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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1 Introduction

1.1 The Community-Based Planning project is a four-country action-research project operating in South Africa, Zimbabwe, Uganda and Ghana, and funded by the UK’s Department for International Development. The project is managed by Khanya-managing rural change. The project in each country comprises a set of partners, including at least the key national organisation involved in decentralised planning (to consider promoting policy impacts), a local government (to look at the integration of the planning process into the local government planning system and a development facilitator to assist in the facilitation of the participatory planning process. The purpose of the project was that “By the end December 2004 realistic plans have been developed in each country for policy change, implementation or piloting of community-based planning systems, which participating institutions are committed to take forward”.

1.2 In 1998-2000, Khanya undertook action-research funded by the UK’s Department for International Development (DFID) looking at “Institutional Support for Sustainable Livelihoods in Southern Africa”. The main focus of the work was looking at institutional issues arising in South Africa, Zambia and Zimbabwe, if sustainable livelihoods (SL) are to be promoted. This work identified that if livelihoods of poor people are to improve, linkages between micro level (community) and meso level (local government and service providers), both in terms of improving participatory governance and in terms of improving services should be addressed. Three key governance requirements were identified at micro and meso levels if poverty was to be addressed:

Empowering communities (micro)
- Poor people must be active and involved in managing their own development (claiming their rights and exercising their responsibilities);
- The need for a responsive, active and accessible network of local service providers (community-based, private sector or government);

Empowering local governments and district level service providers (meso)
- At local government level (lower meso) services need to be facilitated, provided or promoted effectively and responsively, coordinated and local governments should be held accountable for quality delivery of the services.

The first of these requirements implies that communities need to be involved in planning and management of local development.

1.3 The project was implemented between April 2001 and September 2004, including review of in-country experience, sharing across the 4 countries, development of common models, adaptation in each country, piloting, evaluations and mainstreaming. Despite coming to an end as a project, national processes continue around CBP in Uganda, SA and potentially in Zimbabwe.
2 Policies and systems for decentralised planning

2.1 If the 3 governance issues suggested above are to be achieved, decentralisation to local government and below is a critical ingredient. It must increase the participation of communities in the planning for, and management of, development of their area. Community-based planning was conceived as a methodology that increases the participation of communities in planning and improving the quality if plans, of services, and of improving the ability of communities to act in support of their own development.

2.2 In terms of level of decentralisation, South Africa has devolved to provinces, and to some extent to two levels of local government, district and local, with integrated and powerful Metros in the 6 major cities. Beneath local municipalities there are wards as an optional participatory structure. Some critical policies and legislation are the inclusion of local government in the Constitution, and the Municipal Systems Act which enshrines developmental local government, the concept of municipality as including the community, integrated development planning (IDP) and participation. Development plans are produced at both levels of municipality (IDPs), as well as provinces. Wards were used as the level for CBP.

2.3 Uganda has the most advanced decentralisation process in Africa, with all developmental services handed over to local government, and many local services being managed by lower level local governments (subcounties). Central government retains only a policy and oversight brief. There are 5 levels of administration from villages (LC1), parishes (LC2), subcounties (LC3), counties (LC4) and districts (LC5). LC3 and 5 are local governments and both produce development plans. CBP was adopted at LC2 (parish) level.

2.4 Zimbabwe’s decentralisation process started after independence with the creation of provinces, districts, wards and villages. Most government departments are deconcentrated to district level, with rural/urban district councils having limited powers. Plans are produced at district level by the Rural District Development Committee (RDDC) and submitted to province for inclusion in provincial plans. Below the District are two levels of administration i.e the ward and village assemblies and development committees. In theory village plans are filtered through the ward development committee before it reaches the district. CBP was introduced at the ward level.

2.5 The Ghanaian decentralisation process is essentially a deconcentration process where the powers and functions of central government are delegated to district offices of Ministries, while district assemblies (DAs) have some devolved powers. Regions, through the Regional Coordinating Councils and their respective Regional Planning Co-ordinating Units (RPCUs), were given the responsibility to play the role of co-ordination. Traditional authorities are extremely important in Ghana, but are not integrated with the government system. Plans are produced (erratically) at district level. Subdistrict structures are urban, town, area and zonal councils, and below that unit committees. These mostly exist on paper. The Area Council was chosen as the level for CBP.

PART B: WHAT HAPPENED IN EACH PARTNER COUNTRY

3 The Generic CBP methodology

The core methodology that was developed is derived from seeking to apply the sustainable livelihoods approach (SLA) in a planning context. The principles underlying it are derived from the SL principles and are:
• we need to ensure that **poor people are included** in planning;
• systems need to be **realistic and practical**, and the planning process must be implementable using available resources within the district/local government, and must link in with existing processes, particularly local government planning;
• planning must be linked to a **legitimate structure**, ideally one that can take funds;
• planning should **not be a once off** exercise, but should be part of longer process;
• plan must be **people focused and empowering**;
• we must **plan from vision and strength/opportunities** not problems;
• plans must be **holistic** and cover all sectors;
• planning should promote **mutual accountability** between community and officials;
• there must be **commitment** by councillors and officials and there must be someone responsible to ensure it gets done.

The implementation of these principles led to some key decisions being taken, that:

• a 3-5 day process could be empowering but affordable and so realistic to be replicated;
• planning should be based around livelihood outcomes not needs, and build on local strengths;
• the plan must be initiated by the local government but owned by the community;
• participatory methodologies must be used to help build that ownership;
• a legitimate structure such as a ward must be used as the basis of the planning.

The basic process developed involved:

**Stage 1 Preparation**
Preparation involves a pre planning meeting and a community launch meeting

**Stage 2 Gathering information (situation analysis)**
This step normally takes two days ending in an analysis of the information and report back to the community. This step involves using several PLA tools with different social groups and service providers.

**Stage 3 Analysing planning information and report back**
This step involves analysis of the information from all social groups interviewed in an effort to understand the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats of the community. At this stage the methodology looks at the preferred outcomes of the community and these outcomes are prioritised (not needs) and 5 top priorities selected.

**Stage 4 Reconciliation**
This step is undertaken to gather all the information from all the different exercises and to relate them to the prioritised outcomes.

**Stage 5 Planning**
The first step is undertaken by a small group chosen by the community during a two day period following the community meeting, and may involve service providers, NGOs, relevant CBOs etc. A ministrategic plan is developed around the 5 priorities with objectives, strategies, projects/activities indicating what the community will do, what the municipality needs to do, and what others need to do. Where process funds are provided by the municipality these are planned for, projects for submission for the district plan, and a community action plan.
Stage 6  Implementation
Once the plan is completed and submitted the key stages include appraisal, implementation, monitoring. However the way this was approached varied in the different countries.

4  Implementing CBP in each country

4.1 According to the experiences of participatory approaches being applied by various stakeholders, the application of the CBP planning methodology varied, including the timing of the training and duration of the community planning.

4.2 In South Africa two phases can be identified:

- **Phase 1 – implementation from April 2001 to November 2002** - this phase saw piloting in Mangaung Local Municipality. The partners were Mangaung Local Municipality; Decentralised Development Planning, the section of the national Department of Provincial and Local Government who were responsible for local government planning; CARE; and Khanya-managing rural change. The generic planning process was adopted based on a contact time of 4 days. The municipality implemented CBP or ward planning in all 43 wards of the city and rural areas over the period from September 2001 to March 2002. The plans were supported by R50 000 allocated per ward as “process funds” by Mangaung. An independent evaluation was conducted in late 2002 which was very positive about the impact on communities. There were improved plans and services as a result, considerable community action and the plans addressed the priorities of the disadvantaged.

- **Phase 2 - National Piloting in 8 municipalities** - The national workshop held in October 2002 highlighted the success and the learnings of the pilot in Mangaung. It was agreed to establish a national Steering Committee to take forward CBP, a proposal was agreed to refine the methodology and pilot in 8 more municipalities. The Steering Committee included dplg, SALGA, IDT, Mangaung, eThekwini, Tzaneen, Khanya, GTZ, Free State Department of Local Government and Housing. This project included improving the linkages between the participatory planning and the IDP, development of the M&E systems, definition of support systems, production of a resource book for ward committees, development of draft national manuals, piloting, learning from the pilots and then finalisation of the national manuals and proposals for national rollout. This CBP/IDP Project was funded by Netherlands Aid, DFIDSA, GTZ and DBSA, with municipalities contributing a matching contribution of R250 000 each. The total project cost is around US$1 million, much more than the original funding for the CBP research project.

4.2 In Uganda the initial pilot was in Bushenyi District. The initial partnership in Uganda, which took forward CBP, was between the Local Government Development Programme (LGDP), CARE International, and Bushenyi District Local Government. The core planning methodology developed across the 4 participating countries was adapted by a team of district based staff into a Busheny Planning manual which was then tested in 170 parishes and all sub-counties within Bushenyi District. This subsequently influenced and informed the development and refinement of the Harmonized Participatory Planning Guides for planning at sub-district levels. As part of this two planning guides have been developed, one for parishes/wards and another for subcounties, as well as a training guide. The development and refining of the HPPG has been supported from the Local Government Development Programme and UNCDF.
4.3 In **Zimbabwe** the Ministry of Local Government, Public Works and National Housing is the lead agency for CBP, with partners the Intermediate Technology Development Group. It was decided to pilot and later implement in Gwanda and Chinhimanimi Districts and these became the local government partners in the programme. Again the generic manual was used as a base with a 5 days process. A District Training Team (DTT) was set up in each District plus a Core Facilitation Team (CFT) at ward level, who were trained for 1.5 days. All of Gwanda and most of Chinhimanimi have been completed. The Ward Development Plans have been submitted to Chinhimanimi and Gwanda Rural District Councils (RDCs) for them to inform Council budgeting and also have increased access to various stakeholders since the RDC is the root entry point for all community support projects and initiatives.

4.4 In **Ghana** the partners are the Integrated Social Development Centre (ISODEC), Ministry of Local Government and Rural Development, National Development and Planning Commission and the pilot District Assemblies of Asante Akim South and Adanse East. The process was conducted using the first generic CBP Manual with few adaptations to fit the local condition. Facilitators were drawn from the DPCUs of the two District Assemblies. 60 facilitators were trained during the period and then a five year development plan was developed for each of the 20 Town/Area Councils in the two districts. A lot of time needed to be put into preplanning. Documenting the plans proved problematic.

**PART C: LESSONS LEARNT AND WAY FORWARD**

5 Lessons Learnt in implementing CBP

5.1 Overall the **planning methodology** worked although preplanning was often inadequate.

5.2 In terms of **training of facilitators**, a mix of municipal and community facilitators seems best, trained using an experiential approach where they have to undertake a plan. In SA this was a two week process. It is also important to run training for politicians and for the planners. There needs to be a proper **training team** established, as in the District Training Team in Zimbabwe. These need to be fulltime for the period the planning is being undertaken and part-time during the implementation phase.

5.3 Having the mix of national and local government partners with a facilitating agent, usually an NGO, proved very positive. It was important during the planning itself to involve other service providers, and in Mangaung this resulted in an impact on service quality.

5.4 CBP was well **linked to the local government system**, notably in that the products of CBP were incorporated in local government planning. A number of areas are identified where this could be strengthened.

5.5 **Community participation and ownership** was high in all countries. There was evidence of considerable community action, implying ownership. Disadvantaged groups managed to participate and influence the plans in all cases, although to a limited extent in Ghana, where formal representational structures were used which these people did not have.

5.6 The key **financial implication** is actually for funds to support implementation of the ward plans. SA has recommended from US$3300-7700 per ward or a total of 1-2% of the local government’s capital budget. In Zimbabwe and Uganda local revenue is supposed to be used to assist with implementing the plan. The cost of training varied from US$8-25 000 for 40 facilitators.
6 Evidence of Impact and Up-scaling

6.1 CBP specifically aims to:

- improve the **quality of plans**, making them more relevant to local needs and conditions, and incorporating the priorities of poor people (and others);
- improve the **quality of services**, as they are now more informed as to people’s real assets and capabilities, vulnerabilities, their preferred outcomes, their views on services, and where communities actually want support;
- improve **community control** over their own development, so ensuring they are active actors and not passive recipients of development imposed from outside;
- promote **community action** to make their own vision a reality in their community, mobilising latent energy and creativity to promote local development.

6.2 The impacts at **community level** were significant. Most countries reported a range of community action for which no external funds were needed. There was very widespread participation, and in general disadvantaged groups were able to influence the outcomes of the planning. In Zimbabwe CBP was seen as easing socio-political tensions at local levels since different political parties, war veterans and traditional leadership have been able to sit and work together on issues that are important for community development. In South Africa apart from considerable community action, there was often a first time engagement between the affluent and less-affluent at ward level, improved communication between Councillor, ward committee and community and greater willingness of ward members to participate in ward affairs – also a better attendance of meetings.

6.3 CBP has had significant impact at the **local government level** (see Box 6.3). The greatest impact has been the incorporation of the community plans into the local government development plans and the influencing on priorities and resource allocation.

6.4 The impact at the **national level** has varied. In South Africa and Uganda CBP has been piloted in 9 and 40 districts respectively and there is widespread national recognition. In Zimbabwe and Ghana the process has not gone beyond the two districts in each country, for different reasons in each case.

6.5 There has been considerable interest internationally in the CBP experience, and CBP partners have been invited to numerous conferences around the world to speak on the CBP experience, ranging from Sao Paolo, London, Washington, Montpellier, to Burkina Faso. The experience has also fed into the World Bank’s Community-Driven Development approach.

7 Way Forward

7.1 The **planning process and methodology** was found to work, although there are areas to be strengthened. The weakest element has been preplanning, where most municipalities did not plan enough in advance, and around implementation, and M&E. This would be enhanced by having a fulltime CBP Coordinator.

7.2 In **Uganda** Bushenyi District has set the pace in terms of formulation and implementation of robust development plans, in line with the CBP/HPPG initiative. They have had a role in influencing the production of the HPPG and should continue generating useful lessons for adaptation in other parts of the country. At national level it may be several years until the new ideas and processes embedded within the HPPG are genuinely
mainstreamed within parish and subcounty plans. The Ministry is currently working on the national **policy on capacity building** in Local Governments, which should yield a standardized, coherent and consistent framework. The **district planning guides** are due to be reviewed. Beyond the traditional menu of interventions, effective operationalisation of the HPPG will call for institutionalisation of **robust M&E mechanisms**. Every effort will need to made to rationalize the sequencing of the planning processes at various levels, so as to ensure that community action plans meaningfully inform policy making at higher levels.

7.3 In **Ghana** without the two key champions who have been transferred, the two Districts are unlikely to carry CBP forward. The Department of Community Development is promoting a process to harmonise participatory planning systems, and this should be supported. The rollout of the Community-Based Rural Development Programme (CBRDP) also provides an opportunity to influence. These two provide an opportunity to input the learnings from CBP, and to contribute to developing a national process that allows communities to plan for their own action and to influence district plans.

7.4 In **Zimbabwe** Chimanimani and Gwanda will take CBP further. The level of capacity and enthusiasm about CBP in Gwanda provides some hope for a self-driven CBP processes in the future as well as possible replication by other RDCs in Matabeleland South Province. Some refresher training may be necessary as the key trainers and facilitators move from the area. Consultations with various stakeholders have indicated the existence of a huge demand for CBP in Zimbabwe. Despite this interest it has proved difficult to raise resources for CBP activities in the current economic and political environment prevailing in Zimbabwe. A series of meetings will be held with DFID and NGOs in November which may open up some opportunities to take CBP forward.

7.5 In **South Africa** the 8 pilot districts are still undertaking their pilot processes, and it looks likely that this phase of work will complete in June 2005. Mangaung is undertaking an ambitious Phase 2 which should define the methodology to apply in a second year after the ward plan has been produced, look at how participatory budgeting can link to CBP, and the implementation mechanisms. In learning from the 8 pilots, three areas of methodology have been identified as critical:

(a) What to do in low capacity municipalities where CBP may not be a priority;
(b) How to help municipalities to think through carefully what they are letting themselves in for before deciding to undertake CBP;
(c) What might be a national support system for those municipalities that would like to undertake CBP (bearing in mind that in SA the intention is to keep it optional).

Some thinking is emerging about how to treat these, including the idea that there might be a suite of CBP/IDP possibilities, depending on the levels of municipal and ward capacity. In some instances of low capacity the IDP process may be better handled as an expanded CBP process at municipal level, rather than a scaled down IDP process.

7.6 The four-country initiative has generated an invaluable cross-country collaborative approach to the development of methodologies, piloting and implementation of community-based participatory planning systems, which link poor people and villages and parishes more effectively with local government planning systems. Beyond the project life there is need to establish a continued mechanism of information exchange in a manner that should directly benefit in-country grassroots planning processes in local governments, and enable enrichment of each others processes from the sharing of experience.
PART A: INTRODUCTION

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background to CBP

The Community-Based Planning project is a four-country action-research project operating in South Africa, Zimbabwe, Uganda and Ghana, and funded by the UK’s Department for International Development (DFID). The project is managed by Khanya-managing rural change. The project in each country comprises a set of partners, including at least the key national organisation involved in decentralised planning (to consider promoting policy impacts), a local government (to look at the integration of the planning process into the local government planning system and a development facilitator to assist in the facilitation of the participatory planning process. In this way it embeds micro-macro linkages in the project design. As an action-research project, it builds on committed partners for whom these questions are critical.

The purpose of the project was that “By the end December 2004 realistic plans have been developed in each country for policy change, implementation or piloting of community-based planning systems, which participating institutions are committed to take forward”.

1.2 How was CBP conceived?

In 1998-2000, Khanya undertook action-research funded by the UK’s Department for International Development (DFID) looking at “Institutional Support for Sustainable Livelihoods in Southern Africa”. The main focus of the work was looking at institutional issues arising in South Africa, Zambia and Zimbabwe, if sustainable livelihoods (SL) are to be promoted. This work identified that if livelihoods of poor people are to improve, linkages between micro level (community) and meso level (local government and service providers), both in terms of improving participatory governance and in terms of improving services should be addressed. Three key governance requirements were identified at micro and meso levels if poverty was to be addressed, to encourage community-driven development:

Empowering communities (micro)

- Poor people must be active and involved in managing their own development (claiming their rights and exercising their responsibilities)
- The need for a responsive, active and accessible network of local service providers (community-based, private sector or government)

Empowering local governments and district level service providers (meso)

- At local government level (lower meso) services need to be facilitated, provided or promoted effectively and responsively, coordinated and local governments should be held accountable for quality delivery of the services.

The first of these requirements implies that communities need to be involved in planning and management of local development. The requirement for widely dispersed and accessible services implied by the second suggests a rethinking of service delivery paradigms. This project concentrates on the first, and how community involvement in planning and management can link to decentralised delivery systems. This formed the basis of the four
country CBP action-research project covering Uganda, Zimbabwe, Ghana and South Africa, “Action Research on Community-Based Planning”.

### 1.3 Main elements in the CBP Project

The project started in April 2001 and was scheduled to last 14 months, but as the project purpose was achieved by January 2002, the project was extended to 30 September 2004 to take it to implementation. The main action-research activities were:

- Development of a partnership in each country combining target institutions including policy-makers, local governments and NGOs
- Reviews of experience in each country
- Study visits to India and Bolivia
- Sharing of each country’s experience to develop a common approach and methodology
- Adaptation of that methodology in each country and piloting
- Regular 4 country meetings for peer learning
- Implementation in at least one local government in each country
- Evaluation and sharing of the experience nationally and across the 4 countries
- Upscaling in Uganda and SA

Table 1.3 shows the main outputs (original, and then added as the project was extended) and the progress achieved against these.

#### Table 1.3 Summary of outputs and progress reached

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Output</th>
<th>Indicator By June 2002 (note project later extended to Sept 2004)</th>
<th>Progress as at 30 September 2004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Start-up effective with teams operational and case studies selected</td>
<td>1.1 Madhya Pradesh and Bolivia selected as case studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.1 Two case study sites selected/agreed by hosts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2 Consultants commissioned and workshops arranged</td>
<td>1.2 First phase of in-country work completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Methodology finalised and understood by participants</td>
<td>2.1 Core methodology developed for participating country case studies (Aug 01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.1 Team able to adapt methodology for case study</td>
<td>2.2 Generic CBP manual developed, and adapted version produced in all 4 countries (Sep 01).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.3 Revised manual produced based on experience and results of evaluations (Nov 02).</td>
<td>2.4 Training of Trainers (ToT) manual developed (Jan 03).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.5 ToT manual used for second round training in Zimbabwe and in SA</td>
<td>2.6 Revised HPPG used for national ToT in Uganda (Mar 04).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Case studies completed, clarifying best practice lessons from case studies and recommendations</td>
<td>3.1 4 country case studies completed and written up (July-Aug 01).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.1 Report on existing country experience produced for each participating country</td>
<td>3.2 Visits to India and Bolivia completed and written up (Oct 01 and May 02).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.2 Report on each of 2 case studies produced identifying learnings</td>
<td>3.3 Draft country reports produced documenting what happened in project and lessons learned (Aug 01) and early 2003.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.4 All partner countries have written up experience for special edition of PLA Notes (March 2004)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Learnings amongst partners</td>
<td>4.1 All countries have held workshops, and country reports have been produced and disseminated.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Comparative report on CBP experience in Uganda, SA, Ghana and Zimbabwe

16 October 2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Output</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>By June 2002 (note project later extended to Sept 2004)</th>
<th>Progress as at 30 September 2004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.2 Reference groups have met regularly in Uganda, SA and Zimbabwe and are being incorporated into ongoing programmes. This is a formal Steering Committee in SA, which meets every 2 months.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.3 Exchange visit happened for facilitators from SA to Uganda in April 2002, from Uganda to Zimbabwe and Ghana in September 2002.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.4 Learnings from methodology workshopped at 3 partner meetings (Aug 01, July 02, Nov 02)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.5 Second national workshops held in SA (Oct 02), Zimbabwe (Jan 03) and Ghana (July 03).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5 Implementation plans developed which reflect learning and are refined by comments from collaborating partners

| 5 Implementation plans developed which reflect learning and are refined by comments from collaborating partners | 5.1 Plans produced for all 4 countries | 5.1 Implementation in pilots planned in all 4 countries |
|      |                                                      | 5.2 Proposals made for how policy should be modified | 5.2 National rollout happening in Uganda and in SA (see output 8). |

### Unplanned outputs

6 Pilots run and methodology adapted

| 6 Pilots run and methodology adapted | 6.1 Pilots run in one district in Uganda, and 2+ districts in SA, Zimbabwe and Ghana. |

7 Methodology applied in all of at least one local government area in each country

| 7 Methodology applied in all of at least one local government area in each country | 7.1 Full implementation in one city in SA (Mangaung/Bloemfontein), one rural district in Uganda (Bushenyi), two rural districts in each of Zimbabwe, and Ghana covering 2 million people |
|                                                                                  | 7.2 Rollout of HPPG in all districts of Uganda in 2003, and revised programme for 2004. |
|                                                                                  | 7.3 In SA programme rolling out to 8 municipalities and national guidelines. |
|                                                                                  | 7.4 In Zimbabwe a second planning round initiated in Gwanda. |

8 National policy adapted to incorporate CBP

| 8 National policy adapted to incorporate CBP | 8.1 HPPG for Uganda incorporates CBP methodology and being rolled out nationally under LGDP 1 and 2 (including DFID funding). |
|                                             | 8.2 KPIs for DPLG in South Africa include CBP – national Steering Committee leading on stage 2 which includes development of national guidelines |
|                                             | 8.3 Zimbabwe pillar in decentralisation policy added to include CBP and Ministry committed to taking forward CBP. |
2 POLICIES AND SYSTEMS FOR DECENTRALISED PLANNING

2.1 Decentralisation

If the 3 governance issues suggested in the previous section are to be achieved, decentralisation to local government and below is a critical ingredient. Decentralisation can be administrative to lower levels within a government department (delegation or deconcentration), to lower level political bodies (eg local governments) giving them decision-making powers (devolution) and fiscal (where resources are the ability to raise resources are transferred to lower levels).

For decentralisation to make a difference in the quality of peoples lives, it must be carried through beyond the level of local government, but also to increase the participation of the communities in the planning for, and management of, development of their area. Community-based planning was conceived as a methodology that increases the participation of communities in planning and improving the quality if plans, of services, and of improving the ability of communities to act in support of their own development. The four country action research project examined the institutional arrangement in each country to determine to what extent the decentralisation process has been taken forward and is supportive of community participation in the planning and action of service delivery. All four countries are at various stages of decentralisation.

2.2 Policy and planning environment in South Africa

Figure 2.2.1 shows the main decentralised structures in South Africa. This shows devolution to provinces who provide many services, and to some extent to local government, whose role is increasing.

Figure 2.2.1 Levels of government and planning in South Africa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Government</th>
<th>Political</th>
<th>Admin</th>
<th>Traditional</th>
<th>Planning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Centre (43 million people)</td>
<td>National government</td>
<td>National Departments, some with national competence eg Land Affairs.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sector plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provincial (9) Metros (6) – Category A</td>
<td>Provincial governments</td>
<td>Most development services managed from this level. Can’t generate revenue although legislation is pending to permit this</td>
<td>King in some areas (eg of Zulus)</td>
<td>Provincial Growth and Development Strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Municipalities – 47 (Category B)</td>
<td>Elected council</td>
<td>Technical staff and some technical functions eg health. Produce Integrated Development Plan (IDP) Can generate revenue</td>
<td></td>
<td>Integrated Development Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Municipalities 231 (Category C)</td>
<td>Elected council with technical staff</td>
<td>Technical staff and some technical functions. Produce IDP. Generate significant revenue, mainly through electricity, water and rates</td>
<td>Chiefs powerful in some rural areas, especially former bantustans</td>
<td>Integrated Development Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wards (7-100 per municipality)</td>
<td>Councillor and Ward committees</td>
<td>Local staff may operate at this level but not linked to ward structure. Wards very weak.</td>
<td>Headmen in some rural areas</td>
<td>Level used for CBP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In South Africa, the Reconstruction and Development Programme (RDP), published in 1994, became the cornerstone of South African development policy. It laid the foundation for all subsequent legislative measures to improve the standard of living and quality of life of South Africans, particularly the previously disadvantaged communities. One of the six principles of the RDP is that development must be “people-driven” and the importance of deepening democracy. The RDP focused on people’s most immediate needs, and it relied on their energies to drive the process of meeting these needs. Development was therefore not about the delivery of goods to a passive citizens. The legislation therefore put people first and recognised the need for their active involvement and subsequent empowerment. The Constitution of 1996 enshrined the concept of 3 different “spheres” of government, as opposed to tiers, national, provincial and local, and so South Africa is one a rare groups of countries where local governments are actually part of the Constitution.

The White Paper on Local Government of 1999 introduced the notion of “developmental” local government, with four major objectives:

- The provision of infrastructure and services;
- The creation of liveable, integrated towns, cities and rural areas;
- Local economic development, and;
- Community empowerment and redistribution.

The Municipal Services Act (MSA) of 2000 further revolutionised the way municipalities were to function. Three important ideas contained in the MSA were that a municipality comprises the politicians, administration and the community; that the role of municipalities is as facilitators and co-ordinators of development (inclusive of the service and infrastructure delivery); and that municipalities are required to produce integrated and strategic 5 year plans (IDPs), combining both an area development plan and a municipal business plan. Included in the MSA are a number of elements giving communities a role in planning, and in monitoring of the municipality. This has changed the way South African municipalities do business.

The Municipal Structures Act provided for municipalities to choose a model of participation through the establishment of ward committees. Their primary function is to act as a formal communication link between the community and the council. These ward committees are the only participatory structures at submunicipal level, and so were important in this project in that they could play a central role in getting communities to participate effectively in the municipal development planning processes particularly the IDP process.

The IDPs:

- Made municipalities develop a plan for the whole municipal area, including the actions of other stakeholders such as provincial and national government, the private sector and civil society;
- So broadened the the range of stakeholders that need to be involved in the IDP process;
- made local authorities consider some form of participatory process as part of their planning;
- made local authorities accountable to citizens (at least in theory) by having to demonstrate the extent to which they have acted on their plans.

An elected ward councillor is the chairman and accounting officer of the ward committee. While they do not have executive powers they can express their dissatisfaction of the ward councillor. These ward committees can play a central role in getting communities to
participate effectively in the IDP process. CBP was introduced at the ward level with ward committees playing a significant role in community mobilisation, CBP facilitation and leading the in-depth planning sessions and discussions on the way forward.

2.3 Policy and planning environment in Uganda

Uganda has the most advanced decentralisation process in Africa. The Decentralisation Policy was announced by the Government of Uganda in 1992 and gazetted as the Local Government (Resistance Councils) Statute of 1993. Subsequently, the 1995 Constitution and the Local Government Act (1997) entrenched the principles of decentralisation by empowering local governments with responsibilities for the allocation of public resources, for integrated participatory planning, budgeting and investment management. The objectives of decentralisation were to:

- Transfer real power to local councils and thus reduce the load of work on remote and under-resourced Central Officials;
- Bring political and administrative control over services to the point where they are actually delivered thereby improving accountability and effectiveness and promoting the peoples feeling of ownership of programs and projects executed in their local councils;
- Free local managers from central constraints and, as a long-term goal, allow them develop organisational structures tailored to local circumstances;
- Improve financial accountability and responsibility by establishing a clear link between the payment of taxes and the provision of services they finance;
- Improve the capacity of Local Councils to plan, finance and manage the delivery of services to their areas of jurisdictions.

The Local Government Act (1997) created five tiers of Local Councils (see Table 2.3.1);

Table 2.3.1 Levels of government and planning in Uganda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Political</th>
<th>Administrative</th>
<th>Traditional</th>
<th>Planning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Centre</td>
<td>National government</td>
<td>National ministries performing policy roles only</td>
<td>Strong kingdoms at subnational level, eg Buganda, with prime minister and ministers</td>
<td>Sector plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC5</td>
<td>Elected local government</td>
<td>Locally appointed technical staff in most disciplines</td>
<td>District development plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC4</td>
<td>Constituency</td>
<td>King representatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC3</td>
<td>Sub-county/ Municipal Division / Town Council</td>
<td>Sub-county Chief. Technical staff posted at this level – powers increasing.</td>
<td>Clan heads</td>
<td>Subcounty Development Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC2</td>
<td>Parish Council and dev. committee</td>
<td>Parish Chief</td>
<td></td>
<td>Plans as part of sub county. Level selected for CBP/HPPG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC1</td>
<td>Village council and development committee</td>
<td>Village chief</td>
<td></td>
<td>Plans part of parish</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LCs 3, and 5 are local governments ie corporate bodies charged with service provision responsibilities as well as planning. The others are administrative units recognised as statutory planning structures in the constitution. Every local government is required by law to have a three-year integrated rolling investment/development plan. Planning guides are provided by the Ministry, but it is not uncommon to find no development plans at the local government level. While there are planning structures below the local governments, these were limited to needs identification and project implementation.

There are no sectoral or technical committees at the Parish or village levels. These structures are however well recognised in project implementation initiated by them or for projects are suggested from levels above the Parish.

CBP was introduced at the Parish level. Representatives of social groups were drawn from the many villages under the Parish. Professional and technical persons were drawn from the Sub County as facilitators. Community mobilisation was carried out by the Parish and village chiefs. Traditional authorities while being recognised as powerful are not by law required to be represented in the different structures of local government. They however played a significant role in community mobilisation.

2.4 Policy and planning environment in Zimbabwe

The levels of government in Zimbabwe are shown in Table 2.4.1.

Table 2.4.1 Levels of government and planning in Zimbabwe

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Centre</th>
<th>Political</th>
<th>Administrative</th>
<th>Traditional</th>
<th>Planning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National government</td>
<td>National ministries</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sector plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Province</td>
<td>Resident Minister</td>
<td>Provincial staff of government</td>
<td>Provincial</td>
<td>Provinicial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Provincial Governor),</td>
<td>departments, headed by a Provincial</td>
<td>development</td>
<td>development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provincial Council of</td>
<td>Administrator (PA)</td>
<td>plan</td>
<td>plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>reps of Councils</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td>Rural District Council/</td>
<td>Council staff plus deconcentrated</td>
<td>Chiefs</td>
<td>District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>municipality</td>
<td>offices of national departments,</td>
<td></td>
<td>development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>District Administrator (DA) and RDDC</td>
<td></td>
<td>plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward</td>
<td>Ward government</td>
<td>Ward development committee</td>
<td>Headmen</td>
<td>In theory,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(WADCO) including technical staff</td>
<td></td>
<td>make plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village</td>
<td>Village assembly</td>
<td>Village development committee</td>
<td>Headmen</td>
<td>Level used for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Party branches</td>
<td>(VIDCO) including technical staff</td>
<td></td>
<td>CBP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Zimbabwe’s decentralisation process started after independence with the creation of the different levels of government above. Subsequently the Rural District Councils Act created integrated authorities in rural areas, combining urban and rural structures. Local government is not enshrined in the Constitution but local governments are autonomous legal structures. In terms of sectoral ministries, the powers and function of central government are simply delegated to provincial and district levels, ie deconcentration.

The decentralisation processes have stopped and started depending on political and economic changes. Recently government created a Ministerial Committee on Decentralisation and elevated it to Cabinet level, which implies greater commitment and willingness on the part of
politicians. A Vision for Decentralisation has been generated in line with the thirteen principles for decentralisation enunciated in 1996. A key element in the vision amongst others is to build the capacity of local government in order to provide;

- efficient and effective provision of essential public services;
- at atmosphere that promotes public participation in governance by enabling and encouraging local residents to exercise their rights and responsibilities over the social, economic and political development of their areas; and
- and to facilitate co-ordination of all organisations operating in rural areas and providing services to the rural population.

The Decentralisation Policy has already been influenced by CBP, bringing community empowerment into the text. In 2000 government introduced the Traditional Leaders Act which attempts to harmonise the traditional structures and those of local government. This Act essentially brought all adults into the planning arena regardless of political affiliation.

The Rural District Development Committee is a subcommittee of Council, and brings together government departments, NGOs, and is chaired by the District Administrator. The RDDC rather than the RDC was responsible for the production of district plans.

Below the District are two levels of administration ie the ward and village assemblies and development committees. In theory village plans are filtered through the ward development committee before it reaches the district. When plans finally reach the district they have either been diluted or have been dropped as minor projects. District plans are submitted to province, and then to the centre. There is no resource envelope during the planning and thus the motivation to produce the plans is low. In general this planning system has degraded, as it competes with sectoral planning from Ministries, and the regression in the economy has cut the resources available for development (and so to be planned for).

CBP was introduced at the ward level with village development committees (VIDCOs) and villages assemblies taking part. The traditional authorities were used in mobilising communities. In the volatile political situation this helped to cut across political party lines and enabled the planning to take place without undue disturbances. Representative of social groups came from the villages.

2.5 Policy and planning environment in Ghana

The Ghanaian decentralisation process is essentially de-concentration process where the powers and functions of central government are delegated to district offices of Ministries, while district assemblies have some devolved powers. Ghana began the implementation of a programme of a decentralization programme and local government reform in 1988. The policy is reflected in the 1992 Constitution of Ghana. The reforms that have a bearing on the implementation of CBP are among others;

- the establishment of ten Regional Co-ordinating Councils (RCCs) at the regional level;
- devolution of central administrative authority to the regional and district levels,
- assignment of functions and responsibilities to the various levels of government.

The key levels are actually Municipal, Metropolitan and District Assemblies, although their powers are limited by very low funding levels, and the fact that government departments have been deconcentrated, and they have limited authority over them. However these departments are supposed to report to Council committees. At the sub-district level urban, town area and
zonal councils were created. Central government Ministries, Departments and Agencies (MDAs) were assigned the responsibility of policy making, planning, monitoring and evaluation of policies and programmes. Regions, through the RCCs and their respective Regional Planning Co-ordinating Units (RPCUs), were given the responsibility to play the role of co-ordination, to ensure consistency, compatibility and coherence of district level development; facilitate joint ventures among districts and monitor the activities of district administrative units. Table 2.5.1 summarises the structures.

### Table 2.5.1 Structures of government in Ghana

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Political</th>
<th>Administrative</th>
<th>Traditional</th>
<th>Planning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Centre</td>
<td>National government</td>
<td>National ministries</td>
<td>Strong kingdoms at subnational level, eg Ashanti</td>
<td>Sector plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region (10)</td>
<td>Regional Minister</td>
<td>Regional Coordinating Councils</td>
<td>Regional plans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td>District assembly</td>
<td>Staff of DA and deconcentrated government departments</td>
<td>Chiefs, playing strong role in rural areas</td>
<td>District plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subdistrict (eg 10 per district)</td>
<td>Urban, town area and zonal councils</td>
<td>Technical staff</td>
<td>Chiefs, playing strong role in rural areas</td>
<td>Level chosen for CBP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village</td>
<td>Unit committees (for every 100 households)</td>
<td>Headmen, playing strong role in rural areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Local Government Act, 1993 (Act 462) gave the power to the District Assembly to exercise political and administrative authority in the district, provide guidance, give direction to, and supervise all other administrative authorities in the district. The act also empowered the district to:

- formulate and execute plans, programmes and strategies for the effective mobilization of resources necessary for the overall development of the district;
- promote and support productive activity and social development in the district;
- initiate programmes for the development of basic infrastructure and provide municipal works and services in the district;
- be responsible for the development, improvement and management of human settlements and the environment in the district;
- in co-operation with the appropriate national and local security agencies be responsible for the maintenance of security and public safety in the district; and
- initiate, sponsor or carry out such studies as may be necessary for the discharge of any of the functions conferred by this Act or any other enactment.

The District Assemblies are responsible for the implementation of development policies and programmes co-ordinated by the National Development Planning Commission (NDPC). The District Assembly (DA) brings together representatives of the people, a team of development agents and other agencies on the development issues of the district and decide on interventions/actions necessary to deal with them. The DA also builds partnerships between central government the private sector and civil society. Ghana therefore has the legal requirement for community participation in the preparation and execution of development plans.
While the provision for community participation is there, the recognised lowest planning unit is the sub-committee of the council at the District Assembly level. The sub-district structures such as the area councils are used to provide information and administration of the decisions made at the District Assembly level but are not involved in the planning though they are an important source of information for planning. Community participation is encouraged through elected representation at all levels and each level is strongly influenced by party politics. The area councils are determined by distinct boundaries. Local communities within the area councils are determined by the traditional structures and boundaries. It is not uncommon to find more than one community within an area council. Unit committees are determined by population numbers and can divide communities under the same traditional leadership into two or more unit committees. Divergent local politics of unit committees can actually hinder development within the same community.

Traditional leaders in Ghana (such as among the Ashanti communities) are well established and well respected. Government however has not made provision for the representation of the traditional leaders in the government structures. They are seen as good for mobilising the communities but not in the decision making process of government.

CBP was undertaken at the area council level. A number of area councils make the district Assembly. CBP meeting were chaired by the chief who was also responsible for community mobilisation.

2.6 Comparison between the four countries

Table 2.6.1 compares the state of decentralisation and planning in the four countries before CBP started, and the selected level of community for the CBP process. This level was selected to be a legitimate and recognised level of government, to be suitable for participation, but also that it was realistic to expect that plans could be facilitated at that level throughout the country.

Uganda has the most developed decentralisation system, with lower level planning, and well developed structures for promoting participation at sub-local government levels. In all cases however a natural level could be identified for undertaking CBP, which was not the lowest level eg village, for reasons of practicality, that it was impossible to afford to facilitate plans at that level. For example in Bushenyi, the Ugandan pilot there were 170 parish plans, and if conducted at village level, would have been 2000. However where there was a good structuring down to village level, villages provided representatives in the ward/parish planning process. Where this was lacking, notably South Africa, the structuring of representation in the planning process was problematic.
Table 2.6.1  State of decentralisation and entry point for planning before and during CBP across the 4 countries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>State of decentralisation</th>
<th>Lower level planning role before CBP</th>
<th>CBP entry point</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>Major devolution to two tiers of local government with recognised structures beneath</td>
<td>The municipal, Town and Sub-counties were lower level planning authorities, with village and Parish providing information and needs.</td>
<td>Entry was the Parish. Social groups inclusive of disadvantaged groups took part. Plans included in subcounty plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>Significant devolution to provinces and to a lesser degree to local government. Only 1 level of structure below local government</td>
<td>The municipality drew the plans. Ward Committees through the ward Councillor conduct consultations with sub-ward structure who provide information on problems and needs.</td>
<td>Entry was the ward and social groups in the wards. The role of the ward committee was to facilitate and mobilise community participation. Ward plans were produced for each ward.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>Some devolution to districts assemblies. Ministries deconcentrated</td>
<td>The sub-committees of council gathered information and prioritised the projects for submission to the District Assembly. Area councils and unit committees exist on paper.</td>
<td>Entry was the Area Councils using representative social groupings. Their plans will form part of the three year District Assembly plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
<td>Creation of Rural District Councils and Urban Councils, but deconcentration of Ministries</td>
<td>Rural District Development Committee undertook planning. Ward councillors consulted their people on needs and problems.</td>
<td>Entry was ward structures, using interest groups.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PART B: WHAT HAPPENED IN EACH PARTNER COUNTRY

3 THE GENERIC CBP METHODOLOGY

The core methodology that was developed is derived from seeking to apply the sustainable livelihoods approach in a planning context. The principles and key elements were developed at a 4 country workshop in August 2001, after the review in each of the 4 countries. Subsequently a generic manual was developed (in September 2001) which each country then adapted.

3.1 The underlying principles

The approach to planning developed in this manual is based on the sustainable livelihood principles (see Box 1). Work in applying this in Africa has suggested that one of the key elements is ensuring that “people are active and involved in managing their own development”. Community-based planning (CBP) linked to the local government system provides an opportunity to make this a reality. The key principles that this approach to CBP are based on include:

- we need to ensure that poor people are included in planning;
- systems need to be realistic and practical, and the planning process must be implementable using available resources within the district/local government, and must link in and integrate with existing processes, particularly local government planning;
- planning must be linked to a legitimate structure, ideally one that can take funds;
- planning should not be a once off exercise, but should be part of longer process;
- plan must be people focused and empowering;
- we must plan from vision and strength/opportunities not problems;

Box 3.1 Principles of the sustainable livelihoods approach

For effective pro-poor development interventions must be:
- People focused
- Participatory and responsive
- Based on strengths not needs
- Holistic
- Based on partnerships
- Sustainable (economic, social, environmental, and institutional)
- Flexible and dynamic
• plans must be holistic and cover all sectors;
• planning should promote mutual accountability between community and officials;
• there must be commitment by councillors and officials and there must be someone responsible to ensure it gets done.

The clients of the planning are communities/interest groups/individuals, local politicians as well as technical staff of local governments, service providers (including national and provincial Departments, NGOs).

The implementation of these principles led to some key decisions being taken:

• that a 3-5 day process could be empowering but affordable and so realistic to be replicated;
• that planning should be based around livelihood outcomes not needs, and build on local strengths;
• that the plan must be initiated by the local government but owned by the community;
• that participatory methodologies must be used to help build that ownership;
• that a legitimate structure such as a ward must be used as the basis of the planning.

On this basis a core methodology was developed as shown in the next section.

3.2 The core planning process

Table 3.1.2 shows a summary of the core planning process that was developed.

### Table 7.1  Suggested intensive field schedule for first year planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>With whom?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pre Planning</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5 days</td>
<td>Pre-planning meeting at least one week before the planning starts</td>
<td>Ward committee and possibly local leaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Compiling background information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planning (up to 5 days)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 1 (situation analysis)</td>
<td>Community launch meeting</td>
<td>Broad community group (or can be in evening only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evening</td>
<td>Timeline</td>
<td>Smaller community group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Venn diagram</td>
<td>Smaller community group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Livelihood analysis</td>
<td>Socio-economic groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SWOT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community feedback meeting</td>
<td>Broad community group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 2 (situation analysis)</td>
<td>Livelihood analysis continued</td>
<td>Socio-economic groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evening</td>
<td>Well-being analysis</td>
<td>Smaller community group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Service provider interviews</td>
<td>Service providers/CBOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mapping</td>
<td>Smaller community group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transect (optional)</td>
<td>Smaller community group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Visioning and objectives exercise</td>
<td>Broad community group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 3 (planning)</td>
<td>Strategies and projects</td>
<td>Smaller community group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 4 (planning)</td>
<td>Strategy development continued</td>
<td>Smaller community group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evening (or next evening)</td>
<td>Propose spending for process funds, IDP projects, environmental check list and possibly action plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community feedback meeting to confirm plan</td>
<td>Broad community group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 5</td>
<td>Project profiles</td>
<td>Core facilitation team plus other co-opted community members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Start writing up the plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Planning follow up (within next week or by deadline)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(writing)</th>
<th>Completing writing up the plan</th>
<th>Core facilitation team plus other co-opted community members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Submission of plan</td>
<td>Core facilitation team</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Finalisation (0.5 day)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>After local authority review of community plan</th>
<th>Community plan finalisation meeting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Review meetings (0.5 day every 1-3 months)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regular meetings to review plan and roll action plan</th>
<th>Local leaders (Ward committee, parish development committee)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
The planning process built on the SL framework, which includes:

- household’s assets (physical, human, natural, financial and social);
- the external environment including their vulnerabilities to stresses and shocks, the opportunities, and the policies/institutions and processes which affect their lives;
- the livelihood outcomes they are looking for;
- the livelihood strategies they adopt to achieve them, or see as possible.

This is analysed in a form of sophisticated SWOT analysis (see appendix 1) which then leads to a prioritisation around preferred livelihood outcomes and then a simple strategic planning process.

The methodology involved the following steps (see Table and Figure 3.1.2):

**Stage 1  Preparation**
Preparation involves a pre planning meeting and a community launch meeting. This pre-planning meeting is held preferably two weeks prior to the main planning week, initially just with political leadership. This could also include some opinion leaders (such as teachers, clinic staff, religious leaders, youth leaders, leaders of unemployed groups, trade union, women’s groups etc). The aim is to mobilise the leaders of many different sections of the community. The aim is to get broad ownership of the plan so that people realise that this is about their process. During the pre planning stage there is gathering of information about projects and programmes that are already happening in the ward/ planning area as well as projects that the municipality intends to implement in that area. The pre-planning should be followed by a community launch meeting where the community CBP introduces the planning process and timetable, the selection of facilitators and the determination of the social groups that will be addressed during the situation analysis stage.

**Stage 2  Gathering information (situation analysis)**
This second stage in the CBP process is based on the timetable that was drawn at the launch meeting. This step normally takes two days ending in an analysis of the information and report back to the community. This step involves using several PLA tools with different social groups and service providers:

- to analyse their livelihoods, their assets, vulnerabilities, preferred outcomes and livelihood strategies;
- to conduct institutional analysis of service providers, whether CBO, government, NGO or private sector;
- to map the resources and issues of the community;
- to understand the historical trends in the community.

All tools used are written up using a SWOT format.

**Stage 3  Analysing planning information and report back**
This step involves analysis of the information from all social groups interviewed in an effort to understand the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats of the community. At this stage the methodology looks at the preferred outcomes of the community. This stage uses the SL Framework to understand where the community is (refer to the diagram in annex 1).

A community meeting is held at the end of the second day to present all the outcomes identified by different social groups. The community examines the outcomes and also adds to
these. In addition they do a ward SWOT analysis to complement the SWOT of the social groups. The community then prioritises five outcomes through voting. Soon after this the community produces a vision statement based on five prioritised outcomes. The community also selects 5 persons per outcome to be involved in the planning for the community the next day.

Stage 4  Reconciliation
This step is undertaken to gather all the information from all the different exercises and to relate them to the prioritised outcomes. This is done to fully understand how best to address the prioritised outcomes and make sure you are using all the information collected.

Stage 5  Planning
The first step is undertaken by a small group chosen by the community during a two day period following the community meeting, and may involve service providers, NGOs, relevant CBOs etc. Usually this stage includes those community political leaders who will oversee implementation of the plan. The plan developed is a ministrategic plan including objectives, strategies, projects and activities, including:

- what the community will do;
- what the municipality needs to do,
- what others need to do.

The plan also draws up an action plan which the community is going to implement. In addition any large projects are identified and proposals developed which are then submitted to local government to be part of the municipal plan. The community action plan is the responsibility of the community to take forward with some funds from the municipality or with own resources from the community. The community plan is then documented with a copy remaining in the community hands.

Who the facilitators are, who the trainers are, the training of trainers, all varied by country and will be discussed later.

Stage 6  Implementation
Once the plan is completed the key stages include appraisal, implementation, monitoring. However the way this was approached varied in the different countries.
Figure 3.1.2  Diagram illustrating the revised SA process
4 IMPLEMENTING CBP IN EACH COUNTRY

4.1 Introduction

The experience from the application of the CBP planning methodology varied considering experiences of participatory approaches being applied by various stakeholders, including the timing of the training and duration of the community planning.

4.2 The implementation of CBP in South Africa

4.2.1 Phase 1 – implementation from April 2001 to November 2002

The partners in South Africa were a local government (Mangaung Local Municipality); Decentralised Development Planning, the section of the national Department of Provincial and Local Government who were responsible for local government planning; CARE; and Khanya-managing rural change. Various Free State Provincial Government Departments also assisted the rollout of CBP. CBP was also undertaken in Limpopo with the Department of Agriculture, and this section also mentions briefly similar work that was happening in eThekwini Municipality, who later became one of the CBP partners.

Table 4.2.1 shows a summary of the evolution of the project during Phase 1.

Table 4.2.1 Timeline for activity with CBP in South Africa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Country review of experience</td>
<td>May-June</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country workshop</td>
<td>June</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 country SA workshop</td>
<td>August</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of manual</td>
<td>September</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilot</td>
<td>Sept-Oct</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visit to India</td>
<td>October</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full implementation</td>
<td>October -</td>
<td>February</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of IDP</td>
<td>October</td>
<td>June</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDP Representative Forum agrees CBP priorities from</td>
<td>November</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>first 6 wards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exchange to Uganda</td>
<td>April</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visit to Bolivia</td>
<td>May</td>
<td>Me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limpopo DoA approaches Khanya for assistance with</td>
<td>May</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda workshop</td>
<td>July</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work on Limpopo CBP</td>
<td>July-Sept</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA CBP workshop</td>
<td>29-30 Oct</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The very first CBP pilot was conducted in Mangaung Municipality. The generic planning process developed for the project was adopted, with some modifications made for affluent and commercial farming areas. The plans emphasise community action, supported by R50 000 allocated as process funds by Mangaung, and a community action plan to implement the plan. Proposals were made for projects to be included in the IDP or by other agencies. The total contact time was 4 days.
The municipality implemented CBP or ward planning in all 43 wards of the city and rural areas, ranging from central business districts, squatter settlements, commercial farming areas, high density townships to predominantly white affluent suburbs. This occurred over the period from September 2001 to March 2002. Section 4.5 draws from an independent evaluation carried out by the Centre for Development Support (CDS) at the University of the Free State, based on field work in 6 sample wards and a questionnaire to all wards. Overall the evaluation by councillors and ward committees of CBP was extremely positive with ratings of between 3.5 (good) to 5 (excellent). Some suggestions were made to improve preplanning, the timing of planning, planning in affluent areas, and in ensuring follow-up. Some issues were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>Provided in a learning by doing process, but facilitators felt they would have benefited from some prior training;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBP methodology</td>
<td>It worked, ensured the voices of the poor were heard, and created a spirit of participation and empowerment. It was modified in certain situations to fit people’s availability and preferences, notably in affluent and commercial farming areas;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitation</td>
<td>Was conducted by people from various institutions, notably the municipality and provincial departments. Facilitators were very positive about the experience and only in one case was the councillor not satisfied with the facilitator. The lowest level of satisfaction seemed to be a direct result of logistical problems that were experienced, for example transport problems;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manuals</td>
<td>Were regarded as very helpful;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td>There was some confusion about the sustainability of projects and the plan, with some people feeling that the R50 000 should result in sustainable projects, misunderstanding its intention to support a community process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wards contributions</td>
<td>In most wards there were significant contributions by volunteers to implement the plans eg school cleaning, tree planting, cleaning campaigns, etc. No ward reported a direct financial contribution.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In terms of impact of CBP, 42 of the wards completed their plan and 41 of the 42 wards spent their R50 000 allocation. In 18 of the 20 wards surveyed, there were regular ward committee meetings afterwards, implying that the planning was giving some impetus to the ward committees, and 97% of the funds were accounted for. Specific impacts are shown in Table 4.1.3.
Table 4.1.3 Impacts of CBP in Mangaung in 2001/2\(^1\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Degree of impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extent to which CBP was carried out</td>
<td>42 of 43 wards completed their plan and 41 of the 42 wards implemented using their R50 000 allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community action resulting</td>
<td>Local action resulted in 41 of the 42 wards, and in some cases many people were mobilised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved plans</td>
<td>There were no ward plans prior to CBP. The ward planning fed directly into and changed the priorities of Mangaung’s IDP with economic development becoming the top development priority rather than the traditional municipal focus on infrastructure. Other priorities emerged such as HIV and security, where the municipality has to play an enabling rather than provider role. CBP also contributed to the thinking behind the development programmes and some specific projects. The timing meant it was not possible in the first year to directly incorporate projects proposed for the IDP and these are being included in year 2;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved services</td>
<td>Where service providers participated in the ward planning, there does seem to have been impact on services, for example with police, even though the evaluation was carried out only 6 months after the plans were completed;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community empowerment, ownership and action</td>
<td>The feeling of ownership was one of the most significant aspects raised in interviews with councillors, contributing to “proud community members and ward committees”. A wide range of actions on their own initiative occurred in the different wards;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addresses demands of the poor/vulnerable/gender/HIV-affected</td>
<td>- the involvement of poor and disadvantaged groups in the methodology was one of the major positive outcomes of the process. The emphasis on social or interest groups with a disadvantaged background made this possible. It is noteworthy that a ward dominated by urban white middle class people decided to spend 70% of their allocated money on the skills development of farm workers in the ward;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on the local government</td>
<td>- MLM managed the CBP process, with support from Khanya during the initial stages, and some 30 MLM facilitators were trained. They found the process very empowering, and it gave them a much better understanding of planning in general (even for the planners).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Limpopo CBP was carried out in 31 villages. An intensive one-week CBP training was run for 40 district staff of the Department of Agriculture. Immediately afterwards they spent a week applying the learnings in a planning process with three communities and then applied this in 28 other villages, to produce Village Development Plans. It was decided to take this work forward rather with a local government, and Greater Tzaneen decided to become involved.

4.1.2 Phase 2 National Piloting in 8 municipalities

The national workshop held in October 2002 highlighted the success and the learnings of the piloting in Mangaung. There was tremendous interest at this event, and many of the ward committees participated in the first day, which had over 400 participants. It was agreed to

establish a national Steering Committee to take forward CBP, including the current partners, other national and provincial organisations (SALGA, IDT, Free State Department of Local Government and Housing) and other municipalities committed to participatory approaches (eThekwini, Tzaneen). A proposal was developed which was approved by the Steering Committee and Khanya appointed project manager for a next stage of piloting the upscaling of the work to 8 municipalities (and one additional municipality has been added). This included improving the linkages between the participatory planning and the IDP, development of the M&E systems, definition of support systems, production of a resource book for ward committees, development of draft national manuals, piloting, learning from the pilots and then finalisation of the national manuals and proposals for national rollout. This was funded by Netherlands Aid, DFIDSA, GTZ and DBSA, with municipalities contributing a matching contribution of R250 000 each. The total project cost is around US$1 million, much more than the original funding for the CBP research project.

A national training of trainers was held in Bela Bela from 29 September to 9 October 2003, where municipalities sent up to 4 lead trainers for a two weeks training. The training involved 4.5 days in training, plus 5 days actually undertaking the ward planning, usually with a 1.5 hour training session in the morning. Partners from Zimbabwe and Uganda joined us for the training.

Trainers were very enthusiastic about CBP after the training, and in the evaluation when asked whether they viewed CBP as worthwhile, the rating was 86% ie between very good and excellent. Participants saw the importance of CBP in improving the quality of plans, in services, in improving community control, and in promoting community action.

A second training was conducted for IDP managers and those involved in managing community participation. This focused on managing the CBP process and on linking CBP to the IDP and vice versa. The four day training included all eight municipalities, each sending their IDP managers. The training was also very successful (77%). At the end of the training each municipality produced a process plan for rollout in their municipality.

The first step with each pilot was to finalise a process plan and contract. Each municipality had to decide who their facilitators would be (municipal, ward, other). After this a service provider then worked with the lead trainers to conduct the two week training of facilitators in each municipality. Thus CBP started in the earliest municipalities in November 2003, with the rest starting much later. 5 of the municipalities have now completed their ward planning, with the rest starting in November, and implementation start at a similar time. All municipalities are making available R10-50 000 for process funds. Early in the new year evaluations will be conducted on 3 municipalities, learning workshops held in all, a national workshop, revisions to the Guides, and proposals for a support system for those municipalities interested in undertaking CBP. Unlike Uganda, there is no intention to make municipalities have to do CBP, but keep it as an option for those that are committed to community participation in a real sense.

4.2 Implementation of CBP in Uganda

The initial partnership in Uganda, which took forward CBP, was between the Local Government Development Programme (LGDP), CARE International, Bushenyi District Local Government. These partners included national policy-makers, a facilitating agent with the participatory skills (CARE) and a local government to test out the approach (Bushenyi). This was later extended into a broad reference group to take forward the HPPG.
Table 4.2  Overall timeline and achievements for CBP/HPPG project in Uganda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date/ Year</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Under DDP, MOLG develops Investment Planning Guideline for lower level councils, MOLG publishes and issues performance measures for parish and village councils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2001</td>
<td>Decision by LGDP, Bushenyi and CARE to participate in CBP project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2001</td>
<td>CBP project starts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May-June 2001</td>
<td>Review of experience with participatory planning projects in Uganda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2001</td>
<td>Country workshop reviews experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 July-1 Aug 2001</td>
<td>South Africa hosts workshop of 4 Countries on CBP in Bloemfontein, South Africa. UPDNet disseminates workshop reports of Uganda and South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 2001</td>
<td>A workshop of stakeholders in participatory planning recommends revision of the investment Planning Guide, process of producing a Harmonized Framework for Participatory planning starts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept 2001</td>
<td>Generic CBP manual produced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2001</td>
<td>Review of Planning Guides and development of Harmonized Participatory Planning framework for Local Governments continues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2001</td>
<td>Adapted version of CBP manual produced after workshop for Bushenyi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov/Dec 2001</td>
<td>LG conducts study and review workshops, and issues refined investment-planning guidelines. OPM, MGLSD, NGOs and the Local Governments participate to develop a draft harmonized planning framework for local government. Workshop to present the draft HPPG to stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 2001 - Jan 2002</td>
<td>UNCDF new country program pilots implementation for deepening lower local council planning process, appraisal and signing of project document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2001</td>
<td>Visit to India to look at the Panchayat Raj system in Madhya Pradesh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2002</td>
<td>Local Governments apply refined investment planning guide at the beginning of Local government plan and budget cycle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 2002</td>
<td>Bushenyi LG officials develop the fifth draft of Bushenyi Manual for Participatory Parish Planning. Full implementation of CBP starts in Bushenyi with training of Facilitators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2002</td>
<td>MOLG introduces the HPPG to 56 districts and 13 Municipalities through Training of Trainers Regional workshops, sends out the guide for pre-testing and issues it to the Local Governments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2002</td>
<td>The Parish level planning process starts in Bushenyi using CBP methodology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2002</td>
<td>Visit to look at participation system in Bolivia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2002</td>
<td>Lead agencies like MOLG, ULAA and UPDNet advocate and conduct a workshop on CBP for stakeholders. The HPPG is presented to the NGO stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2002</td>
<td>CBP Partners from the four countries visit Bushenyi District to review experience of CBP and participate in the Uganda workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 2002</td>
<td>Consultant evaluates CBP in Bushenyi district in six parishes and sub counties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2002</td>
<td>Advisory Team circulates CBP evaluation report to other countries and plans to implement recommendations/ changes. The CBP processes funds the Bushenyi District Local Government officials to review and re-write the manual into a simpler less bulky size. Training of CAOs, District Planners nationally on HPPG application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2002</td>
<td>4 Country Workshop in South Africa reviews progress and plans for way forward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2003</td>
<td>National review of the HPPG starts through local consulting firm (Mentor Consult), guided by core group members, and with assistance from Khanya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2003</td>
<td>A team of 5 participated in the 4-country workshop at Ghana.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept/Oct. 2003</td>
<td>A team of 2 trainers participated in the South African ToT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comparative report on CBP experience in Uganda, SA, Ghana and Zimbabwe 16 October 2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date/ Year</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oct 2003</td>
<td>A Ugandan trainer participated in the training for South African IDP managers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Nov/December 2003| Re-orientation of District and Sub-county Technical Planning Committees on the HPPG in the six DDP II districts.  
| December 2003    | Development of standardised training materials in LLGs development planning completed.                                                   |
| December 2003    | First draft of an inventory of gender planning guidelines, gender planning guidelines for Lower Local Governments and Parishes were finalized in December 2003. |
| March 2004       | Training of Trainers on the HPPG with support from Khanya  
|                  | Mainstreaming of activities hitherto being executed by CARE Uganda in liaison with DFID and Khanya South Africa into the MoLG’s programmes. |

The core planning methodology developed across the 4 participating countries was adapted by a team of district based staff which was then tested in a number of parishes and sub-counties within Bushenyi District. This subsequently influenced and informed the development and refinement of the Harmonized Participatory Planning Guides for planning at sub-district levels. Table 5.3.1 shows a timeline for the project in Uganda.

The main difference from the methodologies used prior to CBP is that CBP encourages development plans to be more relevant to local needs and priorities by analysing the livelihoods of different social groups in the community so as to understand or focus on poverty better and enable each group to give their views. By encouraging planning based on people’s preferred outcomes and visions, it allows for more creative approaches to dealing with the situation and not just focusing on infrastructure. CBP also enhances the relevance of services, and encourages planning about what the community will do and not just what government will do for them. CBP also gave a methodology which linked to the subcounty and district planning system.

Uganda very early on recognised the importance of the approach and instigated the development of a national Harmonised Participatory Planning Guide for sub-district planning. This is discussed in section 5.

4.3 Implementation of CBP in Zimbabwe

The Ministry of Local Government, Public Works and National Housing is the lead agency for CBP in Zimbabwe. The Ministry also brought into the partnership the Intermediate Technology Development Group for technical support and collaboration as they were already involved in similar and successful initiatives in Chivi and Chimanimani districts and were keen to explore more areas. It was decided to pilot and later implement in Gwanda and Chimanimani Districts and these became the local government partners in the programme. Table 4.3.1 shows a timeline for the evolution of CBP activities in Zimbabwe.

4.3.1 Planning process decided on and why

The facilitation teams initially used the guide provided in the training manual (Table 4.3.2). There were very few situation-specific adjustments to the schedule. After the visit to Uganda the CBP Manual was revised. A District Training Team (DTT) was set up in each District plus a Core Facilitation Team (CFT) at ward level, who were trained for 1.5 days.
The DTT brought a new level of commitment and new modes of institutional behaviour at district level, with a focused and shared vision. In the two pilot districts, 33 DTT members were trained and 75% of these can confidently drive the whole process without external support. The decision to focus on DTTs helped to promote greater integration by various stakeholders operating at district level in their approach to community planning and development processes. The CFT concept worked well in all participating wards in Gwanda, while the process in Chimanimani was affected by the prevailing political climate of that district which was characterized by polarizations at community and institutional levels. Of the 184 CFT members targeted, 169 were successfully trained in facilitating CBP at community level. This helped communities to internalise a range of participatory methodologies, facilitating the participation of over 120 community representatives in each ward planning session, i.e. a total of over 2,700 people who participated in the CBP process in each district.

Table 4.3.1 Timeline for activity with CBP in Zimbabwe

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Review</td>
<td>May – June</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country Workshop</td>
<td>June</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Country Workshop</td>
<td>August</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBP Manual Adaptation</td>
<td>October</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visit to India</td>
<td>October</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda Workshop</td>
<td>July</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training of District Training Teams</td>
<td>August</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training of Core Facilitation Teams</td>
<td>August</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trial Runs and Reviews in Gwanda &amp; Chimanimani</td>
<td>August</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Ward Planning in Gwanda</td>
<td>September</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning in 4 Pilot Wards in Chimanimani</td>
<td>September</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration of Ward Plans into RDC Plans in Gwanda</td>
<td>October</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Quarterly Review of Plans</td>
<td>March</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country Report on Emerging Experiences</td>
<td>July</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO Sharing Workshop</td>
<td>August</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Workshop</td>
<td>November</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refresher Training of Facilitators in Chimanimani</td>
<td>February</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion of Ward Planning in Chimanimani</td>
<td>April – May</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Country Report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>September</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Ward Development Plans have been submitted to Chimanimani and Gwanda Rural District Councils (RDCs) for them to inform Council budgeting and also have increased access to various stakeholders since the RDC is the root entry point for all community support projects and initiatives.

4.3.2 Lessons from the planning process and methodology

The following were some of the lessons learnt from implementing CBP in Zimbabwe;

- Timing of CBP activities is critical – it must not coincide with other key events in the community (e.g. elections, census etc);
• Pre-planning is critical if CBP is to be done properly – it can make or break the whole process. In the case of Gwanda, this stage proved to be vital to the success of the process;
• Traditional and civic leadership are key social drivers of CBP;
• A local community facilitation team (CFT) has moral authority – which is important for trust building, localisation of the plan and leveraging of local resources;
• CBP has strengthened local linkages and social, economic and institutional ties;

• Injection of comparative experiences during facilitation can be inspiring and encouraging to communities;
• Tools for building local confidence and breaking dependency syndrome should be used in the facilitation process to strengthen ownership and control by
• Space must be provided for communities to mobilise locally available resources for supporting CBP. This can enhance cost-effectiveness of the planning process;
• Five full days are needed for planning excluding community feedback and write-up;
• Documentation capacity of CFT must be fully appraised and developed before the completion of the process. Where capacity cannot be developed, support from the District Training Team must be made available in good time;
• CBP has enhanced the RDC’s co-ordination role in the district;
• The deepening of the learning process on CBP with other NGOs is critical for building consensus with other players - there is high receptivity to this approach by NGOs.

4.4 Implementation of CBP in Ghana

The inception of CBP in Ghana created a complementary partnership between the Civil Society Organisation, the Traditional Authority, the sector Ministry and the Decentralised Departments. A six-member CBP team was developed out of this partnership arrangement. This arrangement was between, Integrated Social Development Centre (ISODEC), Ministry of Local Government and Rural Development, National Development and Planning Commission and District Assembly (Asante Akim South and Adanse East).

Table 4.4.1: Timeline for Ghana’s involvement in the CBP Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>May 2001</td>
<td>Meeting with the Deputy Minister of Local Government and Rural Devt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2001</td>
<td>Country CBP Workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July/August 2001</td>
<td>Completion of Country Review of Experience with CBP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2001</td>
<td>4 Country Workshop in South Africa *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 2001</td>
<td>Dissemination of Country Review and Stakeholder Workshops reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2001</td>
<td>Mangaung Pilot Workshop, which the team attended en route to India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2001</td>
<td>Study tour of India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb/March 2002</td>
<td>Adansi East Pilot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr/May 2002</td>
<td>Asante Akim South Pilot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2002</td>
<td>Study tour to Bolivia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On going</td>
<td>Implementation - - Asante Akim South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On going</td>
<td>Implementation - Adansi East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2002</td>
<td>Uganda Workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2002</td>
<td>Joint revising of facilitators’ manual - Bloemfontein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2002</td>
<td>Training of Facilitators - Adansi East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2002</td>
<td>Training of Facilitators - Asante Akim South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept/Oct 2002</td>
<td>Preparation of district reports on training workshops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 2002</td>
<td>South Africa National Workshop and 4 Country Workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 2003</td>
<td>Training Manual Development - Bloemfontein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 2003</td>
<td>Completion of pilots for the remaining Area/Town Councils in the Adansi East and Asante Akim South Districts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2003</td>
<td>Country Workshop and 4 Country Workshop in Accra, and visits to the two districts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May/June 2004</td>
<td>Attended Makana training, South Africa using SA’s revised methodology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The team could not attend due to a flight problem

The timeline for Ghana’s involvement is shown in Table 4.4.1 from May 2001 to September 2004. It covers activities as implemented in-country and those Ghana participated in outside of the country.

CBP in Ghana was piloted in two Town/Area Councils in the Asante Akim South and Adansi East Districts. The process was conducted using the first generic CBP Manual with few adaptations to fit the local condition. Facilitators were drawn from the District Planning and Coordination Units (DPCUs) of the two District Assemblies. The District Assemblies and Khanya jointly financed the first two planning sessions. The first two planning process at New Edubiase and Morso took 10 days and 7 days respectively. However, subsequent planning processes in the two districts took a shorter time of five days per plan.

The planning in Area Councils after the first two pilot councils was solely financed by the CBP Project. 60 facilitators were trained during the period and then a five year development plan was developed for each of the 20 Town/Area Councils in the two districts. A lot of time needed to be put into preplanning. Documenting the plans proved problematic.
PART C: LESSONS LEARNT AND WAY FORWARD

5 LESSONS LEARNT IN IMPLEMENTING CBP

This section takes each of the key elements of the CBP system and compares the experience and learnings across the four countries.

5.1 The methodology itself

Overall the methodology has worked in all 4 countries. Table 5.1.1 includes comments against some of the tools.

Table 5.1.1 Comments against activities in the methodology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-planning</td>
<td>Created excellent opportunities for dialogue between councillor and his constituents and the local government and traditional structures. However this process needs careful monitoring to ensure what is claimed to have happened did actually happen. Often underestimated how much work is needed here and if poorly done, or too close to the planning itself, the planning starts badly. Zimbabwe experimented with social groups collecting information prior to the planning week which seemed to work well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collection of background Information</td>
<td>Poorly done. There is a tendency of viewing any new process as different from the processes that preceded it. Data collected by previous planning exercises was not made use of. Technical staff ought to help the community to bring out and summarise this information obtained through previous processes. Not enough link was made to the district plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community planning launch meeting</td>
<td>Well attended in most wards and was an excellent opportunity for cultivating community interest in the planning process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livelihoods analysis</td>
<td>This was a very useful tool that helped bring out different interest groups and activities in the wards. Members of the community are likely to participate more fully in smaller groups and around their priority interests. In Zimbabwe there was a tendency for some political leadership in some wards to appoint people who do not fit into this formula and the performance of these appointees remained poor. There is a tension in whether to use interest or social groups – social groups are recommended.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well-being analysis</td>
<td>This tool did not always yield the desired results. In most wards it generated a list of indicators for measuring wealth or poverty. It failed to bring out the extent of poverty or otherwise in that particular ward. In most countries this has been dropped.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeline</td>
<td>This brought out very useful data that was then used at the planning stages especially on ways of coping with external factors like drought.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWOT Analysis</td>
<td>Most communities found it difficult to identify opportunities that exist in the community especially at individual level. Most opportunities were defined in natural resource terms. Communities need more practice on this so that it helps to unlock the doors to the hidden potential. In South Africa in particular this was used as a way of presenting the information from the different tools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Provider interviews</td>
<td>In Zimbabwe and Uganda service providers took an active part in the facilitation of the planning process and their presence may have led to a reduced level of discussion concerning their roles and performance. However, at the same time this should be seen as a blessing as this could have also led to the community externalising most of their problems, blaming them on service providers. It is likely that discussion on service providers will become a big issue when the performance of the community plan is reviewed after a year. In SA service providers were interviewed and participated in some places. It was very positive when they did participate and this should be strengthened.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mapping</td>
<td>The mapping exercise worked reasonably well in all wards. However, some facilitators did not use this to discuss the issues arising from that mapping, eg causes for environmental degradation, the state of road repairs and the performance of council in repairing these roads, etc. This should be strengthened. Mapping is also the key tool that permits looking at environmental issues, which need to be brought out in discussion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transect walk</td>
<td>Due to time constraints this technique appears to have been overlooked everywhere. It can be a useful tool if there is time and could be included in refresher training, as a useful addition when facilitators get more confident.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visioning exercise</td>
<td>It stretched the community’s imagination and priority areas emerged from most of the vision statements prepared. It is an easily understood concept. It is not a key part of the planning (which is actually driven by outcomes not the vision) but is very helpful in giving a picture of what people want to achieve.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prioritisation</td>
<td>This is done in a simple way generating from livelihood outcomes. While apparently simple, it is also revolutionary and this was missed initially in Uganda. If outcomes are not used, then planning tends to slip back to infrastructure and the creative thinking about how we can deliver what people are looking for (eg improved health as an outcome may not need a clinic). It is also a way of incorporating the priorities of the disadvantaged. One critical element if the representation at this meeting, as if disadvantaged groups are not represented, their priorities will be lost.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy development</td>
<td>Facilitators struggled somewhat with this, as it is a form of simple strategic planning. However the results were pointing towards the right direction and this should be maintained, giving people backup and training. Developing the skill to undertake this, including at community level is a major achievement and useful throughout one’s life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action plan</td>
<td>In some cases there was very little time in which to prepare a detailed action plan. Follow-up work is needed on this otherwise there will be very little to guide community action. This also needs to link closely to implementation, and if funding is delayed this needs to be redone. Again these are useful life skills for the ward/parish committees which are fundamental to their work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community feedback</td>
<td>The observation in Zimbabwe was that where this was done, community feedback was not informative enough. In most cases the feedback did not touch on the substantive issues of the plan, tending to concentrate on the exercises the planning team had gone through. This is fundamental to ensuring broad community ownership of the plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documentation</td>
<td>This was a struggle in many places where people lacked computers and needed to use district facilities. One possibility that has been tried is to have a blank template which can be handwritten into. This would be worth testing out further. The facilities for documenting the plan need to be planned for at the outset.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project profiles</td>
<td>This is an area that needs some support to local planning teams and must be linked with the local government planning process so that the formats used are those for investment projects for the plan (covering capital and recurrent budgets).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation of the plans</td>
<td>More detailed evaluation is needed of what has happened here. In Mangaung phase 1 community projects were implemented in all wards. It has become clearer that the linkage with local decision-making over funds is a critical part of the empowerment process. In Phase 2 and from now on in SA, CBP will not be suggested without process funds of R25-50 000 per ward (US$4-8000) not for projects but to support the community to take forward their plan, and to be released soon after planning is completed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Financing process               | One of the challenges that has emerged is the process of financing communities. In Mangaung, the local government paid suppliers directly and this worked without problem while other municipalities are struggling with this. This is a major element of large Community-Driven Programmes (CDD), eg in Zambia, Indonesia, Mexico and Brazil and we need to learn lessons about how to upscale this. |

| Monitoring systems              | This area has not been strong but is linked with implementation. Much more effort is needed to ensure that implementation happens and linked with that, effective monitoring upwards and downwards. SA will be stressing this over the next 6 months of Phase 2. |

5.2 Training of Facilitators

Training of lead trainers and facilitators was different in each country in terms who was trained, the length of the training and the approach to training. Table 5.2.1 summarises the learnings from each country.

Table 5.2.1 Learnings from each country about training of facilitators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Lessons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>1st Phase training was targeted at municipal officers, the district and from the provincial government departments. The first group was trained learning-by-doing with a 2 day introductory training. 30 municipal officials people were trained from Mangaung plus two from Motheo municipality. 40 were trained in Limpopo province. The group included Extension Officers, District Coordinators and other levels of management at district level. 2nd phase training took a cascading model with training of lead trainers then facilitators; Facilitators included municipal staff, ward committee members as well as NGOs. The training was two weeks to include both classroom and field work actually doing 3-4 ward plans. Overall the training worked. A separate 2 day training was run for IDP managers and those managing community participation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>First phase training in Bshenyi was targeted at district core team comprising government, NGO and retired civil servants. 98 facilitators were trained in five days. Training was hands-on and immediately followed by community planning in Parishes. In practice many of the facilitators were subcounty extension staff eg from agriculture or community development; first phase of training in HPPG was targeted at regional training of trainers followed by training of district core teams in 1-2 days. This proved insufficient and training of super-trainers in April 2004 involved one week in classroom and one week doing it in the field</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Country | Lessons
--- | ---
Zimbabwe | • Training took the cascading model with training of the district training team then training of core facilitation team at ward level. Initial 5 day training failed due to limited participation from community. Second attempt took 4 persons from each ward. Total of 184 were trained in all ward in the two districts;
• In-between training there was sharing of experiences before the facilitators training;
• Training was ‘hands-on’ immediately followed by community planning;

Ghana | • Training was targeted at district assembly professionals as the facilitators;
• Sub-district training (Area level) was limited to retired civil servants who assisted the district level professionals. A total of 60 community level facilitators were trained; 27 in Adansi East and 33 in Asante Akim.

Some of the key lessons to emerge;

- CBP is not a simple methodology for people not used to participatory methodologies – and **significant training is needed** – it is not possible for them to just use the manual;
- Training is best when **experiential** and immediately followed by actual doing the community planning – the SA experience is that two weeks is thorough;
- In terms of which facilitators to use:
  - **municipal staff** are vital for building capacity for follow-up and linking community level to local government planning. In addition people on community structures may change rapidly while municipal staff are probably employed Facilitators for the training should come from different sector departments, so that it builds up a dispersed ownership and understanding of CBP through the municipality, as well as broadening the understanding of the situation at community level in municipal departments.
  - In Uganda it worked very well when these were drawn from subcounty level **local staff** who have to work at community level. In Zimbabwe the Core Facilitation Team (CFT) included the councillor for the ward, the agricultural extension worker and a community opinion leader drawn from the ward plus a civil servant drawn from the DTT. Where local staff can be used like this, it is ideal;
  - **Community facilitators** are also important to maintaining the momentum and ownership, ensuring that the capacity of community structures is built not just for the planning but for subsequent implementation, and in holding local government accountable. Persons should come from the ward/parish committee, can also be the councillor and opinion leaders as in the CFT;
  - **NGOs** make very useful resource people for local governments wanting to undertake CBP;
  - **Training of IDP managers/district planners** is important for linking the strategic planning with the community level planning. They also manage the CBP implementation overall. In general municipalities underestimated how well organised they need to be to undertake a large number of ward/parish/area plans, and training and preparation need strengthening;
  - There needs to be a proper **training team** established of lead trainers, as in the District Training Team in Zimbabwe, or a set of lead trainers in SA. These need to be fulltime for the period the planning is being undertaken and part-time during the implementation phase

Some of the areas where training is needed are as follows (from South Africa experience)
Table 5.2.2  Areas for training around CBP and local government planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area for training</th>
<th>Who should be trained</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roles and responsibilities in CBP; Different actors’ roles and responsibilities in the local government planning process; Local governance and CBP; Leadership skills; Facilitation skills; Financial Management; Fundraising; Communication Skills;</td>
<td>CBP trainers and facilitators IDP managers/district planners, CBP trainers and facilitators IDP managers/district planners, CBP trainers and facilitators IDP managers/district planners, NGOs, CBP trainers and facilitators IDP managers/district planners IDP managers/district planners IDP managers, Facilitators and trainers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.3 Stakeholder Involvement

The key governance principles of CBP are about building linkages between the micro level (the community) and the meso (local government and other service providers) and the macro (national, provincial government). As stated earlier the project in each country comprised a set of three partners (stakeholders), including at least the key national organisation involved in decentralised planning (to consider promoting policy impacts), local governments (to implement in practice, linking to the local government planning system) and a development facilitator, often an NGO, to assist in the development of the methodology and facilitation of the participatory planning process. Table 5.3 summarises who played which roles in each country.

Table 5.3  The partners and their roles in each country

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Macro - policy level</th>
<th>Meso level implementation</th>
<th>Facilitation</th>
<th>Secretariat in-country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>LGDP/Ministry of Local Government, UNCDF Ministry of Gender</td>
<td>Bushenyi District (later whole country)</td>
<td>CARE International</td>
<td>CARE International, later Ministry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>Department of Provincial and Local Government SA Local Gov Association</td>
<td>Mangaung (later plus Tzaneen, eThekwini, Nkonkobe, Mbombela, Msunduzi, Maluti, BelaBela)</td>
<td>Khanya (later plus Development Works)</td>
<td>Khanya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
<td>Ministry of Local Gov, later plus SNV, UNICEF</td>
<td>Gwanda RDC Chimanimani RDC</td>
<td>ITDG DiP</td>
<td>ITDG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>NDPC/Ministry of Local Gov and Rural Development</td>
<td>Adansi East Asante Akim S DAs</td>
<td>ISODEC</td>
<td>ISODEC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At the national level, the involvement of a national partner was designed to ensure the institutionalisation of the learnings about policy, as well as in looking at upscaling from successful pilots. The visibility of the programme at the national level would help to stimulate commitment from other stakeholders, attract the NGO and the donor community to participate, and to build a coalition to support CBP. The weakness of the role played by national partners in Ghana was the main reason that the project has not been mainstreamed there.
5.4 Linkages with local government planning

CBP focuses on a planning process and system that is practical and empowering, reflecting the complex reality of people’s lives, linked to the mainstream local government, planning system and is realistic within the resource envelopes (human and financial) available within a municipal area.

One of the key governance requirements for improving development management is that at local government level (lower meso) services are facilitated, coordinated, provided or promoted effectively and responsively and local governments should be held accountable for delivery. If CBP is to have a wider impact than directly in the community, it must influence the wider plans and services. Table 5.4.1 shows to what extent community planning was linked to the local government planning overall.

Table 5.4.1 Linkages to local government, and local government planning system

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Linkages to local government, including in planning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>• CBP was managed by the municipality with technical backstopping from a service provider;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• CBP used to bridge the gap between the community and the IDP. In Mangaung and other municipalities results of the ward planning were fed into the IDP and feedback from ward priorities led to change in the overall prioritisation of the municipality;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Municipal development programmes were informed by community issues and strategies;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Many projects suggested by community were supported by the municipality;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Ideas on how specific projects should be handled impacted on the municipal project implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Experience from pilots is being used to rethink the way the local government planning system works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Municipalities are providing process funds to support communities to take forward their plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>• Community (parish) plans issues were incorporated into the sub-county development plans in Bushenyi, and the subcounties adopted the vision-based planning approach from CBP;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Projects suggested by community were implemented by the sub-county/district;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• There was an improvement in the technical description and background information in the project profiles, reflecting more involvement of the target group;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The experience has fed into a national participatory planning methodology, the HPPG, which is being rolled out nationwide.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
<td>• The issues from the CBP process enriched the planning process of Council. Council many of projects broadened since a number of community activities did not need council funding;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Rural district councils looking to allocation of funds to support community prioritised activities;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Gwanda allocating part of local revenue to the wards.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following are recommendations on developing linkages between community planning and municipal level planning.

### Table 5.4.2 Possible mechanisms for strengthening linkages between community planning and local government

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas of linkage</th>
<th>Possible actions to strengthen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>During the planning process</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Proposals for other actions by the municipality and other service providers | • consider process for onward submission of plans and projects to provincial and national departments, both at ward and provincial level.  
• Involve service providers in the planning, especially local |
| Ideas for how specific programmes can be handled | • Develop methodology for feeding back results to technical departments  
• Ensure that technical departments participate in some ward plans, particularly where they lack knowledge |
| Feedback to communities on what has been approved | • System to be developed as soon as proposals finalised for local government plan |
| **During implementation:** | |
| Mechanisms for handling the process funding | • Worked in Mangaung, still to be tested in other pilots  
• Other countries to follow up on the viability of using local revenue for this, eg in Uganda may need to set up system so that local revenue can be planned for in the same financial year, otherwise there is no implementation on the plan until the following year |
| Practical support for implementation | • consider use of community development workers to assist wards in planning and implementation of their ward plans |
| Monitoring by ward/parish committees of their programmes | • develop mechanisms, such as action plan and reporting formats  
• ensure support available to wards to do this, eg community development workers |
| Monitoring by the local government of the area/ward committees | • have at least one community support officer, whose job is to receive reports from wards, including minutes of meetings, monitor progress  
• consider development of “operations room” facility for monitoring wards |
| Monitoring by the community of the ward committees and overall progress on their plan | • ensure that citizen feedback meetings are occurring where wards/parishes report back on progress with implementing the plan  
• promote use of posters showing projects, funds allocated, and progress at central location, as done in Uganda, or use of community radio to highlight |
5.5 Community participation

CBP is designed to promote the active involvement of communities (see principles in section 3.1.1). The planning was therefore designed to empower communities to;

- demand quality service and good governance;
- contribute to the development process of the council;
- unleashes the energies of local people to take action and
- demand accountability of the council.

In the evaluations and reports from all the 4 countries, the feeling of ownership and fulfilment from the planning process comes through strongly. There has been considerable involvement during planning and in implementation.

In South Africa in five of the six wards where the evaluation was conducted in Mangaung, the councillors were of the opinion that the process contributed to proud community members and ward committees. Although the participatory process probably contributed to this level of ownership, one should also recognise that without the R50 000 grant from the municipality the levels of ownership would have been considerably lower. The level of ownership is also reflected in the initiatives that wards took without any reward or which was not linked to the R50 000 grant. The evaluation in Mangaung revealed extensive community action resulting from CBP.

When CBP started in Uganda in April 2001 representatives of the community were amazed that they could be invited to participate in planning for their development. This was unlike the situation where parish chiefs and executives participated without them and brought up lists of problems that they thought were priorities on behalf of the village community. In CBP, ten members of each village were invited by the parish chief to represent their village at the parish planning meeting and the disadvantaged and interest groups were asked to be represented also. There was no resource envelope for community to take forward their activities. This could serve as an incentive in future to release the community energies.

There was active participation by the community in wards in Zimbabwe. The step by step process of introducing and discussing the CBP concept with councillors, then councillors with traditional leadership and other community leaders and from there to communities has been effective. Each level has been convinced and has passed on their convictions to the next level. Communities have seen the merits of the approach and have been willing to embrace and apply it. It is still too early to conclude whether this CBP approach will be internalised and become part of the community development process. Much will depend on whether the approach delivers what the community desires and whether the communities will remain enthusiastic during the plan implementation process. So far the community has shown enthusiasm by participating in the planning.

Ghana’s village communities are organised in diverse political, economic, social and livelihood groups. These groups participated fully in the planning sessions. This enabled the views and aspirations of the represented to be featured in the plan. Unfortunately, it was more difficult to represent the vulnerable groups like widows, orphans, disabled and HIV infected as there are no formal representative groups for them. Because of the short period scheduled

---

3 This was a methodological issue as there is no reason why informal groupings could not have been used, as in the other countries.
for planning, most group representative did not meet their entire membership for discussion and possible feedback.

5.6 Financing the process

Some of the issues around finance include:

- the budget for the planning process, and whether any incentives should be paid to facilitators or community participants;
- the availability of funds to the ward for taking the plan forward, either as process funds (ie not for specific projects, but rather to support small items), or as project funds.

Table 5.6 summarises some of the issues around finance.

Table 5.6 Financing the process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Financing the CBP process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| South Africa| • **Training of trainers and facilitators:** R160 000 for training 40-50 facilitators and undertaking 4-5 ward plans (US$25000);
|             | • **Incentives for participants:** Depends on rate for overtime for each municipality. Travel costs and meals covered;
|             | • **Ward planning:** Costs included meals for the facilitators, travel costs of facilitators, stationery, and some overtime costs for facilitators On average it costs R6700 per ward including costs for external service provider (approx US$1000), R1167 without the external facilitator (US$180)
|             | • **Grant funds for communities:** R50 000 that Mangaung allocated (US$7700). A minimum would perhaps be around R10 000, but ideally at least R25 000 |
| Uganda      | • **Training of trainers and facilitators:** US$8600 for training 98 facilitators;
|             | • **Incentives for participants:** US$1500 for allowances for facilitators;
|             | • **Ward planning:** US$300 contributed by the community for their community planning process;
|             | • **Grant funds for communities:** no parish grant financing, can use local revenue. |
| Zimbabwe    | • **Training of trainers and facilitators:** no figures given
|             | • **Incentives for participants:** no figures given
|             | • **Ward planning:** ZW$150 000 per ward (US$6 000)
|             | • **Grant funds for communities:** portion of local revenue allocated |
| Ghana       | • no figures given                                                                        |

In SA process funds for communities to take forward their ward plans a much greater cost than the planning itself. Mangaung spent R2.1 million on process funds (US$323 000). The recommendation in South Africa is that the total level of process funding should be set at 1-2% of the capital funds of the local government. This leveraged an enormous amount of community action and some evaluation should be done to ascertain the value of the community action, eg during evaluations conducted this year.
In terms of planning costs, during the second phase in SA (ie during the national piloting process) additional funds were spent on fees for external service providers to adapt the generic methodology, initiate the CBP, train local facilitators and to assist with quality control and linkage to the IDP. Some ward committee members who assisted with facilitation in other wards were also given some payment for doing so. It is now estimated that implementation of CBP costs about R215 000 (approx US$33 000) for a 40 ward municipality, excluding, R92 000 optionally for accreditation of the facilitators (US$14 000), R27 000 for a workshop to learn the lessons (US$4000) and around R30-40 000 for the direct costs of doing the planning (US$5000). Costs of planning would vary according to the number of wards, but not in simple proportion, as the cost of training is largely fixed.

Zimbabwe’s local revenue is sent to the national government coffers. They are considering spending part of that money at the ward level. Uganda and Ghana have systems of collection of revenue at the local level and part of the funds are spent at that local level, which can be used for CBP. However the amounts are too small for any meaningful projects. Implementation of community-driven projects is not new to the Ashante community in Ghana. They have raised funds through local levies and local fundraising activities such as proportional payment from harvests. CBP can take full advantage of these existing traditional systems of fund raising which would enlist community members as development partners.
6 EVIDENCE OF IMPACT AND UP-SCALING

6.1 Objectives of CBP

CBP is part of a set of initiatives to promote sustainable livelihoods. In section 1 we indicated that we were aiming to ensure that:

Communities are empowered, through

- Poor people being active and involved in managing their own development (claiming their rights and exercising their responsibilities);
- A responsive, active and accessible network of local service providers (community-based, private sector or government);

Local government and district level services are empowered through

- At local government level (lower meso) services facilitated, provided or promoted effectively and responsibly, coordinated and local governments held accountable for the quality of delivery of the services.

CBP specifically aims to address these three, aiming to:

- To improve the quality of plans, making them more relevant to local needs and conditions, and incorporating the priorities of poor people (and others);
- To improve the quality of services, as they are now more informed as to people’s real assets and capabilities, vulnerabilities, their preferred outcomes, their views on services, and where communities actually want support;
- To improve community control over their own development, so ensuring they are active actors and not passive recipients of development imposed from outside;
- And linked with this to promote community action to make their own vision a reality in their community, mobilising latent energy and creativity to promote local development.

The impacts has been separated into three; the community, the district and the national level. Impact at national level includes whether they are being upscaled, so these are considered in this section.

6.2 Community level impacts

The impacts at community level were significant. Most countries reported a range of community action for which no external funds were needed. Table 6.2.1 shows some of the unfunded activities which wards embarked on in Mangaung. Table 6.2.2 shows some of the results in New Edubiase, one of the 2 pilot Area Councils in Ghana. There was very widespread participation, and in general disadvantaged groups were able to influence the outcomes of the planning.

A number of communities were frustrated by the slow pace of release of funds from local government. For some districts the immediate response by communities surprised them. In Zimbabwe the district officials were impressed by the level of community enthusiasm that they promised to change policy and provide funds for community projects.
Uganda
In Bushenyi, some of the community projects that were identified in the planning process but do not need external funding are being implemented at parish and village levels, including community roads and other “bulungi bwansi” projects where the projects identified are already getting the community contribution in form of unskilled labour for digging the roads and trenches for water and trenches to protect animals and crops from vermin. Some anecdotal examples from the study visit to Uganda in July 2003 are:

- According to the parish development committee in Kichwamba parish “Some communities in the parishes have started digging the community roads, trenches for trapping animals and water pipeline trenches for serving clean safe water.”
- In Kigarama Sub County a 12km gravity flow scheme, identified by the Community as a project beyond their capacity to implement was financed from the District Local government Development funds to the tune of shs.300,000,000 (three hundred million shillings Uganda shillings). Health AID posts were constructed at Parish level in Rutooma of Kyeizooba sub county and Kihunda of Kagango sub County to mention but a few.

There has not yet been a systematic evaluation of impacts at implementation level, apart from the initial evaluation in Bushenyi.

Ghana
The traditional leadership and the area council for the first time sat together had developed a common vision. The socio-political tensions between different area councils and traditional leadership eased. This enhanced the Community-Based initiatives that the Ashante are accustomed to. The methodology used in Ghana based around formal groups did not work well for the disadvantaged who may not have formal structures. This should be changed in any future work on CBP in Ghana.

Table 6.2.1 The projects and activities initiated in New Edubiase

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Activities resulting from the planning in New Edubiase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plan Management</td>
<td>• The Development Committee of New Edubiase continue to meet to address issues hindering the implementation of the plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>• A number of girls were awarded scholarships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Parent Teacher Association meetings were held in all schools within the Town Council area at the beginning of every term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roads</td>
<td>• Some major roads in the town were graded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telecommunication</td>
<td>• The installation of the telecom network has been completed and the town is enjoying an uninterrupted telecommunications service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>• The face-lifting programme of the hospital is completed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The health insurance scheme has started.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The district has been selected to be part of the pilot national heath insurance scheme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• An AIDS Management Team has been formed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• AIDS Clubs in Schools have been formed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• A sensitisation campaign on HIV/AIDS is in progress.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>• Waste bins have been provided at vantage points within the Town Council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleanliness</td>
<td>• The monthly clean up campaigns was undertaken within the period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity</td>
<td>• the town is now connected to the national grid for a 24 hour electricity supply</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Water</td>
<td>• There is great improvement in water after a series of consultations between the community and the service providers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Zimbabwe
CBP was seen as easing socio-political tensions at local levels since different political parties, war veterans and traditional leadership have been able to sit and work together on issues that are for community development. Disadvantaged groups participated effectively in the planning and in Gwanda 60% of participants were women. Many projects identified by the community have been implemented already.

South Africa
The evaluation in Mangaung revealed extensive community action resulting from CBP (CDS, 2002). The feeling of ownership was another significant aspect that came to the fore in interviews with councillors and facilitators. In five of the six wards the councillors were of the opinion that the process contributed to proud community members and ward committees. The level of ownership is also reflected in the initiatives that wards took without any reward or which was not linked to the R50 000 grant (see Table 6.1.2). Although this was not true for all wards, the considerable number of activities and actions that resulted from the CBP process is noteworthy. This is surely an indication of ownership. Furthermore, it should be noted that the activities mentioned were a direct result of the CBP process.

Table 6.2.2 Comments by Mangaung’s Ward Committees on projects or activities conducted on their own initiative as a result of the ward planning, 2002

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities conducted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Home-based care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consortium formed to deal with HIV/AIDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groups that were trained are reorganising and positioning themselves to start income generating activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementing way forward as planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward facilitators train other wards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WC working hard to implement plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keeping ward clean, encourage children to go to school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playing sport - sewing is in process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewing project, access by learners to computers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIDS Committee organising some areas/activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brickmaking project and HIV caretakers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too early – training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training/gardening service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward business forum is functioning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home-based care established &amp; volunteer groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community waiting for computer centre to be open and projects working</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drafting constitution for NGO, youth busy with park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community shares ideas and participate in implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income generating projects</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The involvement of poor and disadvantaged groups in the methodology was one of the major positive outcomes of the process. The emphasis on social or interest groups with a disadvantaged background made this possible. It is, for example, noteworthy that a ward dominated by urban white middle class people decided to spend 70% of their allocated money on the skills development of farm workers in the ward. Although the project had not yet materialised during the few months to when the evaluation was conducted in June 2002, the fact that farm workers were able to raise their needs and priorities was significant and emphasise the effectiveness of the methodology in this regard.
Other impacts noted were:

- A first time engagement between the affluent and less-affluent at ward level;
- Improved communication between Councillor, WC and ward community;
- Greater willingness of ward members to participate in ward affairs – also a better attendance of meetings.

6.3 Local government level

CBP has had significant impact at the local government level (see Table 6.3). The greatest impact has been the incorporation of the community plans into the local government development plans and the influencing on priorities and resource allocation. Evidence of the impacts has varied in each country. The other is the realisation that different sectors of the municipality or local government actually have the same vision and need to work together. Box 6.3 gives an impression from a DA staff member in Ghana.

It will be interesting to see the results of the evaluations in 3 further municipalities in SA early next year, and Uganda needs to undertake some evaluations on the impact of using the HPPG.

Table 6.3 The impact CBP has had on local government

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Evidence of impacts at the local government level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| South Africa (Mangaung and 8 other pilots) | • Ward plans were incorporated into the local municipality’s IDPs changing their priorities and creating new programmes;  
• Ward projects have been incorporated into IDPs;  
• Local municipalities level of interest shown in them making available 50% of the funding for the pilot process in 9 municipalities;  
• Process funds are being made available for communities to take forward their plans, and this is major levels of funding;  
• Several municipalities have created participation structures as a result, eg a CBP co-ordinator, participation unit etc;  
• Sharing of experiences happening between municipalities. At least two municipalities are taking the lead in training other municipalities. |
| Uganda (Bushenyi)        | • Formed a district task force who were trained as trainers for lower LGs;  
• Bushenyi developed and updated (5 times) their own Parish Planning Guide, trained Sub County level staff, who facilitated planning at Parish level;  
• Parishes have produced plans for the 2nd year, which have been integrated into the Sub County & District plans; |
| Zimbabwe (Gwanda and Chimanimani) | • CBP has attracted the attention of district and provincial government staff, traditional leadership and NGOs;  
• District training teams established;  
• Traditional and civic leadership set aside political differences and worked as social drivers of CBP;  
• A local community facilitation team (CFT) created linking councillors and staff;  
• CBP has strengthened local linkages with NGOs, CBOs and the community;  
• CBP has enhanced the RDC’s co-ordination role in the district. |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Evidence of impacts at the local government level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>• District resource team created;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Area plans from Morso/Kurofa and New Edubiase were incorporated. the Medium Term Development Planning (MTDP) for the DAs;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Funds released for identified projects by the district Assembly and NGOs working at the district level.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The CBP process in all authorities was used to bridge the gap between the development plans and Community-Based plans. The process has been useful especially if it results in community action immediately. The need for the process funds needs to be emphasised before municipalities take the decision to undertake CBP.

In Mangaung the results from CBP were fed into the IDP process as each ward was planned, so that for example when the first IDP Representative Forum was held, the results of 5 wards were available (carefully selected to provide a range of situations from urban to rural and disadvantaged to advantaged). These led to the first approximation of development objectives which were refined later, but right from the beginning the overwhelming priority of economic development could be seen. The linkages which happened in practice were:

- Feedback from wards on priorities overall, and for specific areas, which directly led to the overall priority for the municipal development plans;
- Information on the situation in each ward, including for specific social groups (this could have been strengthened in analysis across wards);
- Proposals for specific projects for the municipal development plans;
- Proposals for support by the Municipality through the untied funds for the community;
- Proposals for other actions by the municipality and other service providers;
- Ideas for how specific programmes can be handled (such as an emphasis on People’s Housing Process in housing), which were incorporated into the planning for the specific programmes;
- Feedback on the overall development plan.

A similar process has happened in the other pilots in South Africa, as well as in Bushenyi.

6.4 National

The impact at the national level has varied. In South Africa and Uganda CBP has been piloted in 9 and 40 districts respectively. In Zimbabwe and Ghana the process has not gone beyond the two districts in each country for different reasons in each country. Table 6.4 below gives the extent to which countries took CBP to the national level.
### Table 6.4 The extent to which each country changed policy and implemented CBP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Evidence of impacts at national level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Uganda        | • A national CBP/HPPG Reference Group comprising Ministry of Local Government (MOLG), CARE, UNCDF, Office of the Prime Minister, Ministry of Gender, Labour & Social Development (MGLSD),, Bushenyi District & UPDNet was formed;  
• CBP shaped the Harmonised Participatory Planning Guide for Uganda;  
• Training of National trainers already done, guides for parish and district planning have been produced;  
• Process introduced in 40 districts in Uganda;  
• Inputs from Khanya to support the revisions to HPPG and national training;  
• CBP principles included in the design of the Northern Uganda Social Action Fund (NUSAFF) implemented in 18 districts. |
| South Africa  | • National Steering Committee including national Department and SALGA which has met regularly and driven the process. It is recognised as the committee to lead on participatory planning with municipalities;  
• Meeting was held with the Parliamentary Committee on Provincial and Local Government;  
• SALGA has adopted CBP as an approach to support with its member municipalities;  
• Range of donors and national government supporting extension of project to 9 municipalities and learning from the experience;  
• CBP presented to all municipalities at SALGA conference in September 2004, generating massive interest;  
• More than 10 new local municipalities have requested assistance to undertake CBP. |
| Zimbabwe      | • Minister of Local Government presented a speech to His Excellency the President and invited delegates after the opening of Parliament in 2003, including CBP.  
• Decentralisation Programme has additional element on Community Empowerment as result of CBP  
• The Permanent Secretary has been following the CBP progress in Gwanda and Chimanimani. He paid a visit to Gwanda. In addition CBP in Zimbabwe has been led by the Deputy Secretary who has invested considerable time and effort in the project, visiting the districts, participating in technical meetings etc;  
• steering committee formed although met infrequently |
| Ghana         | • The Ministry of Local Government and Rural Development in Ghana assigned Mr Cofie Agama to follow up on the CBP process and see the integration of CBP in the planning of districts. NDPC had also assigned a staff member to participate in CBP discussions. However this does not seem to have resulted in significant commitment from the institutions to CBP;  
• The CBP training manuals being considered by Department of Community Development (DCD), supported by UNICEF in efforts to harmonise participatory planning approaches.  
• Inputs to World Bank-funded CBRDP on planning approaches |
6.5 International

Khanya and other CBP partners have been invited to numerous conferences to speak on the CBP experience. These include:

- Presentations on the project at an SL workshop at Bradford University in May 2002;
- at a seminar on decentralisation in DFID in June 2002;
- at the World Bank in June 2002 and June 2003;
- at an African Planners meeting in September 2002 and April 2003;
- at a cities meeting in Sao Paulo (by the City Manager of Mangaung);
- at an EU Rural Development Forum in Montpellier (Sept 02);
- at Regional Information Centre on Local Government in Cape Town in May 03 (by ITDG);
- at Institute of Local Government Management conference in SA, June 03;
- at a World Bank Community Driven Development workshop June 03;
- by Mangaung at a national conference on Ward Committees in SA, June 03;
- at a SA national workshop on community participation, June 03;
- at a Regional Local Government Capacity Building Consultative Meeting held in Harare (ITDG);
- at an IDASA meeting with civil society stakeholders in Harare (ITDG);
- at an International Conference on Municipal Planning and Citizen Participation in the UK in September 2003 (ITDG);
- at DFID Programme Design Workshop on Food Security and Livelihoods Recovery in Feb 2004;
- Mangaung having exhibition stand at World Summit on Sustainable Development showcasing CBP (Jul/Aug 02);
- at the SA Local Government Association national conference in September 2004;
- Showcasing of CBP as an example of innovation in SA Cities Network; showing of the video at the launch of the SA Cities Network;
- showing of the video at a meeting of African Ministers on Community-Driven development, Burkina Faso, Oct 2003.

Ian Goldman and Martin Onyach-Olaa from Uganda were invited to participate in a workshop on Up-scaling Community-Driven Development in Washington in 2003, presenting papers on the approaches being used in South Africa and Uganda. Community-driven development is one of the foci of the World Bank, and there is a major drive on up-scaling generally in the Bank at present. A series of 6 case studies have been undertaken (Mexico, Indonesia, India, Benin, Zambia, Uganda) which are meant to highlight up-scaling issues. In addition Khanya has contributed to the Bank's thinking around CDD, notably around the conceptualisation around micro-meso-macro linkages.

The focus on micro-meso linkages has also convinced DFID to fund a parallel piece of action research on Community-Based Workers, in Uganda, South Africa, Lesotho and Kenya. This will be looking at how to address the second governance issues, ensuring a dispersed and active network of local service providers.
7 WAY FORWARD

7.1 Deepening the methodology

This report marks the end of the formal association between the 4 countries through the 4 Country Action Research Project. There are processes underway in all the 4 countries, which may lead to incorporation of the experience of the pilots. The Ugandan and South African processes are now formally established.

There are still areas around the methodology to be explored. These include:

- ensuring participation in politically very divided communities such as IFP and ANC communities in Kwazulu-Natal; ZanuPF and MDC in Zimbabwe. In general there is a need to strengthen the conflict management skills of facilitators;
- ensuring appropriate representation in large rural wards that may be up to 50 km across and have several villages. Representatives of social groups have been used in Ghana, Zimbabwe and Uganda to enhance participation, but where there are no village level structures such as in South Africa this is very problematic;
- Strengthening and intensifying the training to ensure internalisation;
- Strengthening the training for politicians and management in building commitment and understanding around CBP prior to taking the decision to take it forward;
- Ensuring traditional leadership role are respected and accommodated especially when carrying out CBP in an area where communities are politically divided. The Ashante in Ghana and the chiefs and headmen in Zimbabwe played a key role in community mobilisation.

In addition a lot of work is still needed around implementation methodologies:

- Working on the financing of community plans, including process funds;
- Looking at the funding mechanisms, eg in South Africa, which are not well designed for transfers to communities;
- Improving the M&E upwards and downwards between communities, ward/parish structures and local government;

South Africa is also doing some rethinking about the relationship between the ward plans and the local government planning process, the IDP. This is discussed in 7.3.

Table 7.1 summarises some ideas as to areas where the methodology can be improved, around both planning and implementation.
Table 7.1 Areas for strengthening the CBP planning and implementation system

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas of linkage</th>
<th>Possible actions to strengthen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improving planning</td>
<td>• consider how to deal with representation in large wards in rural areas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Proposals for other actions by the municipality and other service providers | • consider process for onward submission of plans and projects to provincial and national departments, both at ward and provincial level.  
• involve service providers in the planning, especially local |
| Ideas for how specific programmes can be handled | • develop methodology for feeding back results to technical departments  
• ensure that technical departments participate in some ward plans, particularly where they lack knowledge |
| Feedback to communities on what has been approved | • system to be developed as soon as proposals finalised for IDP |
| **During implementation:** | |
| Operating funding mechanisms for handling the R50k | • worked in Mangaung, still to be tested in other pilots |
| Practical support for implementation | • consider use of community development workers as suggested by the President, whose main role is to assist wards in planning and implementation of their ward plans |
| Monitoring by ward committees of their programmes | • develop mechanisms, such as action plan and reporting formats  
• ensure support available to wards to do this, eg community development workers |
| Monitoring by the Municipality of the ward committees | • have at least one community support officer, whose job is to receive reports from wards, including minutes of meetings, monitor progress  
• consider development of “ops room” facility for monitoring wards |
| Monitoring by the community of the ward committees and overall progress on their plan | • monitor operation of ward committee, including regularity of public meetings  
• promote use of posters showing projects, amounts of money agreed for projects, and progress at central location, in the press, as done in Uganda, and community radio |

7.2 Uganda

7.2.1 In Bushenyi District

Bushenyi District has already set the pace in terms of formulation and implementation of robust development plans, in line with the principles of the CBP/HPPG initiative. They have had a role in influencing the production of the national planning guide and should continue generating useful lessons for adaptation in other parts of the country. In line with the earlier recommendations of the evaluation as well as internal assessments concerning the scope and depth of the planning processes, there is a recognition within Bushenyi for the need to continue to build local government staff capacity. Focus will have to be diversified into other
areas needed to bolster lower level planning processes. Exchange visits for capacity building and sharing experience among the different sub-counties should continue.

7.2.2 Nationally

The Ministry of Local Government is implementing a number of initiatives aimed at enhancing the capacity of Local Governments. One of the major elements of LGDP II is the capacity building grant. In addition, with EU/MPP funding, the Ministry developed some standardized training materials in the various functional areas of Local Government operations. In spite of the above initiatives, there is need to appreciate that institutional and human resource capacity building is not a one-off process and that support will be needed over the long term. It may be several years until the new ideas and processes embedded within the HPPG evolving out of the CBP process are genuinely mainstreamed within parish and sub county plans. The Ministry is currently working on the national policy on capacity building in Local Governments, which should yield a standardized, coherent and consistent framework.

In line with the earlier recommendations of the evaluation as well as internal assessments concerning the scope and depth of the planning processes, there is a recognition within Bushenyi for the need to continue to build local government staff capacity. Focus will have to be diversified into other areas needed to bolster lower level planning processes.

The district planning guides are due to be reviewed. In addition, there are a number of reforms in planning and budgeting, including the Fiscal Decentralisation Strategy, Sector-wide Approaches and the concept of the Local Government Budget Framework Paper. There is need to ensure that the entrenchment of these reforms take full account of the community-based planning principles so as to maintain relevance of the resultant plans and budgets.

Previous efforts with regard to the introduction of new guidelines and manuals have tended to focus on the establishment of the district resource pools, almost as if it were an end in itself, with limited mechanisms for keeping track of processes at LLG/Council level. Beyond the traditional menu of interventions, effective operationalisation of the HPPG will call for institutionalisation of robust M&E mechanisms.

Whilst the HPPG remains the Ministry of Local Government’s premier intervention with respect to community-based planning and budgeting, and has received significant support from a range of stakeholders, complementary actions are required to ensure realization of desired impact. For a start, a fundamental prerequisite for the effectiveness of any lower level planning process is the existence of a reliable data/information base. This calls for establishment and/or strengthening of institutional mechanisms for data collection, entry, analyses and dissemination mechanisms to support decision making processes, especially in Lower Local Governments.

Every effort will need to made to rationalize the sequencing of the planning processes at various levels, so as to ensure that community action plans meaningfully inform policy making at higher levels.

7.3 Ghana

Without the two key champions who have been transferred, the two Districts are unlikely to carry CBP forward. They however expressed their readiness to pick CBP up in the next planning session should NDPC issue directives in that direction and be supported it with the necessary logistics.
The Department of Community Development harmonisation process around participatory planning should be supported, as with the rollout of CBRDP, and these provide the opportunity to input the learnings from CBP, and to contribute to developing a national process that allows communities to plan for their own action and to influence district plans.

7.4 Zimbabwe

7.4.1 In the pilot districts

In Chimanimani, politics is going to continue to affect the scope of CBP by the RDC itself. Many other actors, in particular NGOs are keen to incorporate some elements of CBP. This is a desirable direction since NGOs may help strengthen demand structures between communities and the RDC which may force RDC to base their plans on community priorities. Chimamanani Rural District Council will:

- Consolidate ward development plans to inform and influence the RDC budgeting process;
- Convene a broad stakeholder workshop to review process and secure buy-in by service providers community interests. ITDG-SA will play a central role in strengthening strategic linkages and feedback between community members and service providers.
- Promote use of and improve accessibility of the Ward Development Plans to various stakeholders for multi-resource leveraging in support of community anchored initiatives;
- Strengthen community monitoring and evaluation systems of ward and external development efforts.

In Gwanda, there is a strong will for the RDC and the entire District Training Team to continue with the CBP in the next planning cycle. Interestingly the key facilitators at district level continue to play an influential role at provincial level. The level of capacity and enthusiasm about CBP in Gwanda provides some hope for a self-driven CBP processes in the future as well as possible replication by other RDCs in Matabeleland South Province. Some refresher training may be necessary as the key trainers and facilitators move from the area.

Other points are:

- Refresher courses are needed for both DTT members and core facilitation teams in integrated development and facilitation.
- Districts, especially Chimanimani, need to consolidate their CBP experience through exchange visits with communities and organisations in Gwanda.
- The technical staff at village and ward levels should help communities develop detailed implementation plans with clear specifications of date of execution, responsibility for action and sources of funding. District staff are experienced in this and this experience was gained during the implementation of the RDCCBP and CAP.

7.4.2 Nationally

Consultations with various stakeholders have indicated the existence of a huge demand for CBP in Zimbabwe. Despite this interest it has proved difficult to raise resources for CBP activities in the current economic and political environment prevailing in Zimbabwe. The National Steering Committee (NSC) in collaboration with Intermediate Technology Development Group Southern Africa have put on their agenda the need to mobilise resources
and share with stakeholders nationwide so as to scale up the process to ensure that lessons and experiences gained in this project are not lost.

Through continued dialogue with government there is a need to fully mainstream community-based planning into the decentralisation process. National guidelines are needed to support all these initiatives, and it is important to create and consolidate forums for sharing CBP lessons and experiences at community, district, provincial, and national levels. The NSC has been given the mandate by the government to look at the modalities of forthcoming national guidelines.

A series of meetings will be held with DFID and NGOs in November which may open up some opportunities to take CBP forward.

7.5 South Africa

7.5.1 In the pilot districts

The 8 pilot districts are still undertaking their pilot processes, and it looks likely that this phase of work will complete in June 2005. Mangaung is undertaking an ambitious Phase 2 which should define the methodology to apply in a second year after the ward plan has been produced, look at how participatory budgeting can link to CBP, and the implementation mechanisms. Specific activities with the pilots still to be completed are:

- Completion of ward planning in Mangaung (Phase 2), Msunduzi, Maluti;
- Undertaking learning workshops in all 8 municipalities;
- Undertaking evaluations in 3 municipalities;

7.5.2 Nationally

In South Africa three areas of methodology have been identified as critical:

(d) What to do in low capacity municipalities where CBP may not be a priority
(e) How to help municipalities to think through carefully what they are letting themselves in for before deciding to undertake CBP
(f) What might be a national support system for those municipalities that would like to undertake CBP (bearing in mind that in SA the intention is to keep it optional)

In this section we share some of the emerging thinking on these grounds that may well be relevant to the three other countries, and indeed other countries considering these participatory planning models.

(a) Linking CBP/IDP with municipal capacity

What has become clear is that where municipal capacity is very low, a different approach may be needed. A suite of methods, from less to more complex have been suggested. The key elements of capacity include:

Municipal capacity:
- To manage an IDP process;
- To organise at community level;
- To process, make decisions and act;
• Developmental orientation (target for transformation);

Community capacity:
• Mobilisation capacity;
• Capacity to manage implementation (facilitate, monitor);
• Effective relationship between ward committee and councillor;
• Skills to lead the process (facilitate meetings, document…);

The proposed models are shown in Box 7.5.2

**Box 7.5.2 Models of CBP/IDP for different levels of municipal and ward capacity**

(1) In very weak municipalities and wards, a combined simple expanded sample-based CBP approach and municipal planning, using the CBP methodology in an intensive facilitated process for a simple IDP, eg doing both in a 10-15 days process;

(2) In low capacity municipalities but medium capacity wards, Full CBP, plus a facilitated IDP process

(3) In very weak local municipalities, but where wards/communities have significant capacity, District-driven CBP, where district municipalities contract service providers (eg NGOs) to support ward-based CBP and supply process funds, and local municipalities play little role;

(4) In medium capacity municipalities, Integrated CBP and more strategic IDP (the current model)

(5) In high capacity municipalities, CBD/IDP as in 4, but strongly aligned to other stakeholders

In cases (2) to (4), CBP is undertaken more-or-less as at present, while the level of work on the IDP changes. In case 1, CBP tools are used in sample wards rather than every ward as part of a facilitated IDP based on the CBP planning methodology.

(b) Preconditions

What has come clear is that many municipalities underestimated the work involved in managing CBP. It is therefore suggested that a series of preconditions are needed, which would also help to guide which model of CBP/IDP is relevant. CBP is not a simple process, requiring facilitation of a plan per ward, analysing the information to use in the IDP, and supporting of implementation. A decision to undertake it should not be taken lightly. However for those committed to deepening democracy, it has significant benefits. In order to support this empowering participation process the municipality must:

• Allocate someone to manage CBP full-time (CBP Coordinator) during the planning process, and part-time during implementation
• Establish a CBP and Implementation steering committee, including those responsible for planning, for participation, councillors, and ward committee members
• Ensure training of 2-4 lead trainers who then train local facilitators (around 1 per 8 facilitators to be trained) in a 10 day experiential training, and to ensure quality
• Provide municipal facilitators drawn from different sectoral departments, for training
• Commit to train 1 ward committee member per ward, and support them with travel and meal costs during implementation
• Run 1-2 training of facilitators in the municipality (depending on numbers), the first of which would be supported by an external trainer
• Ensure the documentation of the plans in a suitable form to be used for the IDP;
• Allocate people to undertake on-going monitoring of planning and implementation;
• Allocate R25-50 000 per ward to support local action (process funds), and allow wards to
decide on what they wish to fund.

Figure 7.5.2  Components of different CBP/IDP combinations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning element</th>
<th>Model</th>
<th>1 Sample-based CBP and munic plan</th>
<th>2 CBP plus short IDP</th>
<th>3 District-driven CBP</th>
<th>4 Integrated CBP and IDP</th>
<th>5 Fully aligned CBP/IDP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How much in Ward process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• CBP phase 1 (situation analysis)</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• CBP phase 1+2 (reconciliation)</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• CBP phase 1-3 (all)</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• CBP 1-3 plus link to IDP</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much in IDP process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• municipal 3-5 day strat plan plus action plan for projects</td>
<td></td>
<td>x (Facilitated)</td>
<td>x (Facilitated)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• more business planning/ integration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• more strategic about area planning</td>
<td></td>
<td>x (Facilitated)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• alignment across sectors and spheres</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key:
* Relevant while no revised IDP guide

Guide 1  Based on existing guide, plus possibly simple linkage (within this project)
Guide 2  Develop new easily based on current CBP guide (if DBSA comes forward)
Guide 3  Complex linkages guide (within this project)
Guide 4  New IDP guide including minimum bus planning and alignment (new funds)
Guide 5  Full version of IDP, which people can select from (new funds)

Some ideas for how this could be handled are shown in table 7.2.

(c)  Support for CBP

First thinking has been done on what elements of a possible national support system could be. This is moving beyond a pilot process, to a system using national, provincial and district systems to support municipalities interested in undertaking CBP. Table 8.3.1 summarises what these systems could be. We are in the process of working on this at the moment, in order to get it into the government budget for 2005/6.
### Table 7.5.2 Possible elements of national support system for CBP in South Africa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Support component</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Exciting interest** | General communication document on benefits and costs  
Introductory event with Mayors/municipal managers  
Roadshow discussing implications of benefits and costs where can interact on costs/benefits |
| **Committing and deciding on what form of CBP/IDP** | Consideration of applications by central administration unit  
Guide for considering CBP/IDP and which model is appropriate  
Detailed consultations with specific municipalities  
Screening process for national support  
Workshop which looks at implications and possible alternatives for CBP/IDP, eg at provincial level  
Drawing up process plans with each municipality |
| **Training** | Training of provincial support people (eg from province, district officials, NGOs) – annual basis  
Training of municipal lead trainers (by provincial support team)  
Training materials for both trainings  
Printing of Guides  
Printed flip charts etc  
Influencing curricula of training institutions to include CBP/participation  
Accreditation of training |
| **Planning** | Support for planning costs (provided from national)  
Quality control by province  
Technical Help desk  
Trouble shooting backup - provincial  
Trouble shooting backup - national |
| **Implementation** | Monitoring of implementation  
Advocacy and proposal of revised procurement systems which favour community implementation  
Assistance with procurement and fin management mechanisms  
Auditing of ward expenditure  
Technical Help desk  
Trouble shooting backup - provincial  
Trouble shooting backup - national |
| **General communication and learning** | Communication – getting examples, cases  
National newsletter  
Section on Local Government Association Website  
Learning support  
Regular learning events – provincial, eg 2 provinces together – say 10 munic together  
Regular learning events – national – eg annual  
Peer-learning events and cross-visits |
| **Management** | Admin centre –  
Technical Help desk  
Trouble shooting backup - provincial  
Trouble shooting backup - national |
7.6 **Across the 4 countries**

The four-country initiative has ushered in an invaluable cross-country collaborative approach to the development of methodologies, piloting and implementation of community-based participatory planning systems, which link poor people and villages and parishes more effectively with local government planning systems. Beyond the project life there is need to establish a continued mechanism of information exchange in a manner that should directly benefit in-country grassroots planning processes in local governments, and enable enrichment of each others processes from the sharing of experience.
Annex 1  Khanya version of Sustainable Livelihoods Framework

**Vulnerability to stresses and shocks**
- Financial, eg market
- Human, eg disease
- Social, eg conflict
- Natural, eg drought
- Physical

**Situation of household/community**
- Natural
- Social
- Human
- Physical

**Opportunities**
- Financial
- Human
- Social
- Natural
- Physical
- Local
- Regional
- National
- International

**Livelihood outcomes desired**
- More income
- Improved well-being
- Reduced vulnerability
- Improved food security………
- More sustainable use of NR base

**Livelihood strategies chosen**
- Natural resource based (on-farm, off-farm)
- Non-NR based (eg employment)
- Migration (seasonal, circular, permanent, international)

**Implementation**
- Own activities without support
- Activities supported by external agencies
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