 2006	103683	Global
	Moreno Focus City Video (Argentina)	103684	LAC
	Focus City Capacity Building for Monitoring Outcomes	103981	Asia
	Focus Cities Phase I: Capacity Building for Economic Analysis	103983	Global
	Focus City - Integrated & participatory research aimed at reducing vulnerability, poverty and environmental loads in Cercado de Lima, Peru	104397	Peru
	Integrated Approach to Research on Water, Sanitation, and Solid Waste Management in Small Urban Centres in Lake Victoria Region of Kenya	104453	Kenya
Waste Management  <u>Total 10 projects</u>	Decentralized Urban Solid Waste Management in Indonesia	103074	Tanjerang and Denpasar in Bali
	Replicable Waste Recycling Project in Gianyar, Bali	103797	Gianyar, Bali
	International Meeting for the Presentation of Municipal Integrated Solid Waste Management (ISWM) Plan and Project Proposals for Cities of LAC	103871	LAC
	International Workshop for the assessment of Integrated Urban Solid Waste Management	103503	LAC
	Training Course for Municipal Technicians in Urban Integrated Solid Waste Management in cities of Latin America and the Caribbean	103512	LAC
	Villes ciblées - Décharge de Mbeubeuss: Analyse des impacts et amélioration des conditions de vie et de l'environnement à Diamalaye (Malika), Dakar	103801	Dakar
	Tutorial Exercise for the Preparation of Integrated Solid Waste Management Plans in 3 cities of LAC	103865	LAC
	Audiovisual: Integrated Solid Waste Management-Source of Jobs and Energy for Municipalities in Latin America and the Caribbean	103867	LAC
	Regional meeting for the assessment of preliminary results of two projects on Integrated Urban Solid Waste Management	103869	LAC

	Pilot Project for the Establishment of a Regional Clearing House Mechanism for Integrated Solid Waste Management in LAC cities	103870	LAC
WatSan Vulnerabilities to natural disasters	Successful Research Experiences of Municipal Environmental Management Policies Suitable for Small and Medium Sized Cities in LAC	103866	LAC
Vulnerabilities to natural disasters	Regional Training Course in Urban Vulnerability and Prevention to Natural Disaster for Municipalities	103307	LAC
	Strengthening a Municipal Disaster Prevention Information System for Latin America and the Caribbean	103408	LAC
Total 8 projects	Duplication, Packaging and Distribution of a Digital Video Disk Documentary Audiovisual on Urban Vulnerability to Natural Disaster	103319	LAC
	Support to Local Authorities to Implement Risk Management Systems in Central American Cities	103465	LAC
	Virtual Distance Training Course in Urban Vulnerability and Prevention of Natural Disasters in Cities of Latin America and the Caribbean	103597	LAC
	International Workshop on Integrated Risk and Vulnerability Management in Municipalities of Latin America and the Caribbean	103678	LAC
	Book: Integrated Urban Vulnerability and Risk Management in Latin America and the Caribbean	103868	LAC
	Integrated Environmental Management System (SIGA) Dissemination: Manual and Documentary Audiovisual	103997	Global
Multi			
Total 11 projects	ECOPOLIS Graduate Research and Design Competition	103710	Global
	Support for Agropolis II Publication	104341	Global
	Mentoring City Teams in Asia and Africa: Introduction to the Urban Participatory Research and Communication Program	103078	MULTIREG
	Environmental Management Secretariat, Phase II	103333	LAC
	Publication and distribution of two issues of the International Magazine "Milenio Ambiental"	103601	LAC
	Mentoring MENA and LAC Focus City Teams on Research Proposal Development, and Urban Participatory Research and Communication Methodology	103685	Global
	Establishment of a Regional Environmental Information System - Clearing House for Municipalities of the Latin America and the Caribbean Region	103688	LAC
	International Workshop on Housing, Urban Poverty and Environment	103798	Global
	Dissemination of Research Results for Urban Poverty and Environment PI Funded Projects	103799	Global
	Dissemination of Research Results for Urban Poverty and Environment PI Funded Projects	104457	Global
	IDRC-UPE Involvement at the Fourth World Urban Forum, Nanjing, China	104464	Global
WatSan	Regional Workshop for the assessment of sustainable water management projects in cities of Latin America and the Caribbean	103595	LAC

## Appendix 7 - Biographies of the Reviewers

### **Axel W. Drescher**, PhD

Professor of Geography, Consultant

Axel Drescher did his PhD in Geography, Faculty of Geosciences, University of Freiburg, on the Ecology of Greenhouse-Landscapes in Southern Spain in 1988. He became an extension officer in participatory extension for biological plant protection for two years. He moved to Zambia in 1990 and became Lecturer at the Department of Geography, University of Zambia (1990-93). During this time he did research on Vegetable Production, Homegardening and Solid Waste Management in Zambia and Zimbabwe. This resulted in his German University Teaching Degree for Geography (Habilitation) on „African Homegardens - Self Management of Sustainable Production Systems and Strategies of Food Security in Zambia and Zimbabwe“ in 1996. In 1994 he became the coordinator of the “Section on Applied Geography of the Tropics and Subtropics (APT) at the Institute for Physical Geography at the University of Freiburg, which deals with development in a interdisciplinary and holistic way, always combining social science and natural science approaches. Since 1992 he worked in the field of urban and periurban agriculture and city development in Africa, Asia and Latin America. He became a consultant for the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) in Rome from 1998 to 2003 mainly dealing with urbanization and food security and coordinated the “Electronic Conference on Urban and periurban Agriculture on the Policy Agenda”. He was an executive member of the Latin American Network for Urban Agriculture Research (AGUILA) (1998 – 2004) and a member of the Steering Committee of the South East Asia Network for periurban Development (PUDSEA) (2000 – 2004).

Since 2002 he got involved in several development projects, the EU funded “GIS-based Urban Environmental Resources Management and Food Security Project (The Philippines)”, “Networking to Promote the Sustainable Production and Marketing of Indigenous Vegetables through Urban and Periurban Agriculture in Sub-Saharan Africa – IndigenoVeg”, the BMZ funded Project “Ensuring Health and Food Safety from Rapidly Expanding Wastewater Irrigation in South Asia” with IWMI and ILRI in India and Pakistan, the GTZ funded projects on “Risk Assessment of extreme Precipitation in the coastal Areas of Chennai as Element of Catastrophe Prevention” and “Risk Assessment of Floods in Antananarivo, Madagascar”.

He was involved in the evaluation of major global programs for urban agriculture support (FAO, IDRC, RUAF) and EU funded education programs and is advisor to several development agencies. His publication record covers around 90 publications on different development aspects like homegardens and allotment gardens for development, urbanization and food security, environmental pollution, landscape transformation, risk assessment and flooding, periurban landscapes and others.

### **Riadh R. Tappuni**, PhD

Architect, Urban Planner

Director; Development & Design International

[www.dev-des.com](http://www.dev-des.com)

Toronto based consultant in international development with over thirty years of experience in urban issues. In his capacity as United Nations Regional Advisor on Urban Development and Housing and Leader of Urban Development & Housing Policies Team he advised governments and municipalities on issues of urban management & development. Dr Tappuni has extensive field experience in post disaster reconstruction, particularly with communities emerging from conflict covering Lebanon, Kosovo and Iraq. He has made many contributions on planning for urban inclusion. Drafted the Strategy for an Inclusive Dubai as consultant for the Dubai Government. Many field projects & over forty publications on sustainable urban development,

environmental planning, and post conflict reconstruction. Dr. Tappuni has extensive experience in the design, management, monitoring and evaluation of development programs and projects for the poor.

### **Patricia L. McCarney, PhD University of Toronto**

Professor Patricia McCarney received her Ph.D. in International Development and Planning in the Department of Urban Studies and Planning from M.I.T. in 1987. Most recently, she served as Associate Vice President, International Research and Development at the University of Toronto. She is currently Associate Professor of Political Science at the University of Toronto, and Director of the Global Cities Programme at the University's Munk Centre for International Studies. She has over twenty years experience in the field of international development, specializing in cities and governance. Her teaching and research is concentrated on urban governance, urban poverty, politics and planning in cities of Asia, Africa and Latin America, cities and the environment, local government and global cities in comparative perspective.

Before joining the University of Toronto, between 1983 and 1994, Professor McCarney worked as a professional staff member in a number of international agencies, including the International Development Research Centre in Ottawa, the World Bank in Washington, and the United Nations Centre for Human Settlements (UN-HABITAT) in Nairobi.

As part of her professional work in these international funding agencies, she worked in some 30 countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America. These years of professional work concentrated on strengthening institutions of higher learning throughout the less developed countries, instituting policy reform in the field of cities and governance, funding international social science research, and pursuing research on land, environment, housing and urban poverty. At the time of joining the University of Toronto in the 1990s, she assisted South Africa (Office of then President Nelson Mandela) to write their National Urban Policy and has continued to work on international urban development over the past fifteen years.

In addition to four books – *Cities and Governance: Asia, Africa and Latin America in Comparative Perspective* (ed.); *The Changing Nature of Local Government in the Developing World* (ed.); *Governance on the Ground: Innovations and Discontinuities in Cities of the Developing World* (co-edited with Richard Stren); and, *Creating Knowledge, Strengthening Nations: The Role of Higher Education* (co-edited with Glen Jones and Michael Skolnick), Patricia McCarney is the author of numerous articles and papers on these subjects. Her newest book nearing completion on urban poverty is tentatively titled, *Space, Economy and Cities: A Case Based Perspective from India*.

## **Appendix 8: Documents Consulted**

The UPE documentation review was in large part facilitated by the reviewers' access to Livelink and IDRC's intranet. The documents reviewed include a range of documents including the corporate and program area documentation, in particular the UPE Prospectus report (Urban Poverty and Environment Proposed Prospectus 2005-2010, Program and Partnership Branch, International Development Research Centre, Ottawa, Canada February 22, 2005) All project documents for projects reviewed in-depth - including PADs, progress and final reports, trip reports, rolling PCRs, monitoring and evaluations and final publications; lists of UPE projects and research support projects, focus cities reports; the list of UPE staff and their biographies to better understand their disciplinary and professional interests; a sampling of project outputs, other evaluation reports (ex RUAF external evaluation report); and staff trip reports and correspondence on projects; and any previous external review reports.

**In addition to these standard documents as listed above reviewed for each in-depth project being reviewed, other documents consulted include:**

### **On the Focus Cities projects**

#### **General:**

- Urban Poverty and Environment (UPE) Program Initiative, Focus Cities Research Program, WORKING OPERATIONAL PLAN, APRIL 2007
- Risk Assessment
- MONITORING FRAMEWORK - Focus Cities Research Initiative (FCRI), last updated: Sept. 10, 2007.

#### **Dakar, Senegal**

##### **Projet No: 103 801**

##### **Project Title: First Monitoring Report, Novembre-Février 2007 by François Gasengayire**

- Projet 103 801 First Quarterly Report Décharge de Mbeubeuss : Analyse des impacts et amélioration des conditions de vie des populations de Diamalaye à Malika dans la banlieue de Dakar Nov 2006- Feb 2007 by François Gasengayire
- Projet #103 801 Proposition Finale 15 Sept 2006
- Projet #103 801 Second Monitoring Report, Mar-Mai 2007 by François Gasengayire
- Projet #103 801 Third Monitoring Report, Mar-Mai 2007 by François Gasengayire
- Projet #103 801 PAD
- Projet #103 801 Second Quarterly Report Décharge de Mbeubeuss : Analyse des impacts et amélioration des conditions de vie des populations de Diamalaye à Malika dans la banlieue de Dakar Mar- Mai 2007 by François Gasengayire
- Projet #103 801 Fourth Monitoring Report by François Gasengayire

#### **JAKARTA, Indonesia**

##### **Project No: 103796**

**Project Title:** Focus City Jakarta, Economic Incentives for Improved Water, Sanitation, and Solid Waste Services in Jakarta, HP3/Lestari

IDRC Project Approval Document; 7 June, 2006.

MercyCorps, HP# IDRC Visit Agenda, May 27-28, 2008

MercyCorps, HP# City Consultation Agenda, May 27, 2008, North Jakarta Government Office

IDRC, Focus City Jakarta, Economic Incentives for Improved Water, Sanitation, and Solid Waste Services in Jakarta, HP3/Lestari Program, Quarterly Report, December 15, 2007

Healthy Places, Prosperous People (H3P): Realizing Economic benefits through Environmentally Sustainable Practices among Poor Jakarta Households, Proposal First Draft for Submittal to IDRC's Urban Poverty & Environment Program, February

IDRC, Focus City Jakarta, Economic Incentives for Improved Water, Sanitation, and Solid Waste Services in Jakarta, HP3/Lestari Program, Quarterly Report, June 15, 2007

MercyCorps – Indonesia, Focus City - Economic Incentives for Improved Water, Sanitation, and Solid Waste Services in Jakarta, Lestari Program Jakarta – Indonesia, Centre File 103796-001, September 15 – December 15, 2006

IDRC, 103796 Focus City – Economic Incentives for Improved Water, Sanitation, and Solid Waste Services in Jakarta, Project Approval Document

MercyCorps, Summary of Land Tenure Research Findings in Jakarta, urban bulletin no.2, March 2008

MercyCorps, Urban Poverty Reduction Strategy, urban bulletin no.1, March 2008

Report covering the period September 15, 2006 – December 14, 2006 on the Focus City Jakarta --- LESTARI Project by the MercyCorps Team.

## **COLOMBO, Sri Lanka**

**Project No: 103795**

**Project Title:** Focus City Colombo– Community-based Assessment and Improvement of Living Environment in Underserved Settlements

IDRC Project Approval Document; 16 June, 2006.

UNESCO-IHE, IDRC Urban Poverty and Environment, Focus Cities Research Program, Community-Based Assessment and Improvement of Living Environment in Underserved Settlements and the Environs; The Case of Gothami-Colombo (103795-001), prepared by Dr. Peter van der Steen, February 2008

Version for Proposal Improvement Workshop, 20 February 2006

Mark Redwood, Trip Report, Colombo, Sri Lanka, November 23 to December 8, 2006

Mark Redwood, Policy Map and Partnership Strategy, Sri Lanka, Colombo FCRI Project, October 6, 2006

Mark Redwood, Project Monitoring Report, Colombo FCRI Project 103795, June 17, 2007

IDRC, 103795 Focus City – Community-Based Assessment and Improvement of living Environment in Underserved Settlements and the Environs: The Case of Gothami-Colombo, Project approval Document

SEVANATHA – Urban Resource Centre, Annual Report – 2005 / 2006, January 2007

CEPA Centre for Poverty Analysis, Towards Independent and Policy relevant Poverty Analysis, Annual Report 2006

Colombo Municipal Council, Municipal Commissioner, Appointment of Project Steering Committee, Implementation Group, and Research, M&E Group for IDRC funded Gothami-Colombo Project

DFID/UNDP/UNHABITAT/UMP Urban Poverty Reduction Project, Poverty Profile, City of Colombo, Urban Poverty Reduction through Community Empowerment, Colombo, Sri Lanka, February 2002

Policy Framework and Operational Strategy, participatory Improvement of Under-Served Settlements in Colombo, Final Report, April 2005

Policy Map and Partnership Strategy, Sri Lanka, Colombo FCRI Project, Mark Redwood, October 6<sup>th</sup>, 2006

Confidential Project Monitoring Report, Colombo FCRI Project 103795, June 17, 2007, Mark Redwood

### **MORENO, Argentina**

#### **Project No: 103554**

**Project Title:** FCRI Moreno: Easing Environmental Burdens in Informal Settlements and Peri-Urban Zones: From Diagnosis to Collaborative Action in Moreno, Argentina.

First Quarterly Report on the Focus City Project 103554

FC Moreno quarterly report Oct 2006

Quarterly report December 2006 April 2007/first annual report

FC Moreno\_Quar\_Rep\_July\_Sep\_2007

<http://www.iiied-al.org.ar/home/bol/bol2.html>

Moreno Focus City Project - Public Update – August 2007: Paving the road for pilot projects in Moreno

FC Moreno Video



**KAMPALA, Uganda****Project No:** 103794**Project Title:** Kampala FCRI “Building a Sustainable, Cohesive Community Through Waste Recycling and Agro-Enterprises”

Final Proposal revised: Turning environmental burdens into livelihood benefits: building a sustainable neighbourhood through waste recycling, agro-enterprise and a cohesive community in Kampala, Uganda

City Networks session at WUF3 inspires Kampala Focus City Team, Alfred Geresom Musamali

Focus City Research Program, Quarterly Update Kampala, 31<sup>st</sup> December 2007

Focus City – Building a Sustainable, Cohesive Community Through Waste Recycling and Agro-Enterprises – Kampala. Reporting Period July 1<sup>st</sup> 2006 to June 30<sup>th</sup> 2007 and Reporting Period July 1<sup>st</sup> 2006 to December 31<sup>st</sup> 2006

FC Kampala Video

**LIMA, Peru****Project No:** 104397**Project Title:** FCRI Lima “Integrated & participatory research aimed at reducing vulnerability, poverty and environmental loads in Cercado de Lima, Peru”

IDRC Web site

Information provided by Anna Boschoi

FC Lima Video

**Plus documents consulted for the non-Focus Cities projects:****JAKARTA – TANGERANG, Indonesia****DENPESAR BALI, Indonesia****Project no:** 103074**Project title:** Decentralized Urban Solid Waste Management in Indonesia

IDRC, 103074 Decentralized Urban Solid Waste Management in Indonesia, Project Approval Document

IDRC, Interim Technical Report, Grant no. 103074-001, March 2008

Integrated City Sanitation Project, Concept Note for IDRC Prepared by BORDA

IDRC, Interim Technical Report, BORDA Indonesia, September 2006

Draft of project concept combined 05082005

IDRC, Interim Technical Report, Grant no. 103074-001, September 2007

IDRC, Interim Technical Report, Grant no. 103074-001, March 2007

IDRC, Interim Technical Report, Grant no. 103074-001, March 2008

BEST Profile

BORDA Profile

## **GIANYAR BALI, Indonesia**

**Project No:** 103797

**Project title:** Replicable Waste Recycling Project in Gianyar, Bali

IDRC Project Approval Document; September 2006.

IDRC, 103797 Replicable Waste Recycling Project in Gianyar, Bali, Project Approval Document

Temesi – Gianyar Waste Recovery Facility, brochure

Application for an IDRC Research Grant; Replicable Waste Recycling Project in Gianyar, Bali, 3<sup>rd</sup> Revision of Sep 2, 2006.

Trouble in Paradise, Bali's Model Waste Processing Facility in Gianyar, an essential CDM compost Project

SGS, UK Findings, CDM Validation issue 1; FINDINGS OVERVIEW; Findings from validation of *[GIANYAR WASTE recovery project]* October 2007.

The Gianyar Waste Project Composting Technology; David Kuper, 18 February, 2008.

## **JERASH, Jordan**

**Project No:** 102732

**Project Title:** Application and Adaptation of WHO Guidelines for the Safe Use of Wastewater, Excreta and Greywater in Low-income Urban Settings

IDRC Project Approval Document; 27 September, 2005.

IDRC, Studies of IDRC Supported Research on Greywater in Jordan Conducted by INWARDAM, October 2007

Education of the Future for the Future, Master of Science Program in Environmental Technology & Management

Royal Scientific Society, Environmental Research Center

IDRC, Guiding Urban Farmers to Safer Use of Wastewater, by Neale MacMillan, August 2007

Project Monitoring Report, 102732: Non-Treatment Options for the Safe Use of Wastewater in Irrigated Agriculture, December 1, 2007

World Health Organization, IDRC/WHO Project on Non-Treatment Options for the Safe Use of Wastewater in Agriculture in Poor Urban Communities in West Africa and the Eastern Mediterranean, First Progress Report over the period 1 May to 31 December 2006

World Health Organization, IDRC/WHO Project on Non-Treatment Options for the Safe Use of Wastewater in Agriculture in Poor Urban Communities in West Africa and the Eastern Mediterranean, Second Progress Report over the period 1 January to 31 December 2007

Greywater Treatment and Reuse, Tufileh, Jordan; project proposal by Murad Bino. 2000.

Report of the First Consultative Workshop on the WHO IDRC project "Non Treatment Options for Safe Waste Water Use in poor Urban Communities; Accra, Ghana, 4-7 December 2006.

Travel report Summary by Bos Robert, Nov. 2007

Environmental Research Center, Royal Scientific Society, Jordan, WHO/FAO/IDRC Project on Non-Treatment Options for the Safe Use of Wastewater in Agriculture in Poor Urban Communities, Power point presentation, 22-05-2008

RSS, Risk Assessment Households

Guiding Urban Farmers to Safer Uae of Waste Water; Neale McMillan, IDRC, August, 2007.

## **KARAK, Jordan**

**Project No: 101536**

**Project Title:** Greywater Treatmant and Use for Poverty Reduction in Jordan (Phase II)

IDRC Project Approval Document, 28 January, 2004.

Mark Redwood, Trip Report, Amman, Jordan and Cairo, Egypt, August 25<sup>th</sup> to September 4<sup>th</sup>

INWRDAM/PLAN:NET LIMITED (P:N), Second Technical Progress Report, covering project period from February 1 2004 to January 31, 2005

INWRDAM, Geywater Treatment and Reuse, Tufileh, Jordan

Greywater Treatment and Use for Poverty Reduction in Jordan (Phase II), Third Technical Progress Report, February 1<sup>st</sup> to August 31<sup>st</sup>, 2005.

KariaNet, Technology Transfer, Obstacles to Marketing and Adopted Methods, Cairo, Egypt, 28-31 October 2007

Project budget excel tables.

IDRC Budget grey water use MENA

**Application and Adaptation of WHO Guidelines for the Safe Use of Wastewater, Excreta and Greywater in Low-income Urban Settings (MENA)**

**Project Number** 102732 **Start Date** 2006/07/01 **Program Area/Group** ENRM | UPE

Project Monitoring Report 102732: Non-Treatment Options for the Safe Use of Wastewater in Irrigated Agriculture December 1, 2007

**KAMPALA, Uganda**

**Project No:** 102444

**Project Title:** “Kampala Edible Landscape project”

Making the Edible Landscape: Participatory Planning, Design and Development of Garden Neighbourhoods. FINAL Evaluation Report, Acacia Consulting & Research, Michel Frojmovic, March 6, 2007

Making the Edible Landscape: Participatory Planning, Design and Development of Garden Neighbourhoods. Mid-Term Evaluation Report, Acacia Consulting & Research, Michel Frojmovic, July 29, 2005

McGill Project Homepage <http://www.mcgill.ca/mchg/projects/edible/>  
Designing the Edible Urban Landscape, Neale MacMillan, August 2007

**Lima, Peru**

**Project No:** 104347

**Project Title:** ENHANCING INNOVATION, PRODUCTIVITY AND MARKET Access in three Periurban Producer Organizations in Latin America.

Segundo Informe Técnico de Avances Período: 16 Diciembre 2007 – 15 Marzo 2008: Actividades regionales: *En Villa María del Triunfo (Lima)*

Trip report, Walter Ubal Giordano, UPE, 2<sup>nd</sup> to 7<sup>th</sup> September, 2007  
IPES Web site

**Project No:** 104397

**Project Title:** FCRI Lima “Integrated & participatory research aimed at reducing vulnerability, poverty and environmental loads in Cercado de Lima, Peru”

IDRC Web site

Information provided by Anna Boschoi

**IDRC/FAO Project Urban and Peri-urban Agriculture: Towards a better understanding of low-income producers’ organizations (June 2005-June 2007)**

Technical report Grant No. 102681-001 Project: GCP/INT/955/CAN “Urban and peri-urban agriculture: Towards a better understanding of low-income producers’ organizations”

FAO, PAIA - Food for the Cities “Urban and peri-urban agriculture: Towards a better understanding of low-income producers’ organizations” GCP/INT/955/CAN LAUNCHING WORKSHOP (17-19 October 2005) PROCEEDINGS PART I (Rome, 10 February 2006)

Final Case Study Reports as submitted to the FAO Task Force. The Case Study Reports from website:

<http://faoidrc.wordpress.com/tag/documents-publications/>

Synthesis report <http://faoidrc.wordpress.com/tag/documents-publications/>

Final Workshop, 29-31 January 2007 in Rome at FAO

<http://faoidrc.wordpress.com/tag/outcomes-of-the-final-workshop/>

Final Report Mid Term Review RUAF-CFF March 2008 Cities Farming for the Future Program  
2 / 65

## **ACCRA, KUMASI & TAMALE, Ghana**

**Project No:** 102732

**Project Title:** “Non-Treatment Options for the Safe Use of Wastewater in Irrigated Agriculture”

Project Monitoring Report 102732: Non-Treatment Options for the Safe Use of Wastewater in Irrigated Agriculture, December 1, 2007

WHO Proposal to the International Development Research Center (IDRC), Ottawa, Canada, Adaptation and Application of WHO Guidelines for the Safe Use of Wastewater, Excreta and Grey water in Low-Income Urban Settings: Focus on Technical, Institutional and Managerial Aspects of Non-treatment Options

Evaluation of non-treatment options for maximizing public health benefits of WHO guidelines governing the use of wastewater in urban vegetable production in Ghana. Proposal submitted to WHO-IDRC, Robert Abaidoo and team, KNUST, Kumasi. Ghana

Minimizing health risks from using excreta and grey water by poor urban and peri-urban farmers in the Tamale Municipality, Ghana. A proposal submitted to WHO and IDRC by Gordana Kranjac-Berisavljevic, University for Development Studies (UDS), Tamale, on behalf of her team of partners

Trip reports Ann Thomas and Mark Redwood

IDRC/WHO Project on non-treatment options for the safe use of wastewater in agriculture in poor urban communities in West Africa and the eastern Mediterranean. First progress report over the period 1 May to 31 December 2006, WHO

WHO Non treatment options for the safe use of waste water in agriculture. WHO 2006.

## **Appendix 9**

### **LIST OF UPE TEAM MEMBERS INTERVIEWED**

All UPE Program Officers were interviewed with the exception of Ana Boischio who was not available at the time of the Ottawa interviews nor on the LARO field visits

Interviews with IDRC UPR staff included:

1. Mark Redwood (Senior Program Officer, Ottawa) with Suzanne Moccia
2. Marwan Owaygen (MERO - Senior Program Officer, Cairo) (telephone interview)
3. Walter Ubal Giordano (LACRO - Senior Program Specialist, Montevideo)
4. François Gasengayire (ESARO - Senior Program Officer, Nairobi, Kenya)
5. Naser Faruqui (UPE - Program Leader, Ottawa)
6. Jean d'Aragon (UPE - Senior Program Officer, Ottawa)

## Appendix 10

### PHOTOS FROM THE PROJECTS



Photo 1: Blocked Drainage system in Kampala area in Lima



Photo 2: Living conditions in the project

Photos: A. Drescher

### Surprises in Projects:

Suddenly major technical questions and investments may arise, e.g. relating to flood prevention or slum upgrading. In both cases major investments are needed, which go far beyond the program and project budget and the expertise of the project members. New approaches and project adjustments need to be looked in.



Photo 3: Pre implementation gutter



Jakarta Focus City:  
Photo 4: Post project implementation gutter  
(Photos: Riadh Tappuni)

### Visible Project progress:

Achieving the objective related to capacity building and community strengthening. First, the Jakarta Focus City project succeeds in achieving this objective by devising appropriate techniques that integrate environmental services solutions for the poor community of Kelurahan Penjaringan in North Jakarta. The project involves the community in three activities: water supply, sewage gutter cleaning and solid waste collection and recycling. Through participating in cleaning open gutters from solid waste, a sense of responsibility is created amongst the community and awareness of the importance of keeping such waste out of these channels, allowing for its fluidity and reducing its pollutant capacity. Families from the same community who used to scavenge on solid waste were assisted in formalizing solid waste separation for recycling and composting techniques and equipment was made available to them.



Photo 5: Gaza Camp in Jordan:  
Solid waste in grey water channels (Photo: Riadh Tappuni)

### **Fighting the root causes of environmental problems:**

The project titled *“Non-treatment options for the safe use of wastewater in irrigated agriculture”* being implemented in the Gaza Camp near Jerash in Jordan. Although the overall context of the project is the use of greywater in agriculture, which has a strong economic component, its roots and target lie in testing the application of the WHO guidelines for the use of greywater in irrigation. The broad objective is improved health protection. This project would benefit from addressing the physical development component. Much of the hazard emanates from the dumping of solid waste in the open gutters of greywater, creating a health risk and significantly reducing the efficiency of the greywater collection system. Due to the extreme



poverty in the camp, it would be beneficial to the project to establish a link between health and economic return.



Photo 6: New design-sifting machine built by IDRC funds replacing the old design in background.



Photo 7: Compost aeration fan and duct

Photos: “Replicable Waste Recycling in Temesi, Gianyar Bali”

### Successes in adapted technology development:

The “*Replicable Waste Recycling in Temesi, Gianyar Bali*” demonstrates how hands on operational research can result in the development of technologies that are suitable for the process and the circumstance. The specially designed and constructed sifting machine is a clear example of that achievement, as well as the whole facility planning (see Photos 6 and 7 in appendix 12). Introduction of forced aeration composting as a technique is new to Indonesia at this scale and can be considered a success in transfer of technology.



Photo 8: Electric float in filtered gray water barrel in Karak (Riadh Tappuni)



Photo 9: Improved Brick Making in Kampala (Axel Drescher)

The success rate of technologies used in the Jordan Karak Greywater reuse is not as clear and needs to be quantified. The process, however, is simple enough to use by the rural locals but the return on investment is probably too slow for them to feel its impact. It is important to

differentiate between the motivation to acquire and utilize donor assistance and the conviction by the community of the benefit of such an investment.



Photo 10: Waste segregation by colors in Kampala (Axel Drescher)

Simple but useful, is another approach in Kampala to facilitate waste segregation and recycling. This method has helped the local NGO involved to teach the community on how to sort the waste properly. Yellow colour is for metals and ceramics, blue is for plastics and green for the biodegradable wastes.



Photo 11: Composting at home in Denpasar, Bali (Riadh Tappuni)

The “*Jakarta FC*” project and the “*Denpasar Bali Integrated Decentralized City Solid Waste Management*” project are good examples of stakeholder partnership and participation where local authorities give clear support to the project and the communities are actively involved.

## Appendix 11

### List of Acronyms

CAD	Canadian Dollar
CFF	Cities Farming for the Future
CFP	Cities Feeding People
CIP	International Potato Centre
CRID	Regional Disaster Information Centre for Latin America and the Caribbean
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization
FC	Focus Cities
FCRI	Focus Cities Research Initiative
IAGU	Institut africain de gestion urbaine
IIED	Institute for Environment and Development
INWRDAM	Inter-Islamic Network on Water Resources Development and Management
IWMI	International Water Management Institute
KCC	Kampala City Council
KIEMP	Kampala Integrated Environmental Management Project
KIM	Knowledge and Information Management
LAC	Latin America and the Caribbean
MDP	Municipal Development Partnership
MENA	Middle East and Northern Africa
RAs	Research Assistantships
RIMISP	Latin American Center for Rural Development
RP	Research Projects
RSP	Research Support Projects
RUAF	Resource Centre for Urban Agriculture and Food Security
SIDA	Swedish International Development Agency
SIGA	Sistema Integrada de Gestion Urbana
SSA	Sub-Sahara Africa
UA	Urban Agriculture
UNDP	United Nations Development Program
UNEP	United Nations Environment Program
UPA	Urban and periurban Agriculture
UPE	Urban Poverty and Environment Program
WHO	World Health Organization
WUF	World Urban Forum

## ENDNOTES