

Practitioner Input Form  
Submitted: 15/02/2005

Input Record Number	020
Name	Robert Hope
Contact Information	Rob Hope – PhD Centre for Land Use and Water Resources Research (CLUWRR) 3 <sup>rd</sup> Floor – Devonshire Building University of Newcastle-upon-Tyne Newcastle NE1 7RU UK <a href="mailto:Robert.hope@ncl.ac.uk">Robert.hope@ncl.ac.uk</a>
Organisation(s) Involved	University of Newcastle-upon-Tyne, UK; CSIR- Environmental, RSA; University of Durham, UK; University of Kwa-Zulu Natal, RSA, Sokoine Agricultural University, Tanzania, Centre for Ecology and Hydrology, UK; Grenada Mistry of Agriculture; Indian Institute of Technology, Delhi; Winrock International, Delhi; Universidad Nacional de Cost Rica; Instituto Tecnologico de Costa Rica.
Geographic Area	Geographic focus: Costa Rica, Grenade, India, Tanzania, South Africa. Project: DFID/FRP/FLOWS cluster (3 linked projects) investigating management of upper water catchments to measurably improve the livelihoods of poor groups. Experience: Hydrological modelling; economic valuation; policy analysis; livelihoods analysis; integrated land and water resource management.
Dates	February 2001-2006
Communities Involved	Various
Duties and Responsibilities/ Purpose of Project	Socio-economic evaluation of land and water resource management at the catchment scale using combined quantitative and qualitative research methods.
Context of Intervention	Upper water catchment management to develop systems for equitable management of the capture and distribution of benefits (value) of upper forest and land zones to contribute to methods and approaches for improved water resource management that will allow greater access to clean water and reduce poverty.

## Practitioner Reflective Case Study

Input Record Number	020 RCS Robert Hope
<p>1) What mechanisms were put into place to ensure access of water for the poor, and could they be categorized as financial. Technological, social or institutional mechanisms?</p> <p>The FLOWS cluster is inter-disciplinary research that addresses water access and poverty reduction from a catchment perspective. The land-water interface is a primary lens from which hydrological models (HYLUC, ACRU, SWAT – technological mechanisms) assess a range of land use scenarios and their estimated impact on water resource. Based on this assessment of the water balance, approaches such as ‘allocation equity and green water policy instruments’ are being developed to better understand resource integrity from an integrated biophysical analysis. Linked to this assessment, social mechanisms attempt to better understand the priorities and preferences of the poor and how well water policy addresses those concerns. Life-history analysis and perceptions and beliefs qualitative approaches explore primary stakeholders past decision-making that influenced drivers of land use change. Household questionnaires explore livelihood assets and include stated choice methods (Conjoint analysis and choice experiments) that provide experimental exploration of the preferences of the poor to a range of policy scenarios (e.g. water quality, water quantity, land use options). Policy analysis includes willingness-to-pay estimates from HHs not connected to improved water supplies and the RSA Working for Water programme.</p>	
<p>2) What were your experiences with implementation and outcomes in regards to these mechanisms?</p> <p>Experience to date indicates that in a range of agro-ecological zones (semi-arid to tropical mountain cloud forest) the impact of forested land cover will alter the hydrological function with no (or uncertain) evidence of positive impacts on water resources in relation to alternative land uses. Outcomes reveal that insufficient attention to the land-water interface by only focusing on run-off may have considerable and significant impacts for nature and society.</p> <p>Social evaluation indicates that land access is often a more significant livelihood constraint than access to improved water for certain poor groups in study areas. Further, experimental approaches illustrate that the embedded nature of ‘clean water access’ may gloss over more knotty problems of delivery alternatives at the (rural) household level. Upgrading water access outside the home may not lead to reduced poverty if based on trade-off analysis of alternative and counterfactual arrangements. Global water policy needs to better address disjunctures between global policy goals and the priorities of heterogeneous poor groups at the sub-national level.</p>	
<p>3) What criteria were used to measure success and failure?</p> <p>Research hypotheses were evaluated in stated choice methodologies to permit understanding of a user evaluation of ‘success or failure’ before policy</p>	

implementation, i.e. ‘evidence-based policy-making’ rather than ‘policy-based evidence making’.

In India, paired catchment HH surveys of a treated and untreated watershed is currently being evaluated with longitudinal data to assess criteria for success/failure over time. How one isolates causality from association is a significant challenge in this respect.

- 4) What factors do you see as crucial in the implementation of pro-poor water interventions in connection with the specific characteristics of your experience?
  - a) Improved and more rigorous evaluation of the priorities and preferences of poor groups across development scenarios both within the water domain and outside it before implementation is approved;
  - b) Development of a ‘negotiation support system’ to better understand and inform policy based on social, economic and institutional criteria. This is being currently developed in Costa Rica and India;
  - c) Improved water resource management that understands and quantifies the resource base across time and space to inform policy development and management;
  - d) Strengthening the institutional linkages at the national and sub-national (province, state, district, etc.) to have more coherent and cooperative institutional arrangements in the water sector across inter-linked but often competing resource groups and government departments. (agriculture, industry, water services, land affairs, environment, energy, etc.);
  - e) Better understanding of water and poverty linkages. Is poverty best addressed by water policy interventions? China suggests (income) poverty reduction is about rural agricultural growth; DOWII studies in East Africa illustrate expensive water interventions have failed. Who decides if more and better quality water is what the poor need (see a))?

Practitioner Input – Part II

Input Record Number	020II Robert Hope
9)	Close liaison with government policy departments, international research institutes, general advocacy, targeted dissemination, etc.
10)	No response.
11)	See 4a).
12)	See 4.
13)	See our project reports (all available on request).