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A five-year learning project aimed at capacity-strengthening of scholars across nine sub-Saharan African countries to link family planning with urban development. It was designed to be multisectoral, using multidisciplinary approaches to bridge the family planning–urban development policy divide, with the ultimate goal of contributing to expanding efforts in sub-Saharan African cities to better meet the family planning needs of urban populations.

Thirteen research fellows, mainly working in demography/family planning, were selected by a competitive process and awarded grants for research and policy engagement/communications of around $60,000 each. They received region-based training in research translation and policy engagement with a sector that was new to them: urban development. Although the COVID pandemic interrupted data collection and impeded links with policy makers, the fellows published seventeen peer-reviewed journal articles, presented at both family planning and urban development regional and international conferences, and engaged a variety of urban actors at the city and national levels. They particularly appreciated IUSSP’s management of the project, the practical nature of the policy-engagement training, and the ability to make inroads to a new sector – although this was limited by the complexity of urban development and governance.

The project identified an important unmet need for training in policy engagement and effectively embedded that training in active research projects. Lessons learned included: an appreciation of the tension between building the research-translation capacity of junior researchers versus the objective of influencing senior policy makers; the need to brief researchers more fully on the new sector with which they are engaging; and the low priority given to interdisciplinary research in African universities. Drawing together fellows from different contexts was highly enriching. The project demonstrated that fellowship projects with research grants and mentorship in both research and policy are an effective way to foster the development of the next generation of leaders in low-income countries.
Objectives
This project’s substantive goal was to call attention to the value of family planning (FP) to urban policy agendas in sub-Saharan Africa (SSA) and South Asia by forging closer links between these two sectors. A parallel goal was to assess a new model of research funding on a small scale, with a prospect of future wider application. The project's specific objectives were: 1. strengthen the capacity of early- and mid-career scholars to produce and communicate policy-relevant research, 2. contribute to the evidence base needed to meet urban FP needs, and 3. raise the profile of FP in urban development policy discussions.

Organization
The project was managed by the International Union for the Scientific Study of Population (IUSSP) with the help of a part-time coordinator. The work was guided by a scientific advisory panel of nine experts (co-chaired by an urbanist and a demographer).

Implementation

1. Capacity-strengthening of early- and mid-career scholars

Scholars (henceforth fellows) were selected competitively in two waves. The advisory panel reviewed responses to IUSSP’s calls for concept papers. The most promising 25 authors of the 144 submissions were asked to develop a full proposal and invited to a two-day workshop where they received individual advice from panel members and associated experts to further improve proposals. The first workshop was held in Rwanda immediately before the 2018 International Conference on Family Planning (ICFP) and the second in Uganda on the eve of the 2019 African Population Conference (APC). Finalists then attended the respective conference as part of capacity-building. From among the revised proposals, the panel selected the best 16 applicants, four of whom were women and five of whom were Francophone, for funding, with an average grant of $48,000, ranging from $25,000 to $69,000. An additional average sum of $9,000 was made available for policy engagement. However, three of the 16 later had to withdraw because of change of circumstances. The geographical distribution of the 13 projects was: Burkina Faso (2); DR Congo; Ghana (2); Guinea; Kenya (2); Malawi; Nigeria (2); Tanzania; and Uganda. Surprisingly, few concept papers were received from South Asia and no projects from this region were funded.

Capacity-strengthening was constrained in 2020-21 by COVID-related travel restrictions (and subsequently by visa problems). Each fellow was assigned a research mentor, typically a senior academic living in the same country and suggested by the fellow. Mentors received a small honorarium on receipt of a report. In addition, fellows were encouraged to seek advice and comments on draft papers from panel members. All fellows were invited, with funding, to an IUSSP conference in Madeira (Portugal) in 2022, which featured panels and presentations on abortion and contraceptive transitions. Only six were able to attend because of visa problems. Fellows received feedback on short presentations on their future research plans.

The project placed special emphasis on the research-policy interface and the communication of results to relevant stakeholders. It engaged the African Population Health Research Center (APHRC) to deliver training thereon. Before COVID lockdown, three of the four first-wave fellows attended an IUSSP two-day workshop in Xiamen, China, immediately before the 2019 International Conference on Urban Health there. During lockdown, APHRC switched to four virtual workshops, on the themes of involving decision-makers, policy monitoring, creating compelling messages, and the role of evidence in policy-making. After lockdown, APHRC held an in-person training for nine fellows who attended the Africities Summit in Kenya in 2022. All fellows were invited to a workshop prior to the ICFP in Thailand in 2022 but, again mainly owing to visa difficulties, only five were able to attend.
Contribute to the evidence base

By mid-2023 fellows had published 17 papers in peer-review journals with many more under review or in draft form (see section 4 and appendix 1). In addition, six fellows were invited to present findings at the 2021 International Population Conference (IPC), two fellows presented at the 2021 Population Association of America meeting, and seven were invited to present at the 2022 ICFP, though only two could be there in person.

Raise the profile of family planning with urban-sector actors

Co-chairs, the coordinator, panel members, a specially recruited post-doctoral fellow, and the fellows contributed to this objective. At the local level, IUSSP assigned fellows an “urban partner” to facilitate policy influence. At regional and international levels, IUSSP organized panel sessions at major urban conferences in China, Kenya and Spain. The project commissioned a short video on FP-urban-development links and arranged for its screening at the conferences in Kenya and Spain, with amplification through social media. The project leadership and selected fellows published one open-access peer-reviewed article in the *Journal of Urban Health*, an important target audience, and another in *Development in Practice*.

Despite these successes, a report by Susan Parnell (advisory panel member) and James Duminy (the project’s post-doc), that the project specially commissioned, entitled “Influencing the urban policy agenda: A survey of expert opinion,” made it clear that it is not easy to introduce any new topic into the urban-focused Sustainable Development Goal 11 sector, and moreover that family planning and fertility hold their own specific challenges. Overall, our project demonstrated cross-sectoral research, policy analysis and outreach but cannot be said to have had a major impact on the SDG 11 community.

Raise profile of urban issues and needs with family planning sector actors

The most sustainable project impact in this category was that, at the initiative of project leadership, Demographic and Health Surveys (DHS) staff were persuaded to (a) conduct analyses of intra-urban differences in service uptake, including FP (*DHS Analytical Study No. 73* and *DHS Spatial Analysis Report No. 19*), and (b) add or revise DHS survey questions in order to improve the measurement of rural-urban mobility and to strengthen measurement of current use of contraceptive methods in view of evidence of underreporting of non-modern methods, particularly in urban West Africa. The project organized panel sessions at several population conferences including the ICFP in Kenya, the African Population Conference in Uganda and IUSSP’s IPC (see section 5 for details). Research fellows also spoke or presented posters at a number of these conferences as well as at Population Association of America meetings.
EVALUATION METHOD
Face-to-face individual interviews and a group discussion were conducted in late 2022 with six fellows who were attending a conference. Six additional fellows were individually interviewed virtually in early 2023. (One fellow was unavailable due to personal issues.) The interviewer had originally designed the project but was not involved in project management; the aim was that this distance from project management would enable the fellows to speak more freely. The interviewer assured anonymity in any presentation of interview results. Interviews lasted approximately one hour and were recorded and transcribed (into English if the interview had been in French). Questions covered: original goals, skills gained, mentors, policy engagement, networking, project’s weaknesses and strengths. Transcripts were analyzed by one of the advisory panel co-chairs.

FINDINGS
Linking research to policy
Apart from delays due to the pandemic, fellows largely completed their research successfully (see section 4). Those who worked with their academic mentors were satisfied with their support.

The project focused its capacity-building of fellows on enabling them as researchers to identify and communicate their research to policy-makers. Fellows felt they had learned a lot but that some of the training had come too early – before they started their policy outreach (which the pandemic delayed): ‘We were focused on policy before having results to communicate. We were focused on policy very early.’

Fellows especially appreciated the practical nature of the training on how to communicate with policy-makers:

‘Policy communications wasn’t completely new for me, but the practical aspects were not something I’d done before.’

‘Before this project, I didn’t take presentation skills very seriously… the focus on how to convince your audience, a non-academic one, has been eye-opening. …I apply that in my other projects too, lessons on needing a photo, doing a short pitch, limiting the number of slides. Previously I’d be stopped in the middle of a talk, or I’d have to rush through my best slides. Now, I know to have 10 slides for 10 minutes.’

‘We got a lot of really useful training. For me, what I’ve used most is on presentations. Before the training, I was clear but technical, using standard technical format for an academic. It didn’t matter if I was at a (scientific) conference or a ministry of health audience, I presented the same way. Training showed me a different way to present. I thought it was “unserious,” but I realized that one should change the presentation depending on the audience. I went to a dissemination workshop for another project; the audience appreciated that I didn’t bog them down.’

‘Now I know that for presentations to policy audiences, you should have a policy brief on the research.’

‘…we’ll integrate policy briefs systematically into our work at [their institution].’

‘Policy tracking is really key for my work, and knowledge of this will shape the policy analysis I will conduct in the [future].’

‘[The training] built my skills on strategic engagement and knowledge translation.’

‘I changed my view on research. Now, I work to encourage doing research that will be used.’
A key lesson was the value of **early engagement of policy-makers**: ‘If you don’t engage them [policy-makers] from the beginning, they may not accept your findings.’ Some even felt that policy-makers should be involved at the research-proposal-writing stage: ‘otherwise a policy-maker can think “you have the money; you’re just using me as a puppet.” It’s quite different to see who is really interested in the idea before application’. However, they also realize that: ‘There is a risk of early engagement. If you reach out to policy-makers, they think you want their expertise, but if your proposals don’t get accepted, policy makers can be unhappy if they feel their time was wasted.’

Moreover, some fellows felt they didn’t have sufficient time for such engagement: ‘If all our energy is on data collection and analysis, then there’s not enough time for policy engagement.’

Fellows learned how to deal with skepticism from policy-makers – even within their ‘own’ sector: ‘The [national] Director of Primary Health said: “you’re crazy, you’re trying to do something new [linking family planning to urban development]. If you don’t come back to me to share your findings, I won’t be happy.” I said, “I assure you, I’ll come back with my findings.”’

They also perceived distinct levels of policy: ‘What do we mean by policy? It can be change practices to implement existing policies, or change policy at a national level, which is harder.’

Fellows valued the orientation to the **nature of the policy realm**, for example, learning how to adapt to a dynamic policy environment: ‘stakeholders in policy-making keep shifting every day and so being able to map them and to determine …[the] impact and usefulness [of my research] was very helpful.’

**Linking to a new sector: urban development**

The novelty of the cross-sectoral link into the urban domain could be advantageous for the fellows: ‘I loved the idea of linking family planning to urban development and planning. It was entirely new. I’m not aware of many projects on this. By the time I got into the project, not much had been accomplished on this link. I could create a niche for myself.’

Many found the linkage difficult and the choice of urban policy partner, who was meant to facilitate their entry into the sector, was often unsatisfactory because the partners were not fully embedded into the government urban sector – some were consultants to the government, academics, or from urban NGOs. And those who were truly government urban development people were busy, and often skeptical or even dismissive of family planning. Some fellows said it would have been better if they had been helped to identify an urban partner even before writing their project proposals.

‘…with the urban policy sector, I wish I’d had one or two interviews early, to get to know that space. One idea is having an “inception period” once a study is funded, perhaps the first quarter, where the fellows need to meet with stakeholders early on. Then the dissemination engagement would not be new.’

‘Candidates for the fellowships should have contact with stakeholders [“parties prenantes”] from the start [“dès le départ”].’

[The urban policy partner] linked me to people working in the urban space. It’s hard to get their time, they’re very busy.’

‘With a government official, offering payment can raise ethical issues and can pollute relationships. Using urban-focused academics: they don’t know the daily reality, meeting content, etc. that government officials do, but they understand research better.’

Another problem was political instability causing urban policy partners to move on: ‘sustainability of relationships matters.’ ‘The decision makers have changed…COVID disrupted things, and we had a political crisis/coup d’état, so huge instability. We don’t have policy contacts any longer.’ ‘The political situation in [country] wasn’t favorable. The city officials at first were enthusiastic but municipal elections, and the health and political conditions, meant it’s been extremely difficult to engage political leaders.'
Even if you have the impression that they’re interested, they are just telling you that to get rid of/free themselves from you [“se libérer de vous”].’

However, for a minority, the urban links worked well: ‘I enjoyed easy access to the urban development space. My urban policy partner really helped. My partner got me access to people in a place where I didn’t know anyone.’ ‘If I ever have research on urban planning again, I would ask [the urban policy partner] as we’ve kept in touch’. And in one case the urban link was so effective that the research fellow’s work influenced policy: ‘our urban policy partner was involved in drafting [urban development] policies and he said he pushed for [new reproductive-health content] because of this work with us.’

The exposure to urban conferences (for the few fellows who could attend) was useful: ‘My participation at Africities made me aware of secondary cities’ issues and I have spoken about that experience with [the director of national planning].’

Several of the fellows’ outputs reached into urban domains (journals and conferences): ‘My goal was to publish two papers from the research. I was able to do four manuscripts: two focused on urban, two focused on FP. Plus I had five conference presentations accepted’ [of which three were for urban meetings].

**Onward skills transfer: ripple effects**

Fellows were early- to mid-career and were thus well positioned to use their newly gained skills. Most were already incorporating new skills and topics into both their teaching and research projects: ‘A European Union research project in urban areas asked us to do policy briefs. I have just drafted them. The training from this project helped. This will continue.’ Another fellow intends to use the policy-tracking template in a new research proposal on urbanization and child nutrition.

The ‘value added’ for the more junior fellows was significant:

> ‘It’s a joke among my colleagues – they now think I’m their professor. I’ve grown a lot, in different ways. I’ve changed my thinking about research. My confidence in leading a research project has increased… as has my confidence in applying for funding. I’ve gotten three [other] grants. …there was a call for proposals on research and policy communications, and we’re working on writing something. I feel more confident to apply. I’m finishing a publication. I’ve increased my profile within the university. I was featured three times in a university newsletter on innovation, twice on this project. And it increased my research’s visibility. A week before [an international conference], my article came out in a national newspaper. This is a practical example of broadening the scope of communicating research. It’s changed my teaching and mentoring of Masters’ and PhD students. Some say I am a serious inspiration, and they want to follow in my footsteps. I’m teaching policy communications to master’s and even undergraduates.’

These ripple effects are not limited to academia: one fellow is passing on the skills to health sector workers who are ‘implementing research and struggling to transform [it into] policy briefs.’

**Networking**

One of the project objectives was to build a networked cadre of fellows. This had begun to work before the pandemic: ‘we are “children of the same mother,” we bond well when we come together... We have the idea for a proposal running over many cities.’

> ‘We are connected as a team, but we haven’t developed anything yet. At [project meetings], we tried to figure out what we can do in the future. Now I have contacts in Kenya, Malawi, Ghana and Nigeria.’

> ‘I’ve been able to network with colleagues – the Cohort 1 fellows have continued to work together.’
But many felt that this bonding had been limited by the inability to meet in person due to the pandemic: ‘The bonding was not strong enough; that was entirely beyond the power of the organizers.’ ‘I benefited with respect to networks; cohort 1 has stayed in touch and shared resources. Without COVID, there would have been a larger network of people, more connections. Our WhatsApp group is not as strong as meetings would have been.’

However, some felt that the international conferences they did manage to attend launched them into a global research network: ‘I had done all my studies in [home country], never traveling outside the country, so I didn’t have a lot of exposure to what happens in the global research world. This project exposed me to that.’

Several fellows felt that multi-country projects would have been better than individual projects: ‘instead of each fellow doing an individual study, I would encourage discussion among the candidates to have a cross-border project, with 3-4 fellows working on the same project, sharing experience. That would make a difference in terms of collaboration, we would each learn more.’ ‘If it had been a team rather than an individual [getting the grant], it would have helped.’

Project management
All fellows were positive about the project management by IUSSP. Many appreciated the fact that they were treated as principal investigators (PIs) (sometimes for the first time for them), felt autonomy and/or got effective support: ‘Some emails you get look like they’re out to criticize you, but the emails from this project were out to support you.’ ‘You could be a PI and lead your own project, that was appealing.’ ‘You believed in us and you didn’t come to supervise our research project.’ ‘You allowed us to tell our stories without taking control of the message. Often that is not the case.’ ‘This is one of the best fellowships I’ve ever belonged to’ [s/he had had five fellowships].

IMPLICATIONS
Training researchers in ‘getting research into policy and practice’ (‘GRIPP’) or ‘research translation’ is increasingly popular and there are now plenty of materials on how to do this. Provision of such capacity-building in the global south for an international project is less common. APHRC, the project’s partner organization for this capacity-building, succeeded in delivering the fellows’ training although adapting to pandemic disruptions. The fellows especially appreciated the practical nature of the training, and are already passing on the skills gained to others. This model of delivery works and should be replicated.

The most original part of the project was the cross-sectoral linkage to the urban development sector. This proved difficult due to the often-unsatisfactory nature of the selected urban partners. Additional training to orient fellows to the characteristics (e.g. language and key structures) of the urban sector would have been useful but this would have needed the involvement of an additional, specialist training center, which the pandemic made impractical.

At the project’s outset there was relatively little documented experience of managing international inter-sectoral research projects. Recent research concurs with this project’s experience that a ‘super bridger’, someone who falls in-between the two sectors and who can have a translator role and bridge communication gaps, is vital and should be featured in future, similar projects. That research, like ours, found that mid-career researchers venturing into interdisciplinary work need a sort of protection as they veer from their single-discipline trajectory: incentives in academia are single-disciplinary, so those embarking on cross-sectoralism are going out on a limb career-wise. Boosting their profiles by publishing in top-tier interdisciplinary journals can help their status, and the project partly achieved this (see section 4).

The ‘added value’ that the project provided to each fellow depended on the fellow’s level or career stage. These differed enormously because the advisory panel selected fellows on the basis of their research proposals, not their level or profile. Future, similar endeavors might focus on a more narrowly defined level of researcher.
The views of panel members were canvassed in the form of three questions: main strengths; main weaknesses; and what would you do differently in designing a similar project? Six members responded.

The strengths mentioned included: the explicit link between FP and urban development; the emphasis on early- and mid-career researchers whom the project gave the opportunity to lead their own studies; skills transfer and mentorship, particularly in regard to policy-related training; and the opportunity to present results to policy audiences.

Respondents identified the following weaknesses: the small size of grants that limited the scope of studies and their potential impact; insufficient opportunities to forge links among fellows; and lack of attention to precise mechanisms for influencing urban policy or planning with the consequence that some fellows were unsuccessful in engaging municipal leadership.

Three radical suggestions were made for the design of similar projects: (1) focus on institutions rather than individuals: compile a list of potentially interested institutions and then develop mechanisms for linking them; (2) create joint projects among 2-3 fellows with common mentorship and embed cascaded mentorship of more junior researchers; and (3) ensure that initiatives are equally owned by the researcher and targeted policy-maker by soliciting joint proposals.
**FELLOWS’ RESEARCH**

**Methods**
With the limited funding available, fellows were encouraged to undertake secondary analysis of accessible data sets or collect new data on a modest scale, or a combination of both. Seven projects involved secondary analysis, using a range of sources including DHS (Guinea, Malawi), Living Standards Measurement Surveys (Nigeria), Performance Monitoring for Action (DR Congo), Ouagadougou Population Surveillance data (Burkina Faso), and HIV Impact Survey (Tanzania). Initial concerns of an over-reliance on DHS turned out to be mistaken.

Most projects involved some original data collection. Two projects comprised policy analyses, in Nairobi and in Ibadan/Kaduna, involving interviews with stakeholders and document analysis. Interview surveys of individuals were carried out in Uganda, Ghana, Kenya and Tanzania, with sample sizes in the range of 600-700. Two projects in Uganda and Tanzania included surveys (or audits) of facilities. In a remarkable development, the fellow in Guinea secured additional funds from the World Health Organization’s Reproductive Health Research department to carry out a survey of 1707 urban providers selected from 173 public- and private-sector facilities.

Apart from the two policy analyses, only one project, in Accra, relied exclusively on qualitative data collection; but several others featured a qualitative component. Another project in Accra involved extensive interviews and discussions with stakeholders, experts and local leaders. In Conakry, Guinea, 56 in-depth interviews and 10 focus-group discussions were held. The Uganda project conducted eight focus-group discussions in Kira municipality, and the projects in Malawi and Kenya involved interviews with key stakeholders and community leaders.

**Study populations**
Though diverse, they had the common underlying characteristic that they are generally regarded as marginalized and under-served. Populations living in informal settlements or slums were the focus in Uganda, DR Congo, and Accra. The needs of urban adolescents and youth were studied in Conakry and Accra. Rural-urban migrants, an ethnic minority (Somalis), and women living with AIDS were the focus of attention in Ouagadougou, Nairobi, and Dar/Dodoma, respectively.

**Publications**
Several publications were initiated by one very enterprising fellow, Moses Tetui in Uganda, who organized a special issue of the journal Frontiers in Global Women’s Health on urban FP. In addition to several papers from his project, the issue contained two papers from the project in Guinea and a one by James Duminy, the specially recruited post-doctoral fellow. As of mid-2023 fellows had published 17 papers (appendix 1).

**Relevance of results**
The project’s emphasis was the generation and effective communication of policy- and program-relevant research. Basically, such research is of two main types: studies that assess solutions to acknowledged problems or promising improvements to current activities; and studies that identify defects and inequalities that are often unacknowledged in policy arenas. The first type typically takes the form of an intervention with evaluation by experimental or quasi-experimental designs. Such studies require substantial funding and are usually undertaken by large international organizations with prior endorsement by the relevant government agency. The second type is diagnostic in nature. No costly intervention is needed and, while prior involvement of policy or program staff is advantageous, it is not necessary. Of necessity, fellows’ projects were of the second type.
It is impossible here to summarize all results but some examples will provide a valid overall impression. In Ouagadougou, recent migrants to informal settlements have low FP use (and thus require greater attention) but not those to formal settlements (Bougma et al. 2021). In Malawi, women of minority ethnic groups have particularly low levels of demand satisfied for FP, with implications for remedial action (Alhassan & Madise 2021). An unexpected result was found in Kinshasa, where FP use was higher in slum than non-slum areas, probably owing to focussed activities of community health workers (Akilimali et al. 2021). Conversely, FP facilities in slum areas of Kira, Uganda, offered a much lower quality of service than those in non-slum areas particularly in regard to availability of long-acting methods (Lukyamuzi et al. 2021). Striking regional differences in the attitude of providers to FP provision for adolescents were apparent in Guinea (Sidibe et al. 2022). A close association between high fertility (as indicated for instance by number of children) and household food insecurity was found in Nigeria and this was more pronounced in urban than rural areas (Owoo 2020). Barriers to integration of FP and urban development agendas in Ibadan and Kaduna were identified and means to overcome them suggested (Adedini et al. 2022). It is clear that results are relevant for policies and programs. So far, we are unaware of direct effects on policy but note that results from a single study rarely have an impact.

OTHER PUBLICATIONS
A review of the urban FP literature with a total of 180 references (Duminy et al. 2021) culminates in a discussion of implications for future research: more attention needs to be given to spatial heterogeneity including study of how variations across neighborhoods in such factors as social cohesion and social capital influence FP and fertility. A strong case exists for research into the precise operations of the often-complex FP governance system within cities. Diverse urban migratory pathways, with their implications for FP programming, remain understudied.

A second paper, explicitly directed at an urban audience, calls for a greater appreciation of the importance of demographic factors, particularly fertility and age structure, in shaping urban well-being and resilience (Duminy 2021). He concludes that FP and reproductive health interventions can play a critical role in promoting healthier and more sustainable urban futures.

To complement the fellows’ site-specific studies, the project gave a small grant to panel member Alex Ezeh to conduct a cross-national analysis of urban FP trends in sub-Saharan Africa, with a focus on rich-poor differences. In most East and Southern African countries, the rich-poor gap in FP use by urban married women largely disappeared in the decade 2003/7 to 2013/9. In these countries, nearly 80% of poor women obtained contraceptive supplies from a public-sector source (Ezeh et al. 2022). The same paper revealed a very different situation for Central/West African countries: remarkably little change in use of modern contraceptive methods was apparent, rich-poor gaps in use remained, and reliance on public-sector sources of supply was weaker than in other sub-regions.

Two articles led by one of the panel co-chairs with co-authorship by several fellows, other panel members, staff of the partner training institution, the project coordinator and the project’s post-doc (Harpham et al. 2021, Harpham et al. 2022) covered the research translation and the intersectoral aspects of the project respectively. These articles were purposely published in non-family-planning journals in order to reach a wider, international development audience. The first paper analyzes the success of the project’s capacity-building, and the second – based on policy document analysis and stakeholder interviews, from both the family planning and urban development sectors and across the eight sub-Saharan African countries – revealed how cross-sectoral barriers can stymie efforts but also identified some points of connection which can be built upon.
The project organized panel sessions at global meetings. For family-planning audiences, this included “Family planning, fertility and urban welfare in the rapidly growing cities of sub-Saharan Africa and South Asia: Policy Implications” at the 2018 ICFP in Rwanda. IUSSP also helped organize a pre-conference workshop sponsored by The Challenge Initiative (TCI) on Transforming Cities and Saving Lives: Making the Case for Urban Reproductive Health.

The Challenge Initiative (TCI), which supports local governments to provide reproductive health services, was an important partner throughout the project, collaborating on several key events and offering policy support to several fellows. For example, TCI identified both a mayor and a staff person to participate in a panel session on urban family planning at the 8th African Population Conference in Uganda in 2019. IUSSP commissioned two analyses for a panel session at its (virtual) IPC in 2021 called “New evidence on urban fertility and family planning in sub-Saharan Africa and South Asia.” Six fellows also had poster or oral presentations at the IPC.

A number of fellows secured acceptance by family planning meetings to present their study results as posters and/or oral presentations including at several annual Population Association of America (PAA) events, at ICFP in Thailand in 2022, and at national or regional conferences.

The aforementioned IUSSP conference in Madeira in 2022 brought together members of three different IUSSP research panels and fellows participated in the project’s session on “Introducing a new type of IUSSP Panel: Family Planning, Fertility and Urban Development”. In addition, the fellows presented their work in a poster session.

For urban-focused audiences, the project targeted two conferences of the International Society for Urban Health. In the 2019 conference in China, two panel sessions were organized featuring fellows, representatives of TCI, and senior scholars; the themes were “Research and action on addressing family planning and reproductive health in urban health care systems” and “Policy and governance approaches to considering family planning and fertility in urban health.” In the 2022 conference in Spain, a panel called “Family planning meets urban development in Sub-Saharan Africa: addressing intersectoral challenges for urban health” featured project leadership and fellows. Results were mixed because the International Society for Urban Health draws together a wide range of urban experts, of whom few are involved in health service delivery in general and almost none in reproductive health, so attendance was limited. However, a training workshop for fellows before the China session led to a transformation of their draft presentations as they learned how to craft messages for audiences not specialized in family planning, and other policy communications skills.
In addition to usual academic dissemination of research findings, IUSSP worked to be creative and broad-ranging in its outreach, especially to urban audiences. A highlight was the collaboration with TCI on organizing a panel session called “Family Planning is critical to urban development: What you need to know and what you can do about it” at the Africities Summit in Kenya in 2022. The Summit, organized by the United Cities and Local Governments of Africa (UCLGA) every three years, is a gathering of hundreds of municipal authorities from across Africa. The panel speakers included not just expert researchers selected by IUSSP but also elected municipal officials who could talk about their experiences in promoting family planning. (The virtual presentation of one of the primary speakers, Alex Ezeh, can be found here.) Among other efforts to reach this audience, IUSSP commissioned the aforementioned 5-minute video to be shown at the panel and throughout the conference. The version played at the conference called on these municipal officials in attendance to act; another version, found here, has a more generic ending and can be used for teaching. One lesson learned is that an organization such as UCGLA has rich potential to share messages about family planning: there was interest in collaborating on follow-up activities in between conferences, and a list of such activities generated, though the lack of human and financial resources available after the project ends precluded acting on this potential collaboration.

The Africities Summit also demonstrated how an explicit press outreach strategy could succeed in getting family-planning messages communicated through a wide variety of channels represented at the conference. Please see appendix 2 for the list of newspaper articles generated, thanks to a combination of a press release, the use of the UCGLA press team and the contacts with specific media representatives it shared, and a focused Twitter campaign aimed at those media outlets before and during the conference. The fellows who attended this meeting gained confidence in approaching elected officials about their research findings, drawing on the policy communications training they had received during the project.
This initiative was conceived as a limited-scope learning project that could be subsequently scaled up. It was designed to achieve, within its scope, some multisectoral links and understanding while also testing some methods to generate such links so as to inform future multisectoral efforts in general. It used multidisciplinary approaches to bridge the family planning–urban development policy divide, with the ultimate goal of contributing to expanding efforts in sub-Saharan African cities to better meet the family-planning needs of urban populations. This section reflects on the lessons learned from the project and makes recommendations for future work, loosely organized around the operational goals described in the introduction. Note that the text occasionally refers to a recent review of the LIRA 2030 Africa project run by the International Science Council. That project too offered transdisciplinary early-career fellowships aiming to reinforce capacity in urban development in sub-Saharan Africa, and several of its findings resemble those of the Urban FP project.

A multisectoral and multidisciplinary approach is called for to address issues such as urban family-planning policy in sub-Saharan Africa. In terms of policy, family planning is intrinsically multisectoral, as aspects of its effects fall under the jurisdiction of several different ministries. This can be seen in Figure 1, which illustrates the main pathways by which improved family planning services can benefit urban welfare at household, community and city levels. A chronic challenge with multisectoral issues is that their value tends to be underestimated, as each policy-maker sees only part of their full impact - for example, the effects of improving access to family planning on reproductive and maternal health, women’s empowerment and labor productivity, school enrolment or poverty alleviation. As a result, the policy and programs addressing these issues risk being underfunded, fragmented and piecemeal.

A deep understanding of family planning behaviors, outcomes and effects, which is required for designing effective policy and interventions, similarly calls for a multidisciplinary approach, with public health, economics, sociology, urban studies and other fields each contributing to aspects of its comprehension. The problem here is that many top researchers in Africa are based in academic institutions that tend to be narrowly structured around disciplines and work within departments, and which often do not place priority on interdisciplinary collaborations and policy outreach. (This was also noted in the LIRA review.) A strength of the Urban FP project is that, by design, it sought to draw together two sectors and to provide external funding and other support (travel, training and ongoing guidance in policy outreach, etc.) to dynamic junior-to-mid level researchers from different academic backgrounds and working in different countries, facilitating exchanges, network building and a strengthening of their skills. Unfortunately, the COVID pandemic sharply limited travel and thus exchanges over the course of the project.
The Urban FP project was not, however, fully multisectoral in the sense that it consisted largely of an effort by the family planning, public health and demography communities to reach out and influence urban-development specialists and policy. (This asymmetry was a perhaps unintended consequence of the original project design, which reached out more to the FP than the urban-development side.) Making the project truly multisectoral would have required a more concerted push to draw in the (fairly amorphous) urban development community, entailing a systematic effort to identify and include in the project key “urban hub actors” (urban development academics) and “urban hub partners” at the level of municipalities. Minimally, a greater familiarity with the urban development sector and a better understanding of how to solicit their interest, along with a knowledge of key actors and policy levers, would be valuable. The lessons learned from the current Urban FP project set the stage for implementing this approach, should a second stage of the initiative or a comparable project be proposed. And in general, the project added to an understanding that multisectoral research and action cannot be expected to succeed spontaneously but rather requires purposive multisectoral design, with some elements common to all sectoral combinations and some specific to the sectors in question (Harpham et al. 2022).

Capacity-strengthening of early- and mid-career scholars in sub-Saharan Africa

This was the most important, and most successful, component of the project. The project aimed to create a cadre of committed early-to-mid career researchers with the necessary skills to undertake high-level research and simultaneously to engage with the policy and programmatic worlds. The importance of strengthening the capacity of local policy researchers and institutions is hard to overstate.

Fellowship projects with research grants and ongoing mentorship in both research and policy are an effective way to foster the development of the next generation of leaders in low-income countries, a view that the LIRA project’s experience also supports. Shorter-term training in policy outreach or specific research tools, while at times useful, is less effective than sustained hands-on work combined with ongoing guidance from senior researchers and from policy and training partners such as the APHRC. An advantage of supporting researchers based in African institutions, like this project’s fellows, is that their work is likely to be more responsive to local community needs and attuned to the policy context. Initiatives like this project may contribute to shifting the nexus of research and policy formulation from Northern countries to scholars and institutions in the Global South.

Drawing together fellows from different contexts can be highly enriching. Research projects that are limited to just one setting may be constrained in their ability to assess what works and what does not, and to learn from the experiences revealed in other contexts. A deeper, more nuanced and complete understanding can be gained by examining commonalities and differences across contexts, and by bringing together researchers working on similar issues from different milieus. Creating opportunities for sustained exchanges among fellows from diverse backgrounds and countries are also conducive to peer learning and expanding networks. Similar projects in the future should seek to maintain or even expand the geographic spread of fellows, and to consider ways to promote the development of collaborative, or at least comparative, studies across space (recognizing that these may require somewhat larger budgets and longer fellowship periods to complete).

As noted above, during the project the COVID pandemic combined with tightened visa rules sharply reduced opportunities for travel to project meetings and conferences, and for exchanges with other fellows and panel members. In addition, a first meeting for fellows, project leaders, research mentors and policy partners, with the goal of establishing a common understanding of the fellowship project, the research projects and the roles and responsibilities of each person, had to be canceled. Notwithstanding

---

1 The project initially sought to support fellows from South Asia as well as from SSA, but there was a lack of viable candidates from that region. Should a similar project be funded, we recommend that a strong, proactive effort be made to expand it to include key institutions and younger scholars from South Asia and, if feasible, Latin America.
the fellows’ creation of a WhatsApp group, the small number of on-site meetings clearly limited the development of their sense of being part of a true, sustained community of practice.

While intensive guidance from research mentors and policy partners is key to both skill development and ensuring that the fellow’s research and outreach work is well designed to affect policy, there was clearly a need for a more careful selection of these individuals and for a more explicit definition of their roles. The “urban partner,” in particular, did not work well for many fellows, causing them to rely more heavily on counsel from the APHRC policy training team. One reason for this is the sheer complexity and often politicized nature of urban governance; in contrast to a project on, say, adolescent reproductive health, where the task of finding enthusiastic and helpful policy partners would have been much simpler. In addition, the diversity of research topics and country policy contexts made it difficult to define a general approach, further complicating the problem of selecting the right policy partner for each fellow. Future similar projects should think more rigorously about the research-policy interface, paying more attention to intermediaries such as community leaders, women’s groups, other advocacy agencies, and journalists who have more experience and standing to influence policies than academics.

There was considerable variation in the prior research experiences of the fellows funded by the project, and this affected project outputs. The project awarded fellowships to candidates with the best proposed projects through a competitive process, and this tended to favor those with stronger research backgrounds. From our small sample, those who benefited most from their fellowships seemed to be the few fellows with limited or no international research experience at the start of their fellowships and whose prior studies had taken place in their home countries. Most of the more experienced fellows, though they all spoke of the substantial value of the project for their careers and for improving their policy outreach skills, would have made their mark in any case; for them, the fellowships were less centrally important to their professional development. In addition, the project gave fellows considerable leeway in defining their research proposals and then in running their projects. Many spoke of the importance of being “project PIs” for the first time in their professional lives: that status made them fully responsible for their funded studies, developed their reputations as autonomous researchers and afforded them the management skills needed for this work.

Contributions to the evidence base and policy impact

The fellows produced considerably more publications than promised in the initial grant proposal, and several have additional manuscripts submitted for publication or under revision. However, with a couple of exceptions, their research has been competent rather than groundbreaking - useful for guiding local policy and programs but of little consequence for pushing forward the knowledge base on FP in urban Africa.

The limited scope of the project – the small number of fellows and their modest budgets and timelines – is a large part of the reason for this. In addition, as noted above, the project did not require the fellows’ research topics to be tightly focused on specific issues, and several fellows were fairly junior in terms of prior research experience. The downside of this design is that their studies tended to be less original and consequent. Thus, to some degree, there was a contradiction between the project’s goals of reinforcing capacity and contributing to the evidence base for policy. If policy-relevant, high-quality, original research were instead given top priority, the project should have recruited more experienced researchers, provided them with more generous funding and time for their work, and imposed a more structured framework (topic, approach) on their research – changes that would however have greatly diminished the capacity-strengthening aspects of the fellowships.
Future projects should reflect on the relative importance of the capacity-strengthening and research-policy-impact goals, and then design or perhaps segment their fellowship project in response. At a minimum, a greater effort should be made to define more clearly the issues of real importance in the recruitment announcements, and to include a more intense research protocol meeting around each prospective fellow's research topic at the start of their fellowships, so as to better focus their work.

**The impact of the fellows' studies on policies and programs has been limited to date.** This was expected, as it is unrealistic to expect a strong impact on established public policy from a small number of non-senior researchers over a short period. The bulk of the fellows' policy outreach work took place after their research was completed; for many of them, these efforts are ongoing as of this writing. It is thus too early to assess the extent to which their work may affect policy. Two fellows opted to focus their efforts on journalists and NGOs as an alternative means of influencing policy, as the rapid turnover of public officials in their country made it impossible to establish a sustained dialogue with them, and several others were successful in getting their findings covered by local print, radio and TV media.

**Bridging the family planning and urban development divide**

**The rationale for the Urban FP project remains as valid today as when it was proposed five years ago.** In sharp contrast to other regions of the world, sub-Saharan Africa’s population continues to grow rapidly and cities in the region are growing faster still: the urban population in the region is estimated to double about every 18 years. Clearly, achieving the SDGs and subsequent development goals must include substantial improvements in urban SSA. Unmet FP need remains high especially in Central and West Africa, and recent studies have documented stalls and slowdowns in fertility decline in several capital cities in the region. Efforts to improve access to quality family planning services are known to have beneficial effects on human welfare in many dimensions, of which the main ones are summarized in Figure 1, above. And yet, for the most part, the urban development community continues to neglect the value of providing women and couples with the means to plan their families.

The project’s scoping work² examined the reasons for this and suggested that much time and work will be needed to sensitize urban-development specialists to family-planning concerns. In its small way, the project did reach out to the urban-development community through papers published in non-population journals and by organizing sessions, making presentations and screening an original video in several important urban development and health research and policy forums. Other organizations such as The Challenge Initiative have also been working to heighten the attention to family planning in urban policies and programs in the Global South. However, the need for more work in this area is manifest.

For social and health demographers, policy-relevant research has been constrained by inadequate data and often by insufficient attention paid to the heterogeneity of cities – the enormous variation in living conditions, opportunities and constraints faced by people of different neighborhoods, educational levels and social class within and among cities in the Global South. The Urban FP project made a small contribution to addressing these issues. Project leaders, for instance, convinced the DHS program to pay more attention to urban populations in their survey questionnaires and studies. Through published articles and presentations at major population and FP conferences, the project emphasized the importance of the gaps in urban-family planning data and evidence. And finally, the fellows’ engagement with the public via the press and urban sector policy-makers heightened awareness of the scale and urgency of urban population growth and FP as a necessary policy response.

---

² "Influencing the urban policy agenda: A survey of expert opinion" by S. Parnell and J. Duminy.
APPENDIX 1: PUBLICATIONS

I. ARTICLES BY FELLOWS (NAMES BOLDED)

A. PUBLISHED

https://doi.org/10.3197/jps.63799953906860

https://doi.org/10.1186/s12961-022-00924-0

https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph18179400

https://doi.org/10.3389/fgwh.2021.652902

https://doi.org/10.3389/fgwh.2021.650538

Open acces

https://doi.org/10.3389/fgwh.2021.655929

https://doi.org/10.1186/s12939-021-01518-y

https://doi.org/10.3389/fgwh.2021.656616

https://doi.org/10.1186/s12978-023-01621-z

APPENDIX 1: PUBLICATIONS

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssmqr.2022.100216


II. ARTICLES BY OTHER AUTHORS: POST DOC & PANEL MEMBERS


B. SUBMITTED FOR PUBLICATION/ UNDER REVIEW

APPENDIX 2: PRESS COVERAGE GENERATED BY PROJECT ACTIVITIES AT AFRICITIES SUMMIT


☞ https://www.standardmedia.co.ke/national/article/2001445877/africities-summit-highlights-limited-access-to-family-planning

☞ https://newsbeezer.com/kenya/the-africities-summit-highlights-the-limited-access-to-family-planning/

☞ https://scienceafrica.co.ke/2022/05/19/africa-family-planning-crucial-in-urban-development/

☞ https://www.theeastafrican.co.ke/tea/business/africities-proposes-blueprint-for-african-urban-development-3822368

Raballa, V. (2022, May 19). Poor access to family planning blamed for rapid urban growth. Nation.
☞ https://nation.africa/kenya/news/poor-access-to-family-planning-blamed-for-rapid-urban-growth-3820160

☞ https://english.news.cn/20220519/7a526a78440e447d935e60f4d9e299/c.html