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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Part A: Introduction

1 Introduction

This report summarises the evolution and results of the Community-Based Planning (CBP) Project in Uganda. It aims at informing organisations in Uganda about the context to CBP, the lessons from its application, and its eventual incorporation in the development of the Harmonised Participatory Planning Guides (HPPG). The country report outlines the situation prior to this project, documents what happened in the Bushenyi District pilot and at national level during the last three years of the implementation of the project. It identifies the weaknesses/threats and makes recommendations for the way forward.

Part B: Situation Prior to The Project

2 Administrative structures and policies in relation to local government planning

2.1 The local government structures responsible for planning at different levels are:

- Village Councils, Village Executives and Project Management Committees (PMCs) at the village level (LCI);
- Parish Councils, Parish Development Committees and the Parish Chief at the parish level (LCII);
- Sub-county/Division and Town Councils, Executives, Sectoral Committees, Technical Planning Committees and Investment Committees in lower LGs (LCIII);
- District Councils, Executives, Sectoral Committees, District Technical Planning Committee and District Local Government Tender Board at the District level (LCV)

Decentralised planning is guided by the Decentralisation Policy, the Poverty Eradication Action Plan (PEAP), the Local Government Budget Framework Paper, sector policies and guidelines as well as guidelines issued by the National Planning Authority.

2.2 Every local government is required by law to have a three-year integrated rolling investment/development plan. The process of updating the development plans, apart from serving the purpose of revising the local level priorities is also intended to inform national planning, the Medium Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF) and budgeting. An important element of the local government development plans are the investment projects, which can be at community level, subcounty, or district depending on the area that they cover and their recurrent cost implications.

2.3 The institutional framework for planning features in various development planning guidelines. The Local Government Act itself establishes and defines the planning functions of District Councils, the District Planning Unit, and the District and Sub-county Technical Planning Committees.

2.4 At the national level, the PEAP provides Uganda’s development framework and medium term planning tool. Planning and budgeting have been integrated with the PEAP and sector development plans linked to the budget through the MTEF, and sector strategies set out in the Budget Framework Papers. At Local Government levels and below, the planning has focused largely on investment interventions. There was inadequate linkage between
plans, budgets and the local community development needs. Planning at the LG level was also done sectorally with minimal integration.

There was minimal involvement of the private sector and traditional institutions in the planning process. The NGOs commonly operated independently of LGs and their plans were often not integrated in those of LGs yet they had skilled personnel, logistics and the culture of consultations that could have facilitated the entrenchment of CBP in LGs if they had collaborative arrangements in place.

3 Learnings from experience of participatory planning prior to the CBP project

3.1 Rakai Community Capacity Building Programme for Sustainable Development was a project of Concern Worldwide operating in Rakai District, improving the abilities of communities to manage their own development by strengthening the capacity of local development actors to facilitate this process. A bottom up approach to planning was used using a range of participatory learning and action (PLA) tools. The community contributed 40% of the total project budget mainly in the form of local materials, unskilled labour and in some instances, cash. The involvement of the community in project planning, implementation and monitoring was not only empowering but also cost effective.

3.2 Implementation of DDP/LGDP in Kayunga district - The project provided funds to the local government for capital investments (LDF) and capacity building (for retooling and training). The local government planned for the utilisation of the LDF and CBF, designed, implemented, monitored and supervised projects and accounted for the funds. The communities identified viable investment projects depending on their felt needs, contributed local materials, utilised the facilities and provided for operation and maintenance of facilities.

3.3 ActionAid project Apac - Two main structures were created within the communities to facilitate CBP. The first was a Parish Beneficiaries Forum comprising of two representatives from each village which was responsible for planning, budgeting and implementation of parish projects. The second structure was the community facilitator who were recruited and paid by communities but with money from ActionAid. They were responsible for training members of the Forum and assisting in facilitation of planning sessions at both village and parish level. The amount of money available to each parish from ActionAid was made known at the beginning of the planning period (budget constrained planning). The approach used in planning was problem/needs based.

3.4 The learnings from previous experience include the:

- need for community facilitators to drive the participatory planning;
- need to strengthen and work through established institutions instead of the various development agencies creating their own planning structures;
- importance of local governments initiating and co-ordinating the efforts of the different development practitioners within their areas of jurisdiction;
- absence of strong and uniform coordination structures for the planning function;
- need for collection and management of information and data is critical for viability of planning processes;
- need for the budget framework to be known prior to planning;
- focus on expensive infrastructure projects is problematic and there is inadequate account taken of cross-cutting issues of poverty, environment, HIV/AIDS;
- importance of mechanisms for community management, operation and maintenance of projects for a sustainable flow of benefits of investment interventions;
- The need for on-the-job training.
Part C: What happened during the CBP Project

5 Evolution of the CBP Project in Uganda

5.1 In 1998-2000, Khanya, managing rural change undertook a study to look at “Institutional support for sustainable livelihoods in Southern Africa”. The study identified a key governance requirement for sustainable poverty eradication efforts as “At the community level, poor people must be actively involved in managing their own development (claiming their rights and exercising their responsibilities)”. A follow-on research study was funded by DFID covering Uganda, South Africa, Ghana and Zimbabwe and has focused on community-based planning and the promotion of communities’ ability to influence resource allocation.

5.2 The initial partnership which took forward CBP was between PMU/LGDP, CARE International, Bushenyi District Local Government (with partners in Ghana, Zimbabwe and South Africa). 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.

5.3 A core planning methodology was developed across the 4 participating countries and a generic manual developed in September 2001. Following this, a locally adapted manual was developed 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.

Table 5.3.1 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>October 2001</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>January 2002</td>
<td>Visit to India to look at the Panchayat Raj system in Madhya Pradesh</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date/ Year</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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 by 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 four countries of Ghana, Zimbabwe, South Africa and Bolivia 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 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>
<tr>
<td>Oct 2003</td>
<td>A Ugandan trainer participated in the training even for South African IDP managers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov/December 2003</td>
<td>Re-orientation of District and Sub-county Technical Planning Committees on the HPPG in the six DDP II districts.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2003</td>
<td>Development of standardised training materials in LLGs development planning completed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2003</td>
<td>First draft of an inventory of gender planning guidelines, gender planning guidelines for Lower Local Governments and Parishes were finalized in December 2003.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2004</td>
<td>Training of Trainers on the HPPG with support from Khanya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mainstreaming of activities hitherto being executed by CARE Uganda in liaison with DFID and Khanya South Africa into the MoLG’s programmes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The main difference from the methodologies used prior can be summed up as follows: CBP encourages development plans to be more relevant to local needs and priorities by analysing the livelihoods of different 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 makes for more creative approaches to dealing with the situation and not just focusing on infrastructure, enhances the relevance of services, and encourages planning about what the community will do and not just what government will do for them.

5.4 Some lessons from the study visit to India are the viewing of the population as a resource not a problem, the recognition of the role of traditional leaders, and systems for incentives to encourage community participatory planning and implementation. Of particular

1 The six DDP II districts are Arua, Yumbe, Jinja, Mukono, Kayunga and Kabale.
significance in Bolivia was the role of the Vigilance Committees in ensuring that plans are linked to budgets, and that final budget allocations truly represent bottom-up planning.

6 Results of the implementation of the CBP/HPPG

6.1 CBP has been implemented in Bushenyi district for three years now, being applied in 170 parishes with 92 facilitators trained at subcounty and district level. All the 170 parishes and 29 lower local governments have three year development plans. The lower local governments’ plans incorporate plans from the parishes while the District plan incorporates those from lower local governments. A Bushenyi Manual has been prepared which has been revised 5 times. A Core Team of trainers was established at district level to give technical support to the CBP methodology. The planning was funded by the district with support from CARE, and the CBP Project. Parishes spend US$270–432 in cash and kind for the entire planning process depending on the number of villages, including the cost of producing many copies of the draft plans. There may be increased need for additional parish finances in form of the conditional grants to complement or top up the community contribution.

6.2 In terms of the impacts:

- Evidence of improved plans - for the last three years Parishes have had three year rolling plans, and their quality has improved. The different issues identified in the parish and sub-county plans cut across all sectors. The types of activities planned are not only construction of physical projects like classrooms but also “software” like Functional Adult Literacy (FAL), training in skills for improved agriculture, income generation, environmental management and awareness on disease prevention and management (e.g. malaria, HIV/AIDS);
- Evidence of improved coverage of the poor/vulnerable/gender/HIV - identification and involvement of different livelihood groups in SWOT analysis solicited the views of the different social groups and promoted a better understanding of the numerous faces of poverty that needed to be addressed in the planning process;
- Evidence of improved services - there is evidence of improved service delivery in Bushenyi District as a result of Community-based Planning;
- Evidence of participation/empowerment/community action – many projects not requiring external funding were implemented by parishes directly;
- Impact on local government - a total of 98 facilitators were trained and capacity of LC1-5 officials has improved, at least as far as planning is concerned;
- Evidence of improved stakeholder involvement – the project led to strong linkages between NGOs and government in taking forward the HPPG, which was not true prior;
- Impact on national systems - the basic principles and methods of CBP have informed the review and refinement of the HPPG which is under use nationwide.
7 Upscaling CBP/HPPG in Uganda

7.1 The review and national workshop supported by CBP in mid 2001 led directly to the development of the HPPG. The CBP reference group was widened to address the HPPG, which was tested through the 2002/03 planning cycle. After the HPPG review of 2003, substantial changes were made to the Guide, including splitting the Guides for LLGs and for parishes/wards. The guides have now been illustrated prior to printing and are being used nationwide. The CBP principles were incorporated in the design of the implementation arrangements for the Northern Uganda Social Action Fund (NUSAf), a successor programme to the erstwhile Northern Uganda Reconstruction Programme (NURP).

7.2 The CBP reference group was widened to address the HPPG and became particularly instrumental in providing a strategic oversight of the pre-testing, review and refinement of the HPPG, and the development of the standardized training materials for the decentralised development planning. It was also instrumental in the design of the HPPG roll out strategy.

7.3 The initial training process involved 1-2 day trainings which proved too short. Uganda benefited from participation in the South African training of trainers and training of district planners. A two week training was designed in Uganda for super-trainers, one week theory and one week practical which was held in March 2004.

7.4 The Local Government Development Programme (LGDP) has funded the national rollout. The Capacity Building for Decentralised Community-based Participatory Planning and Budgeting funded under the World Bank Trust Fund also seeks to support the application of the HPPG in 20 selected districts. In order to meet the higher costs inherent in the CBP methodology, there is need for a specific budget for training and support to be allocated at parish and sub-county level.

7.5 The results have been dramatic. The Parishes are now formulating more visionary plans. The HPPG has provided a framework upon which districts are now delivering more focused training interventions to LLGs and Councils. Mainstreaming of cross-cutting issues into the planning process is now much more appreciated and practiced.

7.6 In terms of national impact, the HPPG has incorporated many of the methodological elements of the CBP. The HPPG has been tested, reviewed and refined over time and is being linked to gender guidelines and physical planning guidelines.

Part D: Learnings and way forward

8 Learnings

8.1 Community participation is important for ownership of development interventions – this must be sustained by report backs from the local governments on progress, including resources flowing from higher levels to support their plans.

8.2 Planning process and methodology - the entry point for the CBP process in Uganda is the parish level. A manual has been tested in Bushenyi and adapted for the HPPG. The planning process should take three days in all, with one day spent for planning at the village level\(^2\). The parish and sub-county should budget for the human and other resources that are required to achieve a meaningful good quality planning and implementation process.

\(^2\) Note in South Africa, Zimbabwe and Ghana they took 5 days for this
8.3 **Linkage with local government level** – the HPPG makes provision for parish plans to be developed earlier so as to allow incorporation of priorities into higher level planning and budgeting processes. It is important that the Indicative Planning Figure is known when this happens.

8.4 **Facilitation and training** - for good quality plans, the process needs at least 3 days at parish level that includes spending one full day at the village level. Bushenyi experience shows that subcounty staff can facilitate these plans but need adequate training.

8.5 **Finances** - a separate budget for training and support should be allocated at parish and sub-county level. In order to get realistic plans, the different levels of local government should plan for investments that they will be responsible for implementing and managing. A key constraint is the erratic, unreliable and often inaccurate release of funds from MFPED that differs greatly from the planning figures given to the districts for amounts expected within a given quarter, especially with respect to the submitted and approved work plans.

8.6 **Stakeholder involvement** - the evolution of the CBP/HPPG processes have been highly collaborative and participatory, involving central government agencies, local governments, donor agencies and NGOs/CBOs. There is an opportunity for effective partnerships between NGOs, CBOs and government around CBP/HPPG, at local and national levels.

8.7 **Following up the plan - community management** – communities can implement projects that are funded from their IPF. They may need additional skills to assist them with this. It is mandatory by MOLG that the public be informed on the development plan and budget. Communities should be able to use the plan as a basis of demanding for accountability especially for the planned projects that are being implemented. User committees such as school and health management committees are potentially powerful allies in examining budgets and ensuring that funds are efficiently and effectively spent.

8.8 **Changes needed in structures, systems and linkages** - The local government structure from the national to district and lower local councils works well for the planning process. There is a need to harmonise national level policies particularly to incorporate the crosscutting issues in environment, gender and health. A stronger link is needed between local interest groups and organisations, and decision making processes taken at budget conferences at sub-county and district levels concerning the final allocation of resources. There is a need to harmonise policies at the national level, eg where environmental committees with overlap with other structures at different levels.

9 **Way Forward**

As the CBP Project completes, concrete actions will need to be undertaken to sustain and entrench the salient principles of the CBP as a permanent feature grass roots development efforts in Uganda.

9.1 **Bushenyi district** has 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. Some of the Bushenyi staff are a key national resource that should be used.

9.2 The Ministry is currently working 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. In addition there are a number of reforms coming 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. Effective operationalisation of the HPPG will also call for institutionalisation of robust M&E mechanisms. Every effort will need to made to rationalise the sequencing of the planning processes at various levels, so as to ensure that community action plans meaningfully inform policy making at higher levels.

9.3 The four-country initiative has ushered in an invaluable cross-country collaborative approach around CBP/HPPG. 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.
PART A: INTRODUCTION

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

Uganda is a partner in a 4 country Community-Based Planning Project which has been researching and implementing community-based participatory planning systems linked to local government planning. In the last three years the CBP project has been piloted in four African countries (Uganda, Zimbabwe, Ghana and South Africa) with full-scale implementation in Bushenyi district in Uganda. The project purpose was defined as to have “realistic plans developed in each of the four African countries for policy change, implementation or piloting of Community-based planning systems, which participating institutions are committed to take forward.”

Uganda has been home to a multiplicity of Community-based Planning (CBP) models. Different practitioners had varying perceptions of what CBP entails, ranging from use of Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA) techniques for identifying community needs to the involvement of communities in the provision of services and maintenance thereafter. This experience was not unique to Uganda but also true for the other countries in Africa.

In order to understand the diversity in approaches in Uganda both in conceptual terms and actual practice, as part of the 4 Country Project the Ministry of Local Government (MLG), Plan for Modernisation of Agriculture (PMA) and CARE International commissioned a study to review approaches to Community-based Planning (CBP) within the context of decentralisation. The findings were documented in reports for learning lessons and sharing experiences with other partners in the region. A cross-country workshop was then organised in South Africa to share lessons learned. Many other workshops and exchange visits have since taken place during the implementation phase of the project.

In September 2002 an evaluation was conducted to examine the impact of CBP in Uganda (Bushenyi) and Mangaung in South Africa. In Uganda, the evaluation sought to document the findings on the CBP and to recommend how to improve in the consecutive years and to develop a country report for Uganda.

In order to maintain a collaborative and participatory dispensation, a local reference group comprised of MoLG, LGDP/PCU, Bushenyi District Local Government, UNCDF and CARE/ILM and other stakeholders was established and has met over the years to plan the activities of CBP in Uganda. Recently, a strategy was adopted to mainstream CBP activities into the MoLG’s programmes, and CBP has been incorporated into the Harmonised Participatory Planning Guides. This has yielded the benefit of according the CBP a national character.

---

3 Some of the reports that are documented include the National workshop on CBP, 12-13 June 2001 Synthesis Report on CBP in Uganda, June 2001 by Mentor Consult, Report on a visit to Uganda by 4 countries, (Bolivia, Zimbabwe, Ghana and South Africa) in July 2002 by Report on 2 countries visited (India and Bolivia) in Sep-Oct 2001 among others.
1.2 Objectives of the Country Report

This report summarises the evolution and results of the Community-Based Planning Project in Uganda in the last three years. It aims at informing organisations in Uganda about the context to CBP, and some of the lessons from its application. The objectives of the country report are:

- To outline the situation prior to this project in terms of institutional structures and the policy environment for grassroots planning processes;
- To document what has happened in Bushenyi as a pilot district and at national level during the last three years of the implementation of the project, plus lessons learnt from the previous experience of other partner countries;
- To document the results and impacts of CBP at various levels, identifying the weaknesses and threats;
- To make recommendations for the way forward so that external changes that are needed to inform policy dialogue are identified.

The structure of the report and sources of information for its different elements are outlined in the table below.

1.3 Structure of the Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Source of information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Part A: Introduction; Background to the project; Objectives of the report; Structure of the report.</td>
<td>TOR Various Reports on CBP, bibliography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part B: Situation Before CBP; Administrative structures/policies; Case studies in operationalising participatory planning prior to CBP; Learnings from previous experience.</td>
<td>Synthesis Report of CBP in Uganda by Mentor Consults in June 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part C: What happened during the CBP project; Evolution of CBP in Uganda; Results of the CBP in Bushenyi; Results of the CBP as extended to the HPPG; Impact at pilot district and national level.</td>
<td>Review of previous reports, and workshops, reference material, consultative discussions, interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part D: Learnings and Way Forward; Overall learnings; Proposed way forward.</td>
<td>Shared evaluation findings in Analysis workshop with sub-county and district officials and two members of Advisory Team; Reports of previous studies, workshops &amp; visits</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PART B: THE SITUATION PRIOR TO THE CBP PROJECT

2 ADMINISTRATIVE STRUCTURES AND POLICIES IN RELATION TO LOCAL GOVERNMENT PLANNING

2.1 Policies

2.1.1 Decentralisation Policy

The current decentralised governance system in Uganda was conceived during the ruling National Resistance Movement’s years of the struggle for control of state power. The Movement leadership had a vision of a local government system that was democratic, participatory, efficient and development-oriented. The idea was to empower local communities to take charge of their destiny through democratic local governance institutions, resource mobilization, with community participation in all processes.

Over the years, the principles underpinning the above stated vision were progressively refined, then incorporated into the 1995 Constitution and further elaborated in the Local Government Act, of 1997.

The objectives of the decentralisation policy are 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 to the point where services are actually delivered, thereby improving accountability, 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 Governments Act which constitutes the legal framework for the decentralisation policy defines the planning powers of Local Governments and the institutional framework for planning at district and sub-county levels.

2.1.2 Poverty Eradication Action Plan

Poverty eradication is the fundamental development objective of Government and the overall strategy for its realisation is set out in the Poverty Eradication Action Plan (PEAP). The common consensus reached during the formulation of PEAP in 1997 is that poverty can be eradicated if public resources are focused on key priority areas, namely; measures to increase incomes of the poor, measures to improve on the quality of life; and measures to improve governance and accountability.

The PEAP has been instrumental in guiding policy formulation and provides a framework for preparation of detailed sector and Local Government plans and programmes.
2.1.3 The Local Government Budget Framework Paper

Since 1992, budget strategy in Uganda has been guided by the annual Budget Framework Paper. The BFP introduces a medium-term focus in Government consideration of budget policy, in principle providing a basis for long-term planning of expenditures of line agencies.

In 1999, a start was made on extending the BFP process to Local Governments. The Local Government Budget Framework Paper workshops have become an annual event in the national budget process, and they constitute an important platform for clarifying the resource envelope likely to be available to Local Governments and other key policy initiatives.

2.1.4 Sector Policies and Guidelines of Line Ministries

Over the years, Government has been making concerted effort to shift from a project-driven approach to development of comprehensive, coordinated sector-wide programmes and investment plans. Uganda presently has active SWAPs in a number of sectors, and they outline broad policy objectives, financing and implementation mechanisms for sector interventions. With their front-line responsibility for delivery of a broad range of essential services, Local Governments are bound by the various national and sectoral policy guidelines and programmes.

2.1.5 Guidelines Issued by the National Planning Authority (NPA)

The National Planning Authority is now in place and functional. According to the Local Government Act, 1997 Section 36(2), the District Planning Authorities are required, in addition to procedures they establish for themselves, to work in accordance to guidelines established by the National Planning Authority.

2.2 Categories of projects

Every local government is required by law to have a three-year integrated rolling investment/development plan. The process of updating the development plans, apart from serving the purpose of revising the local level priorities is also intended to inform national planning, the Medium Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF) and budgeting. An important element of the local government development plans are the investment projects.

Local government projects can generally be categorized according to what level of local government will carry the recurrent cost implications, or which level of local government will have the largest say in making decisions on allocation of resources. Below are examples of different categories of investment projects.

2.2.1 Community Investment Projects

These are investment projects to be implemented at the village/parish level. They are small projects identified by the communities themselves to be implemented without any recurrent cost implications for the Sub-county or District. Examples of community projects include spring protection and clearing footpaths. Because the amount of resources at this level are commonly low and given the fact that some problems cut across villages, the villages and/or parishes are encouraged to pool resources together to invest in a priority area.

2.2.2 Sub-county projects
Sub-county projects are relatively larger than community projects and normally benefit a larger population spread over a number of villages. These projects are decided on by the sub-county and have recurrent cost implications mainly at the sub-county level. Examples are drilling of boreholes or improvements of primary schools. Despite the fact that there are differences between the community and sub-county projects, lower local governments (Sub-counties/Divisions and Town Councils) are required to prepare plans that incorporate priorities of the lower councils under their jurisdiction.

2.2.3 District projects

Projects that are decided on by the district are bigger and benefit large populations, sometimes spread over several sub-counties. These projects have recurrent cost implications at the district level. Examples are construction of new health units, feeder roads, secondary schools etc.

2.3 Institutional Framework for Decentralised Planning

The institutional framework for planning features in various development planning guidelines. The Local Government Act itself establishes and defines the planning functions of District Councils, the District Planning Unit, and the District and Sub-county Technical Planning Committees. Needless to mention here that prior to the introduction of CBP, various donor and NGO/CBO agencies established their own planning structures. The tables below outline the planning roles and responsibilities of various institutions at the village, parish, sub-county and district level.

2.3.1 Village level structures

Section 46 Local Government Act, 1997 establishes Village Councils as Administrative Units in rural and urban areas. A village is the lowest unit of governance under Uganda’s decentralisation set up, called Local Council I or LC1. A village council comprises of all persons of eighteen years of age or above residing in that village. The Act establishes an Executive Committee for each Village Administrative Unit, including a series of portfolios. Table 2.3.1 summarises the structures at village level.

2.3.2 Parish level Structures

Again, Section 46 of the Local Government Act, 1997 establishes Parish or Ward Councils as administrative units in rural and urban areas, respectively. A Parish or Ward Council is composed of all members of the village executive committees in the parish. The Parish Council is the second level of governance under Uganda’s decentralisation set up.

Again at Parish level, there shall be an Executive Committee, chosen from among council members. The Parish Executive Committee has the same membership as defined for the Village Executive Committee above. Table 2.3.2 summarises the structures at parish level.
### Table 2.3.1 Structures at village level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structure</th>
<th>Indicative Roles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Village Council (All community members in the village, including the marginalised)</td>
<td>Attend community meetings to discuss/identify problems/needs of the area and available resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contribute locally available materials and labour towards the community projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provide basic operation and maintenance costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village Executive</td>
<td>Mobilise community members for planning meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oversee implementation of village council decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monitor project implementation (site monitoring) and report to village council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Management Committee (e.g. Water Source Committee. They are supposed to be composed of representatives of users, LC Executives, disadvantaged groups, and women.)</td>
<td>Providing site security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>On the spot monitoring of project implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Verifying contractors works before payment by sub-county</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mobilising community contribution for project implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organising community operation, management and maintenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collection of user fees</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2.3.2 Structures at parish level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structure</th>
<th>Indicative Roles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parish Council (LC II) (Composed of all village executives)</td>
<td>Makes final decision about priorities of the parish through some basic appraisal process;[^4]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Submits parish priorities to the sub-county</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish Development Committee (composed of 5 members selected by LC II, 2 representatives from each village. Parish Chief and chairperson LC II are ex-officio members)</td>
<td>Identification of problems/needs of the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prioritise investments within the limits of available funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Initiate development ideas and profiles for the parish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monitor development activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Keep records and submit reports to parish council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oversee and ensure completion of the projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish Chief</td>
<td>Work closely with Parish Council to mobilise people to participate and contribute resources towards the projects[^5]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[^4]: Under the LGDP modality, the Parishes are supposed to receive Indicative Planning Figures to guide their prioritization process. They are also encouraged to plan for investments they will implement using local resources.

[^5]: It should be noted that whereas the Parish Chiefs have the responsibility and potential to perform broader functions in regard to planning, project implementation, monitoring and management, till to-date they have not been oriented and equipped with the skills to perform this function and are still focusing on their conventional function of Graduated Tax collection which is even in a number of cases not forthcoming.
2.3.3 Lower Local Government Structures

Section 24 of the Act establishes the Sub-county Councils, City or Municipal Division Councils and Town Councils as Lower Local Governments. The Lower Local Governments have Executive Committees, nominated by the Chairperson from among Council members. A LLG Executive Committee is responsible for the supervision of the implementation of policies and decisions made by Council. Table 2.3.3 below outlines the planning roles and responsibilities of the various actors at Lower Local Government (LLG) level.

Table 2.3.3 Roles and responsibilities of structures at LLG level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Actor</th>
<th>Programme Implementation Roles and Responsibilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sub-county/Division and Town Council</td>
<td>Planning authority in the sub-county. Its major role is approval of investment projects, plans and budgets. Discuss and approve three year development plans. Collect actual planning ideas from the parishes and ensure incorporation of lower councils’ priorities in the investment plans. Forward plans to district for integration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-county Executive Committee</td>
<td>Oversee the implementation of council decisions. Monitor and supervise projects and other activities undertaken in the local government, NGOs and other development players.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sectoral Committees</td>
<td>Prepare sector plans (like health, education and water) and submit to council for consideration. Appraise proposed projects and act as the initial clearing house before the executive. Foster co-ordination and collaboration in implementation of sector activities in the sub-county by the different stakeholders. Monitor and assess the progress of implementation of sector activities in the sub-county. Submit routine and periodic reports to council through the Executive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Planning Committee (TPCs are composed of the Sub-county chief/Town Clerk, Sub-accountant/Town Treasurer and all extension staff in the Sub-county/Town Council)</td>
<td>Advise council regarding preparation of plans and budgets through the provision of data/information, advising on resource allocation, endowment and deprivation. Appraises individual investment projects before presentation to sectoral committee. Certifies investment projects (minor building and water works). Monitor implementation of parish infrastructure projects and use of funds. Oversee the performance of the PDCs (where available). Resolve conflicts between PDCs and communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment Committee</td>
<td>Prioritise investments. Prepare preliminary design/costing of sub-county and community projects. Monitor implementation of projects. Verify the certification of contractors works to Sub-county for payment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.3.4 District Level Structures

According to Section 4 of the Local Governments Act, the system of Local Government in Uganda shall be based on the District as a Unit under which there shall be Lower Local Governments and Administrative Units. The highest political authority within the district is the District Council, which has legislative and executive powers to be exercised in accordance with the Constitution and the Local Governments Act. Table 2.3.4 outlines the planning functions and responsibilities exercised by the various actors and organs at district level.

Table 2.3.4 Roles of district structures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structure</th>
<th>Indicative Roles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>District Council</strong></td>
<td>Planning authority in the district. Its major role is soliciting of actual planning ideas and feeding them to the Planning Unit and approval of investment projects, plans and budgets. Formulate three year development plan for the district. Incorporate plans of lower LGs. Forward plans to Ministry of Local Government.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>District Executive Committee</strong></td>
<td>Oversee the implementation of council decisions. Monitor and supervise projects and other activities undertaken in the local government, NGOs and other development players.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sectoral Committees</strong></td>
<td>Prepare sector plans (like health, education and water etc.) and submit to council for consideration. Foster co-ordination and collaboration in implementation of sector activities in the district (including the activities of NGOs and CBOs). Monitor and assess the progress of implementation of sector activities in the district. Submit routine and periodic reports to council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>District Technical Planning Committee</strong></td>
<td>Advise council regarding preparation of plans and budgets. Appraises individual investment projects before presentation to council. Co-ordinate implementation of the district projects on behalf of council. Certifies investment projects. Mentor Lower LGs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>District Local Government tender Board</strong></td>
<td>Authorise procurement of council’s requirements. Award contracts for works, goods and services. Maintain a pre-qualified list of contractors and suppliers. Maintain a list of contracts awarded and a blacklist of poor contract performers. Advise accounting officers on tendering procedures. Ratifies below-the-threshold procurements.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.4 Planning Process

2.4.1 National planning processes

It is generally recognized that key to efficient and effective allocation of resources is a strong link between policy, plans and budgets. At the centre, this has been done fairly with the PEAP and sector development plans linked to the budget through the MTEF, and sector strategies set out in the Budget Framework Papers. The PEAP, which is also Uganda’s Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper constitutes the national development framework and medium term planning tool.

It is important to note that the PEAP is not a detailed blueprint for sector activities, but simply guides policy formulation and implementation of programmes through SWAPs and decentralisation. Sector Working Groups (SWGs) have been established for each sector to prepare sector action plans, outlining specific actions for Government, donors, NGOs and communities, and making recommendations for re-orientation and allocation of expenditure for effective implementation of the action plans.

In the preparation and prioritisation of the sector plans, ministries have been guided by the Medium Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF), which is a government-wide framework that integrates policy making with economic planning and budgeting in the context of a multi-year cycle and ensures that expenditure programmes are driven by strategic priorities and disciplined by hard budget constraints. The framework helps government to manage tension between demands for expenditures (“needs”) and the resources realistically likely to be forthcoming from both domestic and external sources (“availabilities”).

The MTEF in each financial year submitted to Cabinet as part of the annual Budget Framework Paper (BFP), covering 3 years. Preparation of the annual BFP includes detailed discussions with SWGs, to monitor performance of current programmes and projects. The discussions identify implementation bottlenecks, inefficiencies in existing operations, and the potentially unsustainable imbalances in the size of the recurrent and development programmes. The discussions take account of upcoming policy initiatives in order to ensure that all new policies and programmes are comprehensively costed to reveal the full extent of their fiscal implications and in order to propose how government’s expenditure programme can be adjusted in the light of new policy priorities within and between sectors.

2.4.2 Planning process at LG level

As highlighted elsewhere above, the statutory structures responsible for planning at the respective LG levels included the Councils, Executive Committees, Sectoral Committees, Technical Planning Committees and the District Planning Units. Under the LGDP/DDP lower LGs have also been encouraged to constitute investment committees to complement the technical planning committee in executing the development planning function, tap into the greater expertise in the LGs, bridge the councils and TPCs and ensure wider participation in planning. Also in place were various guidelines in LG planning processes.

In spite of the existing institutional framework, legal dictates, and the available guidelines however, functional capacity to undertake effective plan and budget formulation was far from satisfactory in most Local Governments, with plans having little focus on poverty, gender, environmental and other core concerns of the national development agenda. In addition, there was inadequacy of linkages between the plans, the annual budget estimates and the local community development needs. Planning at the local government level was also done sectorally with very minimal integrated, cross-sectoral analysis of problems and issues facing
the local governments. Planning, especially at the sub-district levels largely focused on investment interventions.

The challenges to enhanced coordinated participatory planning and budgeting flowed from lack of information on resources and entitlements; lack of clarity of planning responsibilities at various levels; lack on clarity of the relationship between "visionary" and "constraint" budgeting; the vulnerability and lack of self-confidence especially by the marginalised groups to participate in the planning and budgeting processes in Local Governments.

### 2.4.3 Planning process beneath LG level

As indicated elsewhere in this report, the Local Government Act, 1997 mandates Lower Local Governments to prepare development plans incorporating plans of Lower Local Councils in their areas of jurisdiction. Indeed there has always been an institutional setting for planning at these lower local council levels, including the village councils, village executives, and parish councils and executives. Some development agencies operating at the community level created their own structures to spearhead the planning processes, such as the Parish Development Committees by Unicef. Whereas some of these structures complemented the LG planning processes others were managed in parallel to the LG system and more often than not served to weaken rather than strengthen the existing structures.

The involvement in planning of statutory structures beneath the LLGs (like Village and Parish Councils) did not take firm root. This was attributed to among others, the fact that most local governments did not start the planning process according to the planning cycle recommended in the planning guidelines. In order to beat the statutory deadline of June 30 for plans and budgets approvals, most local governments could not afford to wait for inputs from the lower local councils. Moreover, the input from parishes and villages was not expected to make much difference owing to serious capacity gaps at those levels.

In the circumstances, planning processes beneath LG largely focused on needs identification without necessarily defining strategies to be employed to overcome the problems. Prescription of solutions was considered to be the preserve of higher levels of governance.

### 2.4.4 How Local Government fits into national planning

According to Local Governments Act, 1997, districts were required to prepare comprehensive and integrated development plans for submission to the National Planning Authority. The district plans were themselves supposed to be informed by priorities evolved from the lower local government and council planning processes. The guidelines that were formulated to support the decentralised development planning processes highlighted bottom-up planning approach.

In practice however, community-based planning processes in place did not follow the legal dictate and guidelines for a number of constraints. For a start, local governments did not have a culture of planning and lacked skilled personnel to wade through the elaborate sequence of planning activities as outlined in the planning guidelines. In addition, the various central government ministries imposed central policies and plans on local governments through the use of an increasing number of conditional grants. The implication was that local government priorities hardly constituted critical determinants of the national development agenda.

---

In the context of this report, beneath LG level refers to Parish/Ward and Village levels.
With improved capacities of local governments, and the implementation of the FDS which seeks to push Government away from control of inputs and move towards agreement of common policies and objectives, and provision of autonomy to LGs to achieve this, the situation is envisioned to improve.

2.4.5 Involvement of other stakeholders

The Private Sector

Apart from individuals participating in their capacities as members of the community, the private sector was hardly involved at the planning stage. Their involvement was at the implementation stage when they were contracted to supply goods, works and services to the community projects. This denied the community the opportunity of tapping the expertise of the private sector in planning, in terms of their own vision of development, their own priorities, as well as in determining project specifications and indicative costs.

NGOs/CBOs:

As demonstrated by a wide range of case studies, there were a number of other stakeholders involved in CBP in the country especially NGOs and CBOs. Although the law specified that the Local Governments had the responsibility for regulating the operations of the NGOs within their areas of jurisdiction, in practice some NGOs operated almost independently of the local governments and more often than not their plans were not integrated into the development plans of the local governments. However, it was evident that the NGOs were well equipped to facilitate the process of CBP in that they staff with participatory skills and the needed logistical support. There was dire need for LGs and NGOs to foster a collaborative arrangement that would ensure complementarity of efforts in resource allocation and service delivery.

For effective integration, NGOs needed to be transparent in their commitments, timeframe, risks, and used planning sessions to present findings on particular issues to provoke discussion and raise issues.

Traditional institutions (Clans/Elders)

In Uganda, different tribes have traditional institutions. Whereas these institutions wield a lot of influence and control in most of the decisions made in the communities, their involvement in the planning processes was not apparent. Even in the LG planning guidelines, apart from their participation as members of the village councils, their involvement was not particularly catered for. Where these institutions exist and are strong, their role in CBP needed to be recognised. Leadership of these institutions could have been co-opted into the planning structures. This would have ensured wider coverage, forestalled interference in planning, and stimulated sustainability of the planning process, participation in implementation of the investments and guaranteed management and utilisation of the facilities and services.
3 LEARNING FROM EXPERIENCES OF PARTICIPATORY PLANNING PRIOR TO THE CBP PROJECT

This section covers a number of case studies of the use of participatory planning in Uganda prior to the CBP project, and also the learning from these experiences.

3.1 Case Study 1: Rakai Community Capacity Building Programme for Sustainable Development - Concern Worldwide, Rakai district

The purpose of the programme was to improve the abilities of communities to manage their own development by strengthening the capacity of local development actors to facilitate this process. The program entry point was the parish, to foster grass root participation and for wider impact. The structures used were parish development committees, sub-county trainers, sub-county fund board, local councils I-III and other stakeholders like CBOs and NGOs. The planning process followed the decentralised planning process closely and took approximately five days. A bottom up approach to planning was used and the participatory learning and action (PLA) tools such as historical profiles, time line, social and natural resource map, seasonal calendars, family livelihoods, problem/objective trees and priority ranking were used. Community members were split into groups of old women, old men, young women, young men, and children.

The community contributed 40% of the total project budget mainly in the form of local materials, unskilled labour and in some instances, cash. The involvement of the community in project planning, implementation and monitoring was not only empowering but also cost effective. The community developed a vision, came up with needs and problems using the PLA tools. Each individual participant prioritised the needs. PDC representative, local council leaders, sub-county trainers and government extension staff assisted the community to come up with realistic proposals and budgets. The proposals were sent to the sub-county fund board for appraisal, approval and funding. They developed a training manual for use of sub-county trainers in facilitating the planning process. A community-based information management system was developed to collect, store and use data for planning purpose. Information from all the village record books are fed into parish record books and updated annually.

Funds flowed from the donor through the sub-county bank accounts and were transferred to the village or parish accounts in instalments after approval of the board in accordance with funding requirements and project proposals. Project management committees identified the suppliers, purchased project materials and selected contractors. Every community project at village and parish level had a management committee.

The key challenges faced were:

- The district officials did not fulfil their obligations as stipulated in the MoU e.g. of reviewing the program;
- The transfer of government officials like the sub-county chief and parish chiefs affected progress of program as new civil servants had to be re-oriented to the process. Change of leadership also had impact on leadership quality;
- The sub-county trainers, sub-county fund board members and other local leaders had high expectation in Concern which was not met; and
- There were sustainability concerns with regard to structures established by Concern.
3.2 Case Study II: Implementation of DDP/LGDP in Kayunga district local government.

Kayunga was carved out of Mukono District and was one of the pilot districts for the District Development Programme (DDP). The project provided funds to the local government for capital investments (LDF) and capacity building (for retooling and training). The local government planned for the utilisation of the LDF and CBF, designed, implemented, monitored and supervised projects and accounted for the funds.

The communities identified viable investment projects depending on their felt needs, contributed local materials, utilised the facilities and provided for operation and maintenance of facilities.

The program aimed at strengthening the existing regulations and procedures with respect to the use of public funds towards delivery of mandated services. It was executed according to the existing structures of district and lower level local governments. The sub-county investment committee and project management committee were established to assist the sub-county and lower local councils. Together with the sub-county technical planning committee, the investment committee prepared preliminary costing and design of sub-county and community projects, prioritised investments within the limits of the IPF or LDF allocation and oversaw project monitoring. They certified contractor’s work for sub-county council approval for payment, and held meetings to review projects’ progress.

The sub-county resource team facilitated the village planning meetings by reviewing the previous parish achievements, constraints to service delivery and asking for the community’s problems, how they could be solved and what the community could contribute. The parish level planning was done by the parish council prioritising the village submissions within limits of the Indicative Planning Figures (IPFs) provided by MOLG-PMU. The parish council used certain criteria for selection depending on location, number of beneficiaries and capacity of the community to contribute. The selected project was forwarded to the sub-county investment and technical planning committee for appraisal and onward transmission to the district. Heads of departments evaluated, endorsed and prioritised crosscutting issues according to availability of funds for recurrent costs. The community was empowered in the process of defining their own course of development and solving problems. Projects identified in program were invariably physical infrastructure like classrooms, furniture, aid posts and road constructions.

The community planned within a given resource envelope and confined themselves to National Program Priority Areas (NPPAs). The Project Management Committees were charged with the responsibility of overseeing project implementation and on completion of project, organised community O&M of investments.

3.3 Case Study III: ActionAid project Apac

This was one of ActionAid Uganda’s projects situated in Northern Uganda and was aimed at improving the quality of life of the people living in the project area. The project was funded through child sponsorship in the UK and implemented independently of the district and sub-county structures but with close collaboration with the national government departments.

Two main structures were created within the communities to facilitate CBP namely; Parish Beneficiaries Forum (locally referred to as Paribenfora) comprising of two representatives (1 man and 1 woman) from each village. Their main role was to facilitate problem identification

7 NPPA are primary education, primary health care, water and sanitation, agriculture extension and feeder roads.
and analysis at the village level, before submission to the parish level for prioritisation. Paribenfora was responsible for planning, budgeting and implementation of parish projects. The second structure was the community facilitator (locally referred as Comfacis, who were recruited and paid by communities but with money from ActionAid) which was responsible for training members of the Paribenfora and assisting in facilitation of planning sessions at both village and parish level. The amount of money available to each parish from ActionAid was made known at the beginning of the planning period (budget constrained planning). The approach used in planning was problem/needs based.

3.4 Learnings from previous experience

3.4.1 Roles in relation to participatory planning

The CBP process can be effective if there are community facilitators to drive it, especially if drawn from within. As revealed in the case of ActionAid Apac, it would not have been possible to have well structured planning meetings at the village level without community facilitators. This same finding was reinforced by the experiences of other service providers who use paid community facilitators in CBP like Concern World-wide. Lack of remuneration in part explains why sub-counties were not able to strictly follow the planning guidelines as given to them. Whereas extension staff in sub-counties had a lot of skills within their areas of professional expertise, they had not been adequately oriented and facilitated to perform the planning function.

The UPPAP case study on the other hand confirmed that over reliance on national consultant(s) alone is however inadequate. Effort should instead be directed at development of a pool of district and local facilitators to enhance community ownership of the planning process, and for sustainability once the external experts withdraw.

Notwithstanding the above, it is important that in the design of CBP there should be an in-built mechanism for sustainable motivation and maintenance of the morale of the facilitators.

3.4.2 Planning at local government level

The experience from the studies revealed the following with respect to planning at the local government level:

- There was need for higher levels of government to be pro-active in supporting planning processes at lower levels;
- There was need to strengthen and work through established institutions instead of the various development agencies creating their own planning structures;
- Collection and management of information and data is critical for viability of planning processes and it is important to have structures in place at every level. Community-based management information systems are important;
- Use of community-based institutions such as PMCs is important for empowerment and sustainability of investments.
3.4.3 **Linkage between planning to budget**

Experience from DDP/LGDP performance revealed that there was limited linkage between the local governments’ three-year development plans with the annual budgets. In most districts, the sequencing of the planning and budgeting process did not allow for the development plan to effectively influence the budget effectively.

In theory, the Local Government Budget Framework Paper (LGBFP) should provide the link between the DDP and budget. However what obtained on the ground was that the DDP and Budget were prepared and approved after the LGBFP. The DDP did not feed into the LGBFP, and could only influence the budget in so far as it was prepared at the same time. In the circumstances, it was more difficult for the LGBFP to provide the basis for budgetary allocations if it had not been informed by the longer-term, visionary element in the DDP.

Ideally, the DDP ought to be prepared and approved a lot earlier, say by the end of December, so that it can feed into or at least be prepared alongside the BFP, and then ultimately the BFP should feed into the preparation of detailed workplans and budgets to be presented to and approved by council in June.

3.4.4 **Incorporation of lower level priorities**

The parish has been the entry point for grassroots development planning and prioritisation of projects for implementation. As the final selection was done at this level, a number of village priorities tended to be filtered out. This limitation in CBP was revealed by the case studies presented. In the case of APA it was established that articulate members of the Parish Beneficiaries Forum had an advantage over their colleagues in defending and pushing through projects identified by their villages. There was also a tendency for the parishes to have preference for bigger projects, wider in scope than individual villages hence village issues were sometimes completely left out. This had a negative impact on community participation especially in situations where they were also starved of feedback on the project appraisals and the reasons why their priorities lost out.

3.4.5 **Budget constrained versus open-ended planning**

It has also been revealed that to enable communities to formulate realistic plans and balanced budgets as required in the law, they ought to be furnished with timely and accurate Indicative Planning Figures. However, it has been observed in some quarters that budget constrained planning limits the exploration of other opportunities and resource mobilisation by the community members.

3.4.6 **Funding flows**

**Sources of Local Government funds**

The major sources of funding for local governments in Uganda have been the graduated tax and transfers from the centre. The transfers from the centre to local governments, in line with constitutional provisions are in form of conditional, unconditional and equalisation grants. Unconditional grants are monies which are paid to Local Governments to run decentralised services and are calculated in a manner specified in the seventh schedule of the Constitution. Conditional grants are monies given to Local Governments to finance specific programmes agreed upon between the Central Government and the latter. On the other hand, the equalisation grant is the money paid to a Local Government which is delivering services below the national average standard.
Over the years, there has been a tremendous increase in the share of fiscal transfers in the financing of decentralised service delivery. The overdependence of LGs on the Central Government for financial survival has served to undermine the benefits reaped from the decentralisation reform programme.

Sources of community funds

There has thus been need to diversify the sources of local revenues and improve on the efficiency and effectiveness of collection. With regard to funding of the implementation of community action plans, the following have been the potential sources of revenues:

- Transfers from the central government;
- Transfers from the local governments;
- Donor funds;
- Contribution from NGOs/CBOs;
- Specific development taxes from the communities, for example education tax;
- Programme co-financing/counterpart funding by communities;
- User fees from community investment, for example revenue from community water stand post;
- Private sector financing, especially when user fees can be charged.

The local revenue sharing formula between the different local council levels is defined in the Local Governments Act, 1997. The Act prescribes that of local revenue collected by the Sub-county Local Government, 25% must be transferred to communities (LCI). However, the 25% of funds transferred to the village levels was not appropriately planned for, utilised and accounted for, owing to reasons of weak guidance, poor supervision by the Sub-county and low financial management skills at the local levels.

Funding flows under existing institutional arrangements eg DDP

In 1995, the Government of Uganda (GoU) reached agreement with IDA and UNCDF to pilot devolution of discretionary development budget-support to 5 Districts through the District Development Project (DDP). This was designed to test the anticipated Local Governments Act and create a "policy experiment" for developing procedures for decentralised planning, financing and service delivery. The experience of the DDP formed the basis for design of the Local Government Development Programme (LGDP) which is devolving development funds through the Local Development Grant (LDG) and Capacity Building Grant (CBG) to 31 districts and 13 municipalities.

The LGDP approach combines building good local governance with the implementation of development investments. LGDP provides a non-sector specific development grant, the LDG to LGs according to transparent formulae.

As part of the national DTS under the FDS, the LDG has been retained as a source of discretionary financing to local governments, with the sector development grant modalities revised accordingly.

Funding flows under alternative arrangements e.g. NGO projects

According to the case studies reviewed, whereas there were some NGOs that funded capacity-building activities, most of them financed physical infrastructure projects. Unlike under the LGDP/DDP, the NGOs did not require beneficiary communities to meet a set of performance conditions before accessing the funds but they were required to contribute locally available materials and labour during project implementation.
Funds by NGOs flowed to the projects through a number of arrangements in line with the NGOs’ respective financial management systems and procedures. In a number of cases the financial years of NGOs did not match with that of Local Governments. The financial year of most NGOs ran from January to December as opposed to that of Local Governments, which is from July – June.

Most of the NGO funds were maintained by the NGOs in their respective bank accounts (for example ActionAid). This implied that community management structures didn’t have direct control over the financial resources of NGOs nor did they know how much was available. Nevertheless the funds were released funds to the community projects upon submission of work plans with proper accountability for previous releases.

There were also cases such as UPPAP, where donors transferred funds directly to the beneficiary communities without passing through the local government structures. Whereas the communities were required to open up bank accounts, some of them lacked financial management, procurement and accounting capacity. There was also a challenge of delays caused by slow bank transfer processes.

Nevertheless, the advantage of these alternative arrangements was that they were insulated from the bureaucratic bottlenecks that sometimes caused delays in the flow of funds under the existing local government system.

Transfer of funds, management and accountability

The experiences drawn from both the PUIP and DDP transfers of funds for financing community investments indicate that the following considerations need to be taken into account when making decisions for sustainable funding of Community Action Plans:

- Existing institutional set up;
- Sustainability of the mechanism;
- Accountability mechanism for the funds being transferred;
- Auditing arrangement of the funds being transferred.

Both PUIP and DDP demonstrated that to the highest extent possible, the funding flow mechanism should be within the existing institutional structure but with careful stop-gapping measures. This helped ensure the sustainability and strengthening of the existing institutions.

3.4.7 Relationship of community structures to CBP

Though some NGOs worked within the formal local government set up, eg CARE in Bushenyi, others like ActionAid Uganda and Concern World-wide created parallel community structures to facilitate the planning process.

In order to harmonise planning procedures, minimise duplication and to ensure optimum allocation of the limited resources, it was important that the local governments initiate and co-ordinate the efforts of the different development practitioners within their areas of jurisdiction. Although local governments were in many respects hampered by the inadequacies in functional capacity, it was still in everybody’s interests to work through and strengthen their capacities rather than bypass them.

3.4.8 Nature of projects
Most of the projects identified at community level tended to be infrastructural, aimed at addressing immediate/felt needs of the community (problem/needs-based). They were rarely vision-based for long-term issues. Without proper guidance, this was bound to be the case, with communities going in for ambitious projects with no regard for recurrent cost implications. Invariably, the community plans also failed to take adequate account of cross-cutting issues of poverty, environment, HIV/AIDS. The major reason was they had no ready access to guidelines on the mainstreaming of these issues.

3.4.9 Coordination of the CBP

Absence of strong and uniform coordination structures for the planning function was a major constraint to the institutionalisation of community-based participatory planning processes. Planning outside the local government system denied the LG structures an opportunity to enhance their capacities. In the event, some structures created by various NGOs denied the Councils their cardinal role of approving investment projects and plans as provided for under the law. As such, the approach to planning ceased to be holistic and became increasingly sectoral and/or organisation specific.

3.4.10 Involvement of other stakeholders

At parish level, the organs involved in the planning meetings were the Parish Development Committee, Parish Executives, Chairman LC2, Parish Chiefs, Women Council members (who mobilise the women in the community) and CBOs. During the CBP process in Bushenyi district, the elders, clan leaders, religious and opinion leaders also participated in mobilizing the community and by giving information during planning meetings. Retired civil servants helped to translate difficult words used in CBP into Runyankore and they helped as co-facilitators during the planning meetings.

In one sub-county and parish, local government staff were involved in the plan documentation. In another sub-county, UNFA, which is a local NGO, helped in the budgeting or costing of projects because their staff had the requisite knowledge, skill and experience in that particular activity. At the district level, the NGO projects (COBS, ILM) and private sector organisations who had interest in the CBP methodology trained the district based facilitators and gave financial support to the CBP process.

Other stakeholders involved in the planning process were traditional chiefs and government extension staff. The extension staff were helpful in giving technical advice and guidance during the planning process. In Rakai, the stakeholders were involved in the quarterly review meetings at sub-county level to share experience and review the plans.

3.4.11 Promotion of Community Action and Management

Mechanisms for community management, operation and maintenance of projects is important for a sustainable flow of benefits of investment interventions. Under DDP/LGDP, this mechanism mainly centred on the Project Management Committees (PMC). Every project with a well-defined user community was supposed to have a PMC, composed of representatives of users, local council executive, disadvantaged groups, with 40% as women. PMCs are responsible for:

- Providing site security;
- On the spot monitoring of project implementation;
- Verifying contractors works before payment by sub-county;
- Mobilising community contribution for project implementation;
- Organising community operation, management and maintenance;
- Collection and management of user fees for repair and maintenance.

### 3.4.12 Institutional framework for service delivery

There was tremendous interest and commitment to community-based planning as a mechanism of improving service delivery. Translation of this commitment to practical and replicable approaches however called for an appropriate institutional framework that transcended identification of investments to include allocation and investment management systems.

The local governments needed to ensure that detailed mechanisms for horizontal and vertical communication, transparency, accountability and reporting were place. There was a need to inform constituents of the financial allocations, planning processes, outcomes of the planning process and the roles and responsibilities of the different stakeholders during implementation and management stages. Documentation of the planning process (simple minutes of meetings) was important for provision of information required for learning and process improvement, monitoring and administering of the incentive/disincentive system.

As was practice under LGDP, the local government had to administer incentives for progressive improvement in planning. The incentives included:

- Lobbying the donor and sectoral ministry to plan through the LG procedures and only support investments that are derived from the development plans. For this to happen, it implied that the plan should be prepared with due consideration of national policies and strategies. This called for appropriate capacity building interventions;
- Ensuring that the resultant action plans were actually implemented. Planning without action dampens community interest in development planning;
- The allocation of additional resources as incentives to LGs that demonstrate progressive improvements in the quality of communication and planning.

### 3.4.13 Training and support needs

Case studies revealed that participation in project planning and implementation offered a platform for learning. However there was no targeted training done, even if it was known to be useful. For example, it was evident that most of the people voted onto the CAP Committees in Kotido District lacked leadership skills for commercial projects, lacked project planning and management. In stead of having these people trained, the project relied on community-based professionals such as teachers, nurses, extension staff, other professionals and students.

Ideally, training ought to be on-the-job. Those doing CBP needed to go through as many real-situation exercises as possible in order to instil best practices that stand the test of time. In addition, support needed to go to implementation of the plans in order to generate feedback with which to further develop the processes.
PART C: WHAT HAPPENED DURING THE CBP PROJECT

5 EVOLUTION OF THE CBP PROJECT IN UGANDA

5.1 Background

In 1998-2000, Khanya, managing rural change undertook a study to look at “Institutional support for sustainable livelihoods in Southern Africa”. This study focused on institutional issues in South Africa, Zimbabwe and Zambia that needed to be addressed if sustainable livelihoods were to be promoted. The work revealed that if the livelihoods of the poor were to improve, there was need to deal with the problem of linkage between community, local government and service providers in terms of participatory governance and improved services. The study identified three key governance requirements for sustainable poverty eradication efforts:

- At the community level, poor people must be actively 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 base, private sector or government);
- At local government level, service delivery needs to be facilitated, provided or promoted effectively and responsively, coordinated and held accountable.

The first key governance requirement implied that the community was involved in planning and management of local development. A follow-on research study was funded by DFID and covering Uganda, South Africa, Ghana and Zimbabwe and has focused on community-based planning. It has involved developing a core methodology for replicable participatory planning process, piloting it in six districts in the four countries with full-scale implementation in Bushenyi district in Uganda.

5.2 Design of partnership

Earlier initiatives with regard to grassroots development planning in Uganda were essentially NGO-driven. As examples, Concern–World wide was active in Rakai district; Save the Children-Denmark in Kumi district; Action Aid Project in Apac district. In the case of Bushenyi district, there has been an active involvement of CARE Uganda. Over time, there has been a gradual mainstreaming of the various NGO initiatives into the overall national efforts to evolve effective and sustainable community-based planning processes.

The initial partnership which took forward CBP was the PMU/LGDP, CARE International, Bushenyi District Local Government. This brought together national policy-makers, a facilitating agent with the participatory skills (CARE) and a local government to test out the approach (Bushenyi). The CBP process led to the development of a national thrust with respect to community-based planning approaches, which became the Harmonized Participatory Planning Guide (HPPG). The HPPG formulation, review and refinement process has been highly collaborative, enlisting the participation of a wide range of stakeholders. In recent times, the CBP/HPPG reference group has constituted a framework for a collaborative oversight of the evolution of the CBP/HPPG methodologies. The reference group brought in representation from CARE, UNCDF, Office of the Prime Minister, Ministry of
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Local Government (MOLG), Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development, Ministry of Gender, Labour & Social Development (MGLSD), Bushenyi District & UPDNet, and a range of development partners who are funding decentralised development planning programmes.

5.3 Planning process decided on and why

5.3.1 How methodology was adapted for the country

Good governance has been identified in the PEAP as “the efficient, effective and accountable exercise of political, administrative and management authority to achieve society’s objectives, including the welfare of the whole population, sustainable development, and personal freedoms”. Implied in this definition is the fact that good governance is a process of decision making and implementation. More importantly, good governance seeks to entrench mechanisms through which communities can be empowered to participate in the formulation and implementation of initiatives that affect their lives.

The Community-based Planning project which is based on the sustainable livelihoods approach argues that poverty-focused development should be people-focused, participatory and responsive, holistic, dynamic and flexible and sustainable economically, socially, environmentally and institutionally, so that it can be implemented in partnership without depending on donor funds. Table 5.3.1 presents a timeline for the project.

<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>September 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>October 2001</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>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>Date/ Year</td>
<td>Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</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 by 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 four countries of Ghana, Zimbabwe, South Africa and Bolivia 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 to review progress and develop plans for way forward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2003</td>
<td>National review of the local government planning guide 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>
<tr>
<td>Oct 2003</td>
<td>A Ugandan trainer participated in the training even for South African IDP managers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov/December 2003</td>
<td>Re-orientation of District and Sub-county Technical Planning Committees on the HPPG in the six DDP II districts.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2003</td>
<td>Development of the standardized training materials in LLGs development planning completed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2003</td>
<td>First draft of an inventory of gender planning guidelines, gender planning guidelines for Lower Local Governments and Parishes were finalized in December 2003.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2004</td>
<td>Training of Trainers on the HPPG with support from Khanya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mainstreaming of activities hitherto being executed by CARE Uganda in liaison with DFID and Khanya South Africa into the MoLG’s programmes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Following the presentation of case studies from Uganda and the identification of gaps in methodology, the basic methodology for a generic community-based planning manual was developed during a four-country workshop in Bloemfontein in July 2001. This manual was then refined by a smaller working group drawn from different countries and a draft disseminated in September 2001. Following this, a locally adapted manual was developed by a team of district based staff (supported by CARE staffers from different projects operational in the south west) 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.

9 The six DDP II districts are Arua, Yumbe, Jinja, Mukono, Kayunga and Kabale.
5.3.2 How was this planning different from the previous planning initiatives

The presentation of the above case studies revealed a range of alternative planning modalities such as vision-based, livelihood- (or asset-based) processes as well as specific techniques related to the identification of marginalised groups, and ways in which their priorities could be mainstreamed into the broader development planning process. A trade-off was required to move these somewhat “project driven”, high quality processes (which it was argued by government to be dependent upon external support) to a process which could be driven and managed by local governments, but which represented a significant improvement on what came before.

The main differences between the previous local government planning process and the CBP methodology are outlined as follows:

- The shift in emphasis from the needs-based or problems list to vision- and outcomes-based planning;
- The involvement of different livelihood groups of poor and marginalised (Involvement of community members in planning);
- Identification of problems in a cross sectoral manner (holistic approach) and their integration into higher level planning processes. Previously sectoral heads planned for the sector specific issues at district and sub-county level in a top-down manner;
- Greater emphasis on the outcomes of the planning process rather than the previous pre-occupation with process issues;
- Attempts to link economic and the spatial dimensions of development planning;
- Increased recognition of the critical place of service providers in the planning processes;
- Increased emphasis on the need to mobilise local resources to fund implementation of community priorities, which should yield genuine empowerment.
- Greater emphasis on the monitoring and evaluation of development plan implementation.

The difference can be summed up as follows: CBP encourages development plans to be more relevant to local needs and priorities by analysing the livelihoods of different 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 makes for more creative approaches to dealing with the situation and not just focusing on expensive infrastructure, enhances the relevance of services, and encourages planning about what the community will do and not just what government will do for them.

It encourages the empowerment of the people to sustain and control their own lives and livelihood with government sharing responsibility with them.
Table 5.3.2 Comparing previous LG planning and CBP planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Previous situation</th>
<th>Situation under CBP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Investments based on identified constraints and problems</td>
<td>Investments based on identification and negotiation of shared vision, strengths and opportunities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on community meetings at village level with no effort to disaggregate population, particularly the poor and marginalised</td>
<td>Livelihoods analysis identifies different groups, including poor and marginalised households and solicits their views directly. Views of women solicited and gender sensitive investments identified. Checklist for screening investments gives higher rank to those investments that impact upon poor households</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No explicit poverty focus as emphasis is on community priorities</td>
<td>Livelihoods analysis promotes better understanding of poverty and project profile incorporates question on linkages between investment and poverty eradication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No effort to identify assets or opportunities for investments</td>
<td>SWOT analysis of Livelihoods looks at people’s assets as investable assets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No efforts to mainstream environmental issues</td>
<td>Checklist for screening investments that encourages thinking about environmental impacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No analysis of community strengths or weaknesses</td>
<td>SWOT analysis part and parcel of planning process and use of people’s assets as strengths as basis of the planning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiplicity of LLG/Council planning guides/manuals</td>
<td>HPPG as a harmonized framework for planning at lower local council level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No effort to link the spatial and economic dimensions of development.</td>
<td>Efforts in place to link development planning with physical planning.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.4 Incorporation of learning from other partner countries, Bolivia/India

The lessons from India and Bolivia as summarised below have provided useful inputs for improvement of the local Ugandan context.

The entry point for the planning process in India is the village, at which priorities are identified for submission to the higher level and finally to the district level. The planning process enjoys technical support from the sub-county level that also implements the local government projects and programs. The traditional caste system where society is stratified according to different income levels is recognised. The population is looked at as a “resource” and not as “a problem”. The role of traditional leaders is highly valued and integrated in the local government development system by having reserved seats on the council. There are programs that are strong in enhancement of women participation in local governance at all levels despite the strong cultural norms. There are rudimentary systems of providing incentives to encourage community participatory planning and implementation. The role of the “Vigilance Committees” as a social watchdog body against excesses of local government councillors in Bolivia was well received. Of particular significance was the role of the Vigilance Committees in ensuring that plans are linked to budgets, and that final budget allocations truly represent bottom-up planning.
In Uganda, the entry point for the CBP process is the Parish. The parish chiefs invite at least ten representatives from each village to attend the parish planning meeting. The representatives of various interest groups include the village council and village executive, influential people such as opinion leaders, religious leaders and retired civil servants. The planning process starts with livelihood and SWOT analysis of the different livelihood groups that are represented in the village, which serves to take care of various income level groups. They identify a shared vision for the livelihood group, a goal, strategy, and investments that can have impact on the vulnerable poor.

The sub county technical staff have been trained as facilitators and they support the planning process at the village and parish levels for incorporation into sub-county development plan. In fact integration of lower local council plans into the sub-county plans is a legal obligation.

Women’s involvement in the planning processes was widely recognized although no specific mechanisms were in place to enhance participation. This left out some livelihood groups such as the prostitutes, drunkards and other livelihood groups that may have been considered to be social outcasts in the community. Bushenyi district officials at sub-county and parish levels have improvised a rudimentary incentive mechanism (akin to that in India and Bolivia), by providing meals during planning meetings. This yielded retention levels of up to 75% of the invited community members. In contrast, sub-counties and parishes that did not provide motivation experienced drop-off rates of up to 50% on the second day of the planning meeting.

Another important learning from the Indian and Bolivian experiences was the need to improve documentation at parish level through involvement of private service providers. For the first time in Uganda, parishes developed three-year rolling plans complete with budget estimates and project proposals. Useful technical input in project costing and documentation of rolling plans was provided by NGOs/CBOs.

There has been renewed emphasis on the linkage between policies, plans and spending proposals. At district level, the Local Government Budget Framework Paper at the moment constitutes an important instrument for delivering this linkage. In addition, it is envisioned that the Fiscal Decentralisation Strategy (FDS) reforms will further strengthen these linkages. Through the FDS, Government is intent on moving away from control of inputs, towards agreement of common policies and objectives, and provision of autonomy to LGs to achieve this.
6 RESULTS OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CBP/HPPG

6.1 What actually happened

6.1.1. CBP piloted in 170 parishes in Bushenyi District

The CBP methodology was introduced in all the 170 parishes of Bushenyi district\textsuperscript{10} between March and April 2002 after five days of training or orientation for ninety-two (92) district and sub-county-based facilitators on using the methodology. The level to which they applied the principles of the CBP however varied from parish to parish in the first year. Two parishes that compiled background information and held parish planning meetings used the existing information from previous participatory programs, namely the CBMIS which encouraged keeping of village record books and parish registers and the Parish/Sub-county Environment Action Plans (PEAP/SCEAP) which used some PRA tools like those in the CBP, for writing the objective of the plan and parish profile; and used the vision approach for developing the strategy and action plans. Currently all parishes have fully adopted the CBP approaches incorporated in the HPPG.

During the financial year 2002/2003, the district and parishes were able to start the planning on time. The tools used helped the parishes to identify priority issues affecting the identified different livelihood groups and these groups analysed or identified opportunities and strengths, which helped in formulation of vision, goals, and strategy and project profiles.

6.1.2 Revised manual

A Manual for Parish Development Planning was adopted for Bushenyi district to pilot a field methodology for developing parish development plans. A participatory and innovative process was used to develop the manual to provide close guidance for intensive planning at parish level. It helped the lower level councils to understand the "what" and "why" of CBP and to ensure consistency in the planning process by giving an outline or contents of a plan and what tools/techniques could be used for getting a specific/required type of information. It has a schedule showing how community-based planning links to local government planning processes and detailed facilitation notes. It is constantly being revised to incorporate changes and recommendations learnt from sharing experiences with other partners. The current version in use is the fifth draft.

It was proposed that two Manuals should come out of the CBP exercise: a Facilitators manual that incorporates some of the recommendations for its improvement (from previous workshops held in June, July 2002, other planning experiences and the Bushenyi CBP evaluation) and a Users manual that should be short, simple with a glossary of CBP terms in local languages. By September 2002, the Bushenyi Manual was edited and reduced to a less bulky and simpler version to use with the financial support of the CBP processes. A generic training manual was also produced in January of 2003 with input from a district staff member from Bushenyi district local government. The manual for parish development planning had a great input into the national harmonised participatory planning guide which is in use nationally.

\textsuperscript{10} Source. Report of the DCAO in the consultative meeting of 22\textsuperscript{nd} August 2002 between the Consultant and district officials to get an update and overview of CBP process in the district.
6.1.3  Who did the facilitation and the roles they played

A Core Team of trainers was established at district level to give technical support to the CBP methodology. This comprised the Deputy CAO, District Population Officer, District Probation and Social Welfare Officer, the District Economist, Assistant Chief Administrative Officers, (ACAOs) District Fisheries Officer, Project Officers ILM and District PEAP Coordinator. They were trained by among others, CARE Kasese, ILM and COBS staffs. They were involved in the revision and drafting of the Bushenyi Local Government Manual for parish planning draft number 5. The district-based facilitators in turn trained three sub-county extension staff per sub-county? as facilitators to help the planning process. The types of technical staff at sub-county level included sub-county chiefs, veterinary officers, assistant community development officers, agricultural officers and assistants, fisheries officers and health assistants.

The sub-county-based facilitators were involved in different roles during the parish planning meetings. The facilitators and parish executives conducted the pre-planning meeting, parish chiefs compiled the background information for the parish profiles, and the parish secretariat was responsible for documenting the draft plan. The facilitators facilitated the activities of livelihood analysis, parish SWOT and vision exercise.

CBOs, retired civil servants and NGOs staff that attended the planning meetings helped as co-facilitators by translating terminologies into local language during the meetings or giving support in areas of the planning cycle where they had expertise and knowledge like budgeting and costing the investment profiles.

6.1.4  What financial contributions were made – how cost effective was it

Bushenyi district local government and other external funders (CARE projects such as ILM and COBS) contributed USh16 million towards the training of 98 officers as the core team or district and sub-county based facilitators. This initial training was a very expensive venture that the district would not have afforded if there were no external funding. Table 6.1 summarises the funds involved. The sub-county level facilitators that facilitated the planning process at parish level required a substantial amount of financial support, with expenditures ranging between Ush 1,800,000= to 2,500,000= per sub-county (US$950–1,300), which was spent on allowances, training material, fuel and meals for the facilitators and the community. These funds came from the local revenue and the Capacity Building Grant. As the planning capacity at parish grows, the district and sub-county needs to develop a strategy to finance the planning process, the continual replacement of trained staff that will turn over due to illness, transfers, change of political positions etc. and balance between the cost of the training and maintaining the facilitators and the cost of the methodology.

Parishes spent between USh500,000= to 800,000= (US$270–432) in cash and kind for the entire planning process depending on the number of villages, including the cost of producing many copies of the draft plans. The cash contributions were from the local revenue collected that is shared at the sub-county level between parishes and villages and from the central transfer funds, under the conditional grants like the capacity building grant of the local government development program. The community contributed their time, venue for meetings, ideas or information, labour for cooking, matooke and others that was mainly in kind, which is estimated to range between USh 215,000 and 550,000= (US$110–300). This is an enormous contribution that is often underestimated, or not valued and taken for granted. It is a challenge for future planning meetings as the continuity and extent of community contribution will be determined by the outcome or results of completed projects, value for their efforts, transparency of leaders and accountability to community by all concerned. During the planning meeting, attendance dropped from 80%+ on day one to 50% (the lowest) on the second day which is an indication that participation and motivation of
community may fluctuate with time. This also reflects the fact that Uganda used the CBP process in a way that the whole community group was together the whole time, unlike the way it was used in South Africa, where meetings with individual groups were no longer than 2 hours, and so meals did not need to be provided for the whole community.

There may be increased need for additional parish finances in form of the conditional grants to complement or top up the community contribution. Government (MFPED) and Donors needs to streamline policies on co-funding or community contribution so that community have confidence in making their contributions and do not doubt government and implementing agencies for issuing conflicting policies on different donor programs. \(^{11}\)

### Table 6.1  Financial contributions at different levels during the CBP process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Funds provided for the planning process</th>
<th>Source of funds</th>
<th>Purpose of the fund</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td>Ush 16,000,000 (USD 8,600)</td>
<td>Bushenyi DLG CARE- COBS, ILM</td>
<td>Training of 98 officers as core TOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-county</td>
<td>Ush 1,800,000 - 2,500,000 (USD 972 – 1,350)</td>
<td>Local Revenue and Capacity Building Grant</td>
<td>SC based facilitators’ allowances, fuel, meals, training materials, producing SC 3 year rolling plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish</td>
<td>Ush 235,000- 250,000 (USD 130 – 135)</td>
<td>Local revenue shared from sub-county collection</td>
<td>Allowance, fuel, cost of producing parish plans, meals for community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Ush 215,000- 550,000 (USD 115 – 300) [Quantified/ estimated value]</td>
<td>Contributions in-kind like time for meeting, the value of meals eaten in two planning meetings, the furniture and seats used, value of meeting hall, labour for cooking.</td>
<td>Community contribution towards the planning meetings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6.1.5 Number of parishes with plans

All the 170 parishes and 29 lower local governments have three year development plans. The lower local governments plan incorporate plans from the parishes while the District plan incorporates those from lower local government.

---

\(^{11}\) SFG phase one for classroom construction was 100% donor funded, phase two had community contribution; DANIDA funds have 50% community finance, NAADS has 5% sub county and district, 2% community contribution, EDF has 25% contribution
6.1.6 Evidence that the CBP principles were followed

One of the principles of CBP is the involvement of the community in the planning process. The invitation of ten representatives of disadvantaged and marginalised people from each village during the parish planning meetings was a good step. But to what extent the poor or marginalised were involved by the representation is still not very certain but the identification of pro-poor investments is an indication that the marginalised or disadvantaged group were involved. The attendance of the planning meetings by approximately 80% of the invited people on day one and about 50% on day two shows the interest, but at the same time the sharp decline in attendance of meetings if they are prolonged for more than one day. The sub-county and parish have a challenge to maintain the motivation of community to attend planning meetings.

Table 6.1.6 The table below outlines evidence that CBP principles were followed;

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CBP Principles</th>
<th>Evidence on how well they were followed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Poor and disadvantaged people are included in planning;</td>
<td>Livelihood groupings for women, youth, disabled, unemployed were formed and each group made its own SWOT which is part of the overall plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Systems are realistic and practical</td>
<td>The planning systems related to what people actually do and what affect them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Planning process implementable using available resources.</td>
<td>Emphasis put on use of local materials to implement plans and resources within the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Planning process linked to existing processes;</td>
<td>Planning process fitted into the local government budget cycle. The plans are linked to budgets through the budget framework paper.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Planning must be linked to a legitimate structure;</td>
<td>Planning was done through existing technical and political councils. (i.e. the TPC and local councils that approve budgets).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Planning part of longer process;</td>
<td>Planning is linked to the medium term expenditure framework; rolling of the plan is done at the end of the financial year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Planning is people focused and empowering;</td>
<td>Allows people to give their views on development. Defines roles of the various stakeholders. Enables people to identify things that can be done using their own resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Planning from vision and strengths/ opportunities;</td>
<td>Planning centred on strengths and opportunities (what people could do rather than asking for problems)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Plans holistic and cover all sectors;</td>
<td>Despite the sectoral approach to planning, development plans are integrated, covering all sectors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Planning promotes mutual accountability between community and officials;</td>
<td>Communities demand for outputs of what they proposed in the previous plan before embarking on new plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. There is commitment by councillors and officials</td>
<td>Councillors get committed for the plans contribute to the implementation of their election manifestos. Technical officers are evaluated on the basis of attainment of respective sector goals.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The tools used such as livelihood analysis, parish SWOT and vision exercise were very participatory and actively involved most of the people who attended the planning meetings. The methodology used encouraged the community to address the issues affecting them from the vision approach and not the problem approach.
6.2 Impact of what happened

6.2.1 Evidence of improved plans (including better intersectoral planning)

For the last three years Parishes have had three year rolling plans. The different issues identified in the parish and sub-county plans cut across all sectors. The contents of the parish and sub-county plans are outlined by sector and the project or investment profiles are presented with sector goals, major problems/ constraints, causes, priorities, strategies and objectives. There is an improvement in the technical description and background information in the project profile, which is evidence of more involvement of the target group. The types of activities planned are not only construction of physical projects like classrooms but also “software” like Functional Adult Literacy (FAL), training in skills for improved agriculture, income generation, environmental management and awareness on disease prevention and management (e.g. malaria, HIV/AIDS). The planning guide has a checklist for screening investments and gives a higher rank to those investments that has an impact on poor households and encourages thinking about the environmental impact of investments so that specific mitigating measures were incorporated in the plans.

6.2.2 Evidence of improved coverage of the poor/vulnerable/gender/HIV

Identification and Involvement of different livelihood groups in SWOT analysis solicited the views of the represented interest groups and promoted a better understanding of the numerous faces of poverty that needed to be addressed in the planning process.

Environment concerns are incorporated into the Sub-county and district development plans. For every project to be implemented there must be an environment impact assessment and plan to mitigate the negative impact. There are indicators of gender mainstreaming during planning. The manual introduces cross cutting issues during livelihood analysis like gender, environment and HIV/AIDS. These factors are part of the indicators used by the national team while assessing the quality of plans under the LGDP programme. The planned interventions are financed by local revenue and grants from the Central Government like Local Government Development Fund (LGDP) and Poverty Action Funds (PAF).

6.2.3 Evidence of improved services

There is evidence of improved service delivery in Bushenyi District as a result of Community-based Planning. The number of Health units has increased from 61 in 2002 to 71 in 2004. This has eased accessibility to health services for;

- Immunisation coverage is 96%;
- Obstetric coverage from 7% to 11%, (though still low);
- Antenatal care from 70% to 76%;
- Safe water coverage from 70% to 70.3%.
6.2.4 Evidence of participation/empowerment/ownership by community and LG

Some of the community projects that were identified in the planning process but do not need external funding are already being implemented at parish and village levels, this is true for community roads and other “bulungi bwansi” projects where the identified projects 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.

The community-based organizations recognised the importance of the CBP tools such as livelihood groups and their SWOT analysis, vision, strategy development, goals and objectives and they are using the tools to assess themselves ant to re-organise into strong CBOs that can provide services to the community. This is captured by one community member in Kigarama parish in box 6.2.

The CBOs and local NGOs realised through the SWOT analysis that they are weak and some of the tools or techniques used during the planning process could help them to re-organise themselves, to be registered with the community development officers, office of the sub-county chief or CAO in-order to be recognized as service providers. Many CBOs are writing their constitution, vision, goals, strategies and activities for seeking

An empowered community should show their ability to demand for good governance, transparency and accountability. They should be able to contribute willingly and freely to the maintenance of the public investments like schools, health centres and water sources by paying the user or utility fees and monitoring its expenditure. The parish and sub-county plans indicate the allocated budgets for operation and maintenance purpose. Some communities have contributed local materials like bricks, stones, sand and aggregates at sites for construction of physical infrastructure like springs for protection and classroom blocks. The parish development committee in Kichwamba said, “the community living on the high altitudes are very anxious to get clean safe water near their residence, they have even collected the stones and sand at the spring protection sites. The community that collect drinking water from the gravity flow scheme taps contribute five hundred shillings (500=) per household for user fees. They pay willingly, otherwise they will fetch water from down the hills”

6.2.5 Community action as a result of the plans

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.

6.2.6 Impact on local government as a result (including what capacity built)

A total of 98 facilitators were trained as district based facilitators with 5 ACAOs who are in charge of counties. Before CBP, the LCI chairpersons were not recognised in the planning process yet they were always supposed to support village plans. Now they are more involved in parish planning, instead of leaving it to the LCII Executive Committees they are important
stakeholders in the planning process. The parish chiefs have got new skills of situational analysis, writing plans (even though) in very simple language. “This is the first time we have produced a three year development plan for the parish. It is even bound and many visitors who come to visit us request for a copy;” said the PDC Kyamuhunga.

The local governments have allocated budgets for the projects and other interventions that are identified through the planning process and the community are making contributions for projects that will be implemented.

6.2.7 Evidence of improved stakeholder involvement including civil society/government linkages

Some of the recognised and active CBOs that are operating within the parishes attended the planning meetings and participated in the planning meeting especially in the livelihood analysis groups. CBOs are involved in the plan documentation. In another sub-county, UNFA, which is a local NGO, helped in the budgeting or costing of projects because their staff had the knowledge, skills and experience in that particular field.

Under the liberalisation and public private sector partnership, NGOs and CBOs are involved in implementation of plans. For example under the National Agricultural Advisory Services Project, NGOs and CBOs (private sector) are the implementing agencies for projects identified by the people. In this example, the NGO is responsible for the management, monitoring and accountability of the project funds and not the sub-county or parish. Other cross cutting issues like AIDS/HIV and gender may involve other partners that may have the funds and logistical support at district and sub-county level for the implementation.

The parish plans are incorporated into the sub-county plans for priority budget allocations for the district and sub-county to implement or fund. The smaller budget projects are then referred back to the parishes for implementation. The integration of plans into higher local government plan and budget synchronises the plans, avoids duplication and waste of resources.

6.2.8 Impact on national systems (policies, systems, training, support)

It is recommended that the planning guidelines for local government and CBP should be harmonised to be in line with the Budget Act 2001. During the first year of CBP, selected tools and techniques were used for the planning process, but the compilation stage and the plan format for LGDP had to be used for making the project profiles otherwise the sub counties would not get funding from LGDP. The confusion of using different planning guides was visible in the parish plans that were seen by the evaluation team which had a mixture of the two formats. The Local Government/MFPED/Districts/LGDP. The Harmonised participatory planning guide has attempted to address this problem.

In order to meet the cost of CBP methodology a separate budget for training and support to the planning process was allocated and many extension workers together with the new political leaders were trained. The training focused on practical field work which involved the national super trainers for the Harmonized participatory planning guide. This training enabled the facilitators to practice the usage of the various tools to be used in the planning process.
7 UPSCALING CBP/HPPG IN UGANDA

7.1 Background to up-scaling

Until March 2002, the Investment Planning Guide was used nationwide as a tool for guiding Lower Local Government/Council planning processes. However, arising from studies and reviews commissioned, a number of gaps were identified. Among the gaps were insufficient linkage between vision- and needs-based planning approaches; insufficient attention to the specific needs of the marginalised groups; inadequate guidelines on the mainstreaming of cross-cutting issues.

In May 2001, MoLG in association with CARE and PMA commissioned a study on examples of participatory planning and budgeting in the country, which culminated in a national workshop as the first stages of the CBP Project. As well as informing the development in Bushenyi, the lessons learnt were used immediately in national thinking to develop the Harmonized Participatory Planning Guide. The CBP reference group was widened to address the HPPG. The reference group was particularly instrumental in providing a strategic oversight of the pre-testing, review and refinement of the HPPG, and the development of the standardized training materials for the decentralised development planning. It was also instrumental in the design of the HPPG roll out strategy.

The HPPG was tested through the FY 2002/03 planning cycle, revised and is being used nationwide. The HPPG review process was immensely informed with key principles of the CBP methodology. The HPPG has therefore constituted a vehicle for up scaling of the CBP in Uganda. The HPPG was rolled out to all districts in the country. A Review was commissioned by Mentor Consult to monitor and evaluate the rollout. They reviewed a sample of 14 districts, and reported back in May 2003, with Khanya making an input to this review.

As the HPPG process unfolded, it attracted more attention and interest of various agencies. The latest to buy in were the Population Secretariat which felt that the HPPG constituted an excellent opportunity for highlighting demographic issues at grassroots level. The HPPG also received useful inputs from the National Environment Management Authority (NEMA) and the various gender activists. In fact, NEMA played an active role during the Bushenyi leg of the training of national trainers, and made presentations on environmental issues.

In recent times, the CBP principles were incorporated in the design of the implementation arrangements for the Northern Uganda Social Action Fund (NUSAF), a successor programme to the erstwhile Northern Uganda Reconstruction Programme (NURP). The NUSAF programme had come under attack because of failure to involve communities and their local leaderships in some key aspects of programme formulation and implementation. The HPPG has also recently informed the development of gender planning guidelines for LLGs and Villages.

7.2 The CBP Steering Committee

The HPPG development, review and refinement has been a highly collaborative exercise, drawing participation from OPM, MoFPED, MoGL&SD, NEMA, DFID, UNCDF, CARE-Uganda, ILM, World Bank, DANIDA, EU/MPP, Irish Aid, and MoLG, amongst others. The forum for this collaborative approach was the CBP/HPPG reference group which provided an invaluable strategic oversight of the HPPG processes.
7.3 Training of Super Trainers

In spite of significant interventions by the Ministry to support planning processes within Local Governments, the extent of skills transfer and the attendant adoption of innovative planning processes remains a challenge. Part of the blame for this has been laid on the delivery mechanisms for capacity building interventions, which have almost invariably constituted of large-scale district or even regional workshops. Over a space of one or two days, trainers have provided a rapid overview of the planning guides and introduced some tools of analysis to participants. This contrasts with the training process in South Africa, which involves 5 days classroom and 5 days actually doing the planning, so that trainers have real experience of the method when the training is completed.

From the onset therefore, it had been decided by the HPPG reference group that the national ToT for the HPPG should demonstrate a departure from the above through provision of more detailed, focused and quality training over a longer period and using more participatory approaches. The build up towards the design of an effective ToT package included participation by 2 Ugandan trainers in the South African ToT in September/October 2003.

Subsequently, a national ToT was organized in March /April 2004 with 25 participants. The overall objective of the workshop was to train a pool of national trainers of local government development planning processes. The training was organized in two phases, with the classroom training conducted at Hotel Triangle Annex in Jinja and the practical in Bushenyi district. The training was facilitated by a team of two national and one international consultant from Khanya-mrc.

7.4 Funding the National Roll Out

As mentioned elsewhere, the HPPG has constituted a rallying point for significant donor support to community-based planning processes. The dissemination of the initial generation of the HPPG was funded under the Local Government Development Programme (LGDP), Phase I. The LGDP II, will support the printing and dissemination of the revised HPPG. The District Development Project, Phase II has supported the dissemination the revised HPPG in six project districts mentioned earlier. The Capacity Building for Decentralised Community-based Participatory Planning and Budgeting funded under the World Bank Trust Fund also seeks to support the application of the HPPG in 20 selected districts.

7.5 Progress in implementing the HPPG in districts

The consultant’s report of May 2003 on the review and refinement of the initial draft of the HPPG indicated that out of 14 LLGs sampled, only 2 actually tested the Guide to some greater degree, while the others either selectively used it or did not use it at all. The disappointing uptake of the initial draft of the HPPG was blamed on the inadequacy of the training; lack of any effective follow up mechanism; and the user unfriendliness of the guides, amongst others. To address the above, the review team recommended shortening of the Guides, with some details left to the training materials; focusing on parishes/wards rather than villages; and splitting of the Guide into a simplified version for the Parish/Ward and another for LLGs.

In order to further improve on the user friendliness of the Guides, the Ministry of Local Government has gone on to illustrate the refined guides.

The results have been dramatic. The Parishes are now formulating more visionary plans. The HPPG has provided a framework upon which districts are now delivering more focused
training interventions to LLGs and Councils. Mainstreaming of cross-cutting issues into the planning process is now much more appreciated and practiced.

The challenge is to institutionalise incentive mechanisms and mobilise resources for funding of the planning process and the resultant community action plans.

7.6 Impact on national systems (policies, systems, training, support)

The national HPPG has incorporated many of the methodological elements of the CBP. The HPPG has been tested, reviewed and refined over the time.

During the first year of CBP, selected tools and techniques were used for the planning process, but the compilation stage and the plan format for LGDP had to be used for making the project profiles otherwise the sub counties would not get funding from LGDP. The refined HPPG for Parishes/Wards now contains plan formats that are recognized by the LGDP.

In order to meet the higher costs inherent in the CBP methodology, there is need for a specific budget for training and support to be allocated at parish and sub-county level. At the moment, the local governments are being supported with capacity building grants from the central government. It is expected that training of extension staff and political leaders at the sub-county and parish level will be an on-going concern. The training process will focus on practical fieldwork so that the facilitators are capable of handling required/ relevant tools for any situation that they will meet in the planning process.

The HPPG is also being linked with the gender planning guidelines, and the first draft of an inventory of gender planning guidelines, gender planning guidelines for Lower Local Governments and Parishes were finalized in December 2003.

The spatial dimension of planning and development is an aspect that has historically tended to receive a less than deserved emphasis in Uganda. As part of a package of measures to redress this state of affairs, the process to amend the Town and Country Planning Act has commenced. In the meantime, efforts are underway to incorporate the CBP principles into the urban planning guidelines.

One of the basic aims of the CBP is to strengthen the linkage between the community-based plans and higher level planning systems. Through the procedures laid down in the Fiscal Decentralisation Strategy, parish and sub-county priorities are set to find their way to the national planning and budgeting processes through the Local Government Budget Framework Papers. The development components of the LGBFPs are expected to reflect not only activities identified during the rolling of the district development plans, but also the lower local government plans.

The HPPG now constitutes a rallying point for significant donor support to the hitherto marginalised development planning function at lower local government and parish levels. Already, the World Bank, DFID, UNCDF are funding a range of activities aimed at entrenching the application of the HPPG in the local governments.

PART D: LEARNINGS AND WAY FORWARD

8 LEARNINGS

8.1 Community participation and ownership
8.1.1 Overall and of disadvantaged groups

The advent of Community-based Planning in April 2002 served to place the communities into the core of the local development planning processes, unlike in the past when this responsibility was a preserve of the parish chiefs and local council executives. Ten members of each village are now invited by the parish chief to represent their villages at the parish planning fora, with the disadvantaged and other interest groups specifically encouraged to participate.

As part of further efforts to deepen community mobilization and empowerment to initiate, plan and manage development initiatives, Government recently developed a community mobilization strategy, with the objective of:

- Enabling communities to understand government development programmes and policies;
- Preparing communities to embrace and implement such programmes, and;
- Empowering communities to manage and sustain these programmes.

The strategy aims to equip communities with the right attitudes, values and aspirations, and enable them use available opportunities and resources to get themselves out of poverty.

In addition, under the District Development Project, Phase II, one of the activities to be implemented is the documentation and dissemination of incentive mechanisms for enhanced community participation in development planning and budgeting.

8.1.2 Strengths

The strength of the CBP approach lies in the broad participation of the disadvantaged and other interest groups in the parish planning process. The participation of different livelihood groups in the SWOT analysis leads to formulation of realistic visions and goals, and focused identification of priority issues to be addressed using the available opportunities and resources. Moreover, popular perceptions of ownership of the development plans encourages participation in implementation, and provides a foundation for sustainability of interventions.

8.1.3 Weaknesses

Sustaining community participation in planning processes is fraught with challenges. For a start, most local councils are faced with the challenge of providing coherent financing mechanisms for planning processes. As mentioned elsewhere in this report, provision of some sort of incentive mechanism had the significant impact of sustaining popular participation in the planning process in Bushenyi district.

Attainment of equal participation of women in the planning process remains a challenge. In some districts like Yumbe in northern Uganda, residual cultural practices still inhibit women’s participation in planning fora. Nevertheless, a range of guidelines on gender mainstreaming into planning processes have been developed and issued to local governments.

8.1.4 Lessons learned from others

If community participation and interest are to be sustained, the planning process must be budgeted for, with provision for issues such as meals during the planning meetings, facilitation materials and other logistical support like fuel and allowance to the facilitators taken care of. For sustainability considerations, it is advisable that these be funded from local revenue sources. On the other hand, the hours of the planning meetings could be adjusted to
after lunch so that the community does not expect to be served with meals nor get any incentive for attending the planning meeting, or meetings arranged with different groups so people do not have to stay all day, as happens in South Africa.

In the recognition of the critical need for enhanced community participation in the planning processes, the District Development Project, Phase II is supporting the documentation and dissemination of an incentive regime in the six programme districts. The lessons generated by this project will be upscaled to the national level.

8.1.5  Recommendations

- Community involvement should not only stop at the planning meeting, but the upper level councils must give feedback to the lower level councils about the decisions that have been made on the plans that the community have produced. Feedback in the form of circulars, radio or any other mass media will update them of what has been done so far and that will keep their interest and motivation to be involved in all stages of the planning cycle including implementation, monitoring and ownership. The district, sub-county and parish must think, plan and budget for how to keep the community in an enabling environment that can sustain their motivation for the planning process;

- The amount of community contribution in terms of their commitment, time, ideas and other inputs in kind and cash must be valued and appreciated, (not overlooked or underestimated);

- The district, sub-county and parish leaders must integrate the programs and activities of local NGOs and potential CBOs so that the community can assume ownership of the planning and implementation process;

- If the community knows that resources are flowing from the upper local councils to the lower council plans, it is a powerful incentive for them. The sub-county and parish chiefs should give feedback on what is agreed on the investment profiles, plan and budget. The integrated nature of CBP demands for an integrated multidisciplinary/sectoral approach or involvement;

- There is need to strengthen the accountability mechanisms beyond community participation in planning processes at local levels. The link between planning and the allocation of poverty-focused resource investments appears to still be weak. This could potentially be addressed through greater participation by civil society organisations in the budgeting and allocation process, which appears to be a great strength in Bolivia (through the medium of the Vigilance Committees);

- There is a need to strengthen exploration of the potential for multiple resource leveraging for district wide planning, formulate criteria for full integration of viable civil society into planning process, integrate CBO, NGO plans into district and sub-county plans and implementation;

- Implementation of the prioritised action plans serves as an incentive for community participation in subsequent planning cycles. The perception that community action plans are unlikely to be implemented could dampen impetus to participate in subsequent planning cycles. In fact the South African experience in which R 50,000 is given to the wards to kick-start the implementation of the ward plans provides useful lessons for Uganda.
8.2 Planning process and methodology

8.2.1 CBP at Parish level

The entry point for the CBP process in Uganda is the parish level. During the first year of the CBP process, planning was done with haste because it started late and had to catch up with the local government planning process that had reached the stage of integrating parish plans into sub-county plans for allocation and appraisal by the technical planning committee and sectoral committee. The tools that were used for planning were the most participatory and time saving methods i.e. livelihood analysis, parish SWOT and vision exercise which helped to develop the parish goals, strategy and objectives. During the subsequent rounds of CBP, the process has become more harmonised. The table below presents the Parish level planning steps as outlined in the HPPG for Parishes/Wards;

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Steps</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Main Issues</th>
<th>Timing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preparatory Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receive planning guidelines</td>
<td>Parish chief/Town Agent, PDCs, STPC</td>
<td>Planning Guidelines, Indicative Planning Figures (IPFs), Information on other</td>
<td>August (3rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and training of facilitators</td>
<td></td>
<td>grants</td>
<td>Week)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by LLG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-planning meeting</td>
<td>Parish/Ward Executive, village/ cell</td>
<td>Planning approach and tasks, Schedule for village/parish planning,</td>
<td>August (4th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chairpersons and representatives,</td>
<td>Identification of service providers, livelihood groups</td>
<td>week)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>opinion and other local leaders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data collection</td>
<td>Community, LC Executive &amp; NGO</td>
<td>Identification of village priorities</td>
<td>September (1st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>representatives</td>
<td></td>
<td>week)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Parish/ward council, PDC &amp; wider</td>
<td>Objectives and process</td>
<td>September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>community</td>
<td></td>
<td>(2nd Week)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 1 Situation analysis</td>
<td>Parish/ward council, PDC &amp; wider</td>
<td>Objectives and process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Livelihood groups</td>
<td>Objectives and process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mapping (with all livelihood groups)</td>
<td>Spatial picture of natural and physical resources, services, institutions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Timeline (with all livelihood groups)</td>
<td>Development and poverty trends</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Service Provider Analysis</td>
<td>Availability and access to services and service providers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gender Analysis</td>
<td>Time use by both men and women, Participation of women and men in development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Access and control over resources for men and women</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All Livelihood Groups</td>
<td>Summary of situation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Steps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Main Issues</th>
<th>Timing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parish/ward meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Prioritisation, visioning, &amp; selecting groups for next day</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Day 2 Planning</strong></td>
<td>Specific groups</td>
<td>• Work on each of the priority outcomes, develop activities/projects &amp; budgets</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Day 3 Putting the plan together</strong></td>
<td>Parish/ward meeting</td>
<td>• Review and agree on proposals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PDC meeting</td>
<td>• Detailed costing and action planning for parish</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Documentation</strong></td>
<td>PDC Meeting &amp; LLG STPC</td>
<td>• Documentation</td>
<td>Sept(3rd – 4th week)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parish/ward Council</td>
<td>• Approval and submission of plan to LLG</td>
<td>October (1st week)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Feedback</strong></td>
<td>Village/cell meetings</td>
<td>• Feedback to villages on plan</td>
<td>October (2nd week)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 8.2.2 Strengths

The parishes that had experience in participatory tools and processes in previous programs like environment action plans under COBS found it easy to compile their background information and in the writing up of draft plans. The involvement of different livelihood groups recognises the holistic approach to needs at parish level rather than a sectoral approach in the normal planning process.

The use of simple visual aids during the planning process is appropriate for the community many of whom may not easily read typed notes on pieces of paper. All the participants easily understand the visual aids and storage of the information is easy. A multi-sectoral or multi-disciplinary group of facilitators from the community or sub-county were used in the planning process and they had good facilitation skills that was appreciated by all the community.

Parishes that had CBMIS used the village record books and parish registers for developing the parish profiles and situation analysis.

There is an existence of an institutional framework for planning at parish level, including the parish council, parish chief and the parish development committees.

### 8.2.3 Weaknesses

The manual is strong and provides a range of tools and methods in good detail. Some areas where it could be strengthened include:

- bringing out clearly the rights and roles of community, CBOs, NGOs and other stakeholders in participatory planning;
- mentioning the to and fro feedback mechanisms between parish and sub county;
- emphasising the monitoring and mentoring roles of upper local councils on the lower local councils;
- showing revenue flows from central government and local revenue sources and how the release of funds relates to and affects the planning/budgeting process;
- Translated key planning words into local language for people to understand.
The community looked at CBP as a new methodology or project that had nothing to do with similar approaches like the Environment Action Plan at sub-county and parish level and CBMIS introduced by UNICEF that used similar PRA tools for situational analysis. The community were given short notice to attend the planning meetings.

Beyond the initial engagement in the development of the plans, the technical staff at the sub-county and district did not support on-going processes at parish level, such as through some form of feedback, monitoring of implementation or longer term mentoring, due to heavy workload and limited resources. Stakeholders at higher levels like the private sector, national NGOs and agencies were not involved in the planning process.

The prioritisation or ranking technique used (open voting by show of hands) for selecting the projects to be implemented left out some of the issues that were raised by the vulnerable groups- a democratic system takes the vote of the majority. The manual actually suggests a different voting system using small pieces of paper.

8.2.4 Lessons learned from others

It was realised that the expertise for facilitation drawn from the community worked well in other countries as well as in Bushenyi. The extension staff based at the sub-county level and parish chiefs were trained as facilitators to support the parish level planning process in a limited time with minimal logistical support. Most of the projects that are identified at the community level are mainly infrastructure and are aimed at addressing immediate/felt needs (problem/needs based) as opposed to being aspiration/vision based – looking at long term issues.

Prioritisation of projects at parish level tends to filter out village priorities because people at the parish level tend to look at bigger projects, wider in scope than individual villages.

There is a dilemma of how to maintain the spirit and motivation of volunteers over a long period of time. This is further compounded by the fact that participatory planning takes a long time. It is therefore important that in the design of CBP there should be an inbuilt mechanism of motivating and maintaining the morale of the facilitators and the community.

8.2.5 Recommendations

CBP requires systematic planning and takes time. Because most of the local governments start the planning process late, they end up omitting some basic steps in the planning cycle. This makes it more difficult to use CBP/HPPG and affects the quality of the output. Local governments and NGOs should harmonise their planning process and cycles, which currently start at different periods of the year. This needs a policy guideline probably at a higher level (MOLG,MFPED,NPA). The NPA will be key in monitoring and mentoring the feedback to the districts that should in turn provide feedback to the lower levels of local government.

The planning process should take three days in all, with one spent for planning at the village level\(^\text{12}\). The parish and sub-county should budget for the human and other resources that are required to achieve a meaningful good quality planning and implementation process. The 25% village and 5% parish share of the local revenue could be allocated to support the planning process even if this is very little money.

\(^{12}\) Note in South Africa, Zimbabwe and Ghana they took 5 days for this
The entry point for grassroots planning in Uganda is the parish level. There is need for effective mechanisms to ensure that the development priorities of the respective villages are adequately taken care of in the parish development plans.

8.3 Linkage with local government level

The Harmonised Participatory Planning Guide (HPPG) has been used to guide the planning processes in Uganda. The earlier version of the guide did not sequence planning events and activities effectively and the net effect has been planning activities that ran parallel to each other. The guide has since been revised and activities are properly sequenced to ensure clear articulation of issues. Importantly, this guide makes provision for the community action plans to be developed earlier so as to allow incorporation of priorities into higher level planning and budgeting processes.

8.3.1 Strengths

By using the vision-based approach, some parishes came up with issues that take a long term to address like (environment concerns, functional literacy and improved incomes through viable income generating activities) not necessarily identifying issues that are solved by physical infrastructure like the schools and health centres. The tools used like vision helped to open up the minds of the community to see very far (five years into the future) and therefore they identified issues of the long-term that is normally tackled by the technical and sectoral committee at district level. This has been incorporated into the HPPG. Incorporation of lower local council priorities into sub-county plans is a legal imperative.

8.3.2 Weaknesses

In some cases, different development partners, government agencies and donors still use different planning cycles beginning at different times of the year and may not recognize the LG plans.

In some cases, the planning process begins before the parish indicative planning figures (IPFs) are communicated by the centre to the districts and lower levels. The IPFs are not reliable, and are subject to frequent changes, which adversely affects the budgeting process. As a result the parish proposals are made according to the community priorities but there is no feedback on what the actual approved plan and budget will implement and will not. There is a residual lack of a clear understanding by different players within and outside government on the roles and responsibilities of local councils and the ordinary citizen in good governance during the local government planning process. A lot is said about good governance and the beliefs that decentralisation will result in improved governance because funds and services are delivered closer to the communities, but the community members are not informed about these ideas and the basic assumptions.

8.3.3 Lessons learned from others

Local governments are required to make realistic plans and balanced budgets and to do so it is important for the communities to know the resources they have and the resource constraints they face well in advance. This helps them to be realistic in their plans and to consider carefully the priorities they decide to take up. The process does not raise the expectations of the communities unnecessarily.

Most of the CBP initiatives reviewed revealed the importance of communicating the resource envelope (budget) to the community at the beginning of the planning period to enable the community come up with realistic budgets and avoid raising community expectations.
However some practitioners argued that budget constrained planning limits the exploration of other opportunities and resource mobilisation by the community members.

8.3.4 Recommendations

It is important that the national and local government planning and budget cycles are harmonised and that the LG budget process feeds into and impacts upon the national budget. MFPED and MOLG should ensure that the planning processes for particular sectors (like health, water, education) are mainstreamed into the district development planning process.

There is need to get the commitment of local governments, ministries and donors to give timely and reliable indicative planning figures for the planning process to begin. Otherwise, the parishes will be making wish list planning without a real guide to decide what can be done at their level and what needs external (upper local government) assistance. The local governments must display the available resource allocation to the public so that they know how much is resource is available every quarter.

The MOLG and MFPED should harmonise the planning formats for uniformity and ease of integration of plans and budgets. The sub-county level requires technical and knowledgeable persons to integrate the parish plans and project profiles into the sub-county level. This is more emphasised especially when the number of parish plans and projects to be integrated is high.

With the process of review of the district planning guidelines underway, every effort should be made to accommodate the salient principles of the CBP/HPPG. This should ultimately foster linkages between the lower local government and district planning processes.

8.4 Facilitation and training

In spite of earlier interventions by the Central Government to support planning processes within Local Governments, the extent of skills transfer and the attendant adoption of innovative planning processes remained a challenge. Part of the blame for this was laid on the delivery mechanisms for capacity building interventions, which have almost invariably constituted of large-scale district or even regional workshops. Over a space of one or two days, trainers have provided a rapid overview of the planning guides and introduced some tools of analysis to participants. The CBP methodology heralded a departure from the above in that it provided more detailed, focused and quality training over a longer period and using more participatory approaches. In addition, NGOs who are partners in CBP participated in training the core team of district-based officials from a range of disciplines as facilitators.

8.4.1 Strengths

The facilitators have different professional backgrounds or disciplines and they came from the community, speak the local language and have good communication skills that are essential for PRA. The community appreciated the facilitator's knowledge and skills. Politicians (parish chairmen and village executives) were involved in mobilisation of the community and participated in the planning process. A large number of NGOs/CBOs are present in almost all local governments who are an important resource. Local authorities and communities appreciate the importance of training in any development effort. The existence of significant capacity building resource transfers from the centre can be used by local authorities to fund locally defined capacity building activities. Also in place is a range of manuals and guidelines in lower level development planning.
8.4.2 Weaknesses

The facilitation/planning sessions took the whole day, and the facilitators demanded incentives and logistical support from the local government. The cost of facilitation is high especially at the parish level and yet local authorities in Uganda are grappling with the problem of falling local revenues.

There are alarming levels of capacity gaps in a number of sub-counties. Some sub-counties are still staffed by chiefs and other officials with low educational levels. In addition, staff numbers are inadequate. The impending restructuring of local governments is expected to address some of these problems.

The Sub-county and parishes hardly allocate any budget for the planning process therefore the district based officials did not provide on-going mentoring and monitoring of the planning process at the lower level after the training in CBP was done.

Meaningful integration of NGO/CBO development activities into the mainstream local government development plans is still illusive. In most cases, the relationship between the local authorities and the NGOs/CBOs operating in their areas of jurisdiction is characterized by mutual suspicion.

8.4.3 Lessons learnt

The issue of facilitation is core to the effectiveness of community-based planning and the relevance of the resultant development plans. It is thus necessary that any training programme of this nature imparts knowledge, skills and attitudes needed to facilitate the planning process. It is not possible to implement CBP/HPPG without facilitators being trained.

A facilitation manual for the facilitators is important for consistency in facilitation and for guidance during the planning process. Monitoring and mentoring of the planning process is very crucial at all stages by the respective local government levels. For good quality work plan, the process needs at least 3 days at parish level that includes spending one full day at the village level. The community appreciate and understand the planning process better when visual training aids are used. The local governments must provide adequate logistical support and training materials during the training of facilitators and planning sessions. Effective grassroots planning requires a coherent and functional institutional setting at lower local government and council levels. There is need to synchronize local government and NGO/CBO planning and budgeting processes so as to attain a measure of optimality in the utilization of the limited resources. It is critical that the local leadership, especially politicians are part of the process, as they will be the ones responsible for ensuring follow-up and implementation of the plans.

8.4.4 Recommendations

There is need to ensure that in the coming years more extension staff and political leaders (who have the qualities of a good facilitator) at the sub-county and parish level will be trained in PRA skills to strengthen CBP/HPPG. This should be an on-going exercise in view of the high personnel turnover due to illness, corruption or change in elected positions.

In order to meet the higher cost of the CBP/HPPG methodology, it is recommended that a separate budget for training and support be allocated at parish and sub-county level. The

13 On average, the parishes spent between Uganda shillings 235,000 to 250,000 on facilitator’s fuel, allowance and stationery for training and producing a copy of the parish plan.
local revenue shared at sub-county level between the village 25% and parish 5% are very small but can supplement to meet the cost of facilitation.

Participants and Trainers’ handbooks for development planning in lower local governments have been developed under the Ministry of Local Government's Capacity Building Unit's initiative. Much more however needs to be done to simplify the manuals and make them focused to the CBP and HPPG principles and processes.

8.5 Finances

In the first year of the CBP, the budget for planning and incentives or allowances for the facilitators was largely funded from internal sources. The sub-county level planning process was funded from local revenue, community contribution and mostly by the capacity building grant of the LGDP. This was used for stationery (training materials), motivation of the participants to attend planning meetings, fuel and allowances for the facilitators. The CBP project helped in capacity building, training and the development of the manuals, but had little or no contributions to rolling out the planning process itself.

8.5.1 Strengths

Once the budget is allocated for planning from whichever source, it is assured that the funding will be availed at the appropriate time. Projects that have a co-funding component will attract funds from the LGDP as long as the co-funding is available. Approved plans and budgets attract funding from donors and other development partners as long as they were involved or consulted in the planning process. The community contribution comes out easily if the plans are realistic and the project implementation/management committees are transparent regarding the use of the community resources. There is increased recognition of grassroots planning as an element in the community empowerment strategy. Implementation of the Fiscal Decentralisation Strategy should lead to increased local governments’ autonomy, widened local participation in decision making and streamlined fiscal transfer modalities, all leading to increased efficiency and effectiveness of local governments to achieve PEAP goals within an transparent and accountable framework.

8.5.2 Weaknesses

Excessive reliance on funding from the centre undermines local autonomy. Sometimes there is a delay in disbursement of funds from the centre to the districts, which causes delay to the planned activities and implementation schedules.

The MTEF and LGBFP process is a good planning and budgeting framework for the Local Governments. It could encourage the participation of civic and political leaders but these processes are driven by the centre, i.e. Ministry of Finance Planning and Economic Development. In practice the key decisions about funding amounts are completed with the drafting of the Budget Framework Paper (BFP) at the end of December. This is a big constraint to the bottom-up participatory planning process because the funding amounts are decided long before the planning begins in January/February.

Another key constraint with finance is the erratic, unreliable and often inaccurate release of funds from the centre (MFPED) that differs greatly from the planning figures given to the districts for amounts expected within a given quarter, especially with respect to the submitted and approved work plans. Sometimes there is an unexpected funding source especially in Education, Works department and Health, which requires the local governments to prepare approved supplementary budgets before spending the surplus funds.
Another weakness is that there is no link between taxation and service delivery.

**8.5.3 Lessons learned from others**

Greater partnership with the private sector, NGOs and CBOs that are participating in the local revenue collection could improve the revenue or finances of the local governments to fund the projects identified through the CBP/HPPG process. Co-funding can improve if there is a clear accountability between the civil servants and politicians to the community. The relationships between key stakeholders for “checks and balances” encourages the community to demand for accountability of the resources used for project implementation. If the community do not contribute their share, the technical people can also threaten to stop the implementation of a project and this often wakes up a community that has to contribute their share.

Increased emphasis on the utilization of local resources will lead increased relevance and sustainability of development interventions.

Increased commitment of the political leadership will lead to improved allocation of resources for the planning process and implementation of the resultant development plans.

**8.5.4 Recommendations**

In-order to get realistic plans, the different levels of local government should plan for investments that they will be responsible for implementing and managing. As advocated under LGDP, planning for investments that have recurrent cost implications for a higher level should only be done with prior approval and commitment from the mandated level to meet the recurrent cost implications.

To enhance local revenue/resource mobilisation as well as empower citizens to demand for accountability of resources, it is desirable that the lower levels are encouraged to plan for and implement small, low cost investments even without external support. In this way taxpayers can see the link between taxes, co-funding and services through operation and maintenance of facilities, sustainability of projects among others.

In order to improve on the timely allocation of funds to the lower local governments, the MFPED could amend the release guidelines from quarterly to bi-annual releases for the PAF and other grants. The local governments could advocate for this through the Uganda Local Authorities Association, (ULAA)

The Government should ensure harmonisation of modalities and channels of fiscal transfers from the centre to local governments. Transfers from the centre should not substitute for local revenues because the level and extent of participation in the management of resources generated locally usually is greater than for resources coming from without. NGOs and CBOs that participate in local revenue mobilisation could work with the local governments to mobilise people to pay taxes. Contracting out revenue collection to private businesses could improve the effectiveness and efficiency of the collection and thus boost the local revenue.

Co–funding could be collected according to the performance of the local revenue collection that can be established by the population that has paid taxes, assessment of the previous year’s performance as the numbers are accurate and discussing the issue with the National assessment Team.

**8.6 Stakeholder involvement**
8.6.1 What was done

The evolution of the CBP/HPPG processes have been highly collaborative and participatory, involving central government agencies, local governments, donor agencies and NGOs/CBOs. More recently, the forum for this collaborative process has been the HPPG reference group, chaired by the Ministry of Local Government and drawing membership from the above listed array of stakeholders. This forum provided the invaluable strategic oversight of the HPPG review and refinement process.

8.6.2 Strengths

There is commitment at the national level to engage CSOs and communities in the process of policy planning, formulation and implementation. The community was interested to start action or contributing local materials like bricks and unskilled labour for implementation after participating in the CBP. The presence of institutional mechanisms such as a Project Management Committees can be useful, drawn from the respective project catchment areas to oversee implementation of and maintenance of project outputs.

8.6.3 Weaknesses

Existence of some capacity gaps at the lower local governments is a big constraint to institutionalising CBP/HPPG and integrating the CBO plans into the local government plans which results into limited or no sharing of information on plans, sources of funds and budgets of different development partners in an area.

The private sector did not get involved in the planning process in Bushenyi though it was proposed in the planning guidelines that they could be involved in the costing of investments. The local governments are however cautioned to be careful about the conflict of interest in involving private sector in giving support on budgeting.

Participation of the communities in their respective livelihood groups has not been well pronounced.

8.6.4 Lessons learnt

Traditional and opinion leaders that have high influence in a community are very important to integrate or involve in the planning and implementation process. CBOs and NGOs that have resources have power and are able to form their own structures for planning and implementation. But when they are involved in the local government planning process, the outcome or synergy can be very beneficial to the community.

Careful timing of the planning sessions is critical for enhanced participation of various stakeholders. As an example, care should be made to ensure that planning sessions do not coincide with market days and cultural ceremonies.

8.6.5 Recommendations

Local governments must involve stakeholders such as civil society, the private sector and NGOs in the planning process and implementation because they have different roles which are mutually beneficial. Civil society can influence the community to participate in planning as CBOs and NGOs have the skills and interest and resources to support the planning process, and the private sector can be involved in implementation.
Local governments must formulate clear criteria for involving active CBOs and NGOs to participate in the CBP/HPPG process, so that more confidence is built around the relationship of local governments and CBOs/NGOs for implementation of development activities.

The development of the community mobilization and empowerment strategy should be finalized and coherent financing mechanisms for its implementation identified.

8.7 Following up the plan - community management

8.7.1. What was done

Previous efforts with regard to support to grassroots planning have tended to focus on development of guidelines and 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. The HPPG lays emphasis on monitoring and evaluation of the development plan and provides guiding strategies, frameworks and principles.

As a strategy to bolster the responsiveness of the HPPG to the priority needs of the communities, the World Bank-funded Capacity Building for Decentralised Community-based Participatory Development Planning and Budgeting project is supporting development and implementation of mechanisms of collection and management of data on the basis of which to formulate focused grassroots plans and spending proposals. For a start, the project is funding training of sub-county Community Development Assistants on basic data collection, entry, analysis and implementation.

It is also important to note that the Ministry of Local Government has developed a computerised Local Government Information Communication System (LoGICS) to facilitate local decision making and a better information flow within local governments. LoGICS is a monitoring and evaluation data base, capturing performance and financial information. The LoGICS has a planning and implementation screen, which monitors the progress of activities and projects at as low as sub-county level.

With these mechanisms in place, the sub-county and district councillors find the plan a useful document to help them "chase" the implementers to ensure the planned activities are fulfilled. In addition, the communities should be able to use the plan as a basis of demanding for accountability especially for the planned projects that are being implemented. Since they know what they planned for, they ask how far the implementation has reached. (Community-based monitoring)

8.7.2 Strengths

In Uganda, the local government structures for follow up are in place such as the parish development committees, the village and parish executives and the various technical and political committees at sub-county and district level.

It is mandatory by MOLG that the public be informed on the development plan and budget and one of the minimum conditions for the LGDP funds is for the parish and sub-county to display information to the public on the amount of money released every quarter into the sub-county and parish for development activities. This transparency helps the community at village and parish to monitor and assess the performance of the local government officials and politicians and demand for accountability and feedback especially when they are not satisfied with the output.
For now, there is funding for M&E activities on a national scale to track the implementation of the HPPG.

### 8.7.3. Weaknesses

There is a residual lack of awareness and knowledge about the roles and responsibilities of community leaders at parish and village levels. Another constraint is the limited access the community has to a copy of the written parish plan and budget. Very limited copies are printed because it is expensive to reproduce and many visitors including other interested development partners often demand a copy of the development plan and budget. Lack of access to information limits community capacity to demand for services, as well as effectively participate in decision making.

The community-based organizations, private sector and NGOs are not fully involved in the planning process therefore the modalities of involving them in monitoring CBP and the plans is not clear.

### 8.7.4. Lessons learned from others

The community are very interested and supportive in following up the implementation of projects that are identified by them. Sub-county and district projects that are implemented within the community and have not been identified as the felt need of the community get very little or no community involvement because the communities will regard them as donor or district or sub-county projects. In projects where the community representatives at village and parish levels have roles of project management, monitoring and maintenance there is a clear follow-up mechanism on which community can demand for information, accountability and feedback.

### 8.7.5 Recommendations

There is need to strengthen the extent of interface between the district administrations and the rural service providers. User committees such as school and health management committees are potentially powerful allies in examining budgets and ensuring that funds are efficiently and effectively spent. In making these bodies effective, their access to regular information is key, closely followed by skills for analyzing and discussing information. At a wider level, civil society monitoring needs to be enhanced, probably by enhancing the capacity of user groups linked to a specific service.

It is important to strengthen the existing local government mechanisms for community monitoring and follow up and for them to get feedback on their plan and budget. The PDCs, PICs, Management and User committees should be used to support the interventions, implementation and maintenance. They must also be used to enhance the institutional capacity to check on corruption, accountability and transparency because misappropriation of community resources and funds will result in poor quality infrastructure and service delivery that will not improve the living condition of the poor.

The civic and political leaders at various local government levels need to create awareness among the community on the public investments within their location and the community must be encouraged to contribute in implementation, monitoring and management of planned projects. After completion; they must use the services and contribute to the maintenance.

Plans must document detailed project profiles such as project location, monitoring indicators, specific target group, budget allocated and time frame for implementation among others,
which will help the community and external stakeholders to assess more easily the effects or impact of a public investment on the livelihoods of poor and disadvantaged people.

8.8 Changes needed in structures, systems and linkages

The local government structure from the national to district and lower local councils works well for the planning process. Parish development committees and parish councils and village executives have participated in the planning process and mobilised the community to attend the planning meetings.

There is a need to harmonise national level policies particularly to incorporate the crosscutting issues in environment, gender and health. For example the National Environmental Statute provides for the establishment of different environment committees from the village to the district level. One of the main purposes of these committees is to come up with environmental action plans but which are supposed to finally be integrated in the local governments' development plans. The members of these committees are commonly similar to those on the other committees (including local councils) and yet their functions are parallel to the planning process structures. In fact these functions should be absorbed into existing structures and not have new structures created.

Sector-wide approaches (SWAps) have become increasingly popular instruments for articulation of sector policies, programmes and spending plans. Uganda presently has active SWAps in the roads, education and health sectors. In the context of decentralisation, there is an inherent degree of tension between the sector-wide approach and the devolved local government planning model. There is a risk that a SWAP can undermine local discretion and action. For this reason, SWAP processes need to be carefully managed and harmonised to ensure that the broad principles of decentralisation are respected and that the former does not undermine the specific interests of the LG planning process.

An important requirement for effective planning at grassroots level is an institutional framework to enhance cohesion of various efforts. To this effect community development workers have been identified to act as core mobilisers and facilitators of the planning function at sub-district levels. In much the same way, the legal status of the Parish Development Committees will need to be formalized.

Finally, a stronger link is needed between local interest groups and organisations, and decision making processes taken at budget conferences at sub-county and district levels concerning the final allocation of resources. Currently, a major weakness exists that allocations of budgets do not necessarily reflect bottom up planning, but tend to be driven by other district level interests and political considerations. Greater civil society engagement in this process would open it up and make it more transparent.

8.8.4 Lessons learned from others

The laws should make a provision of incorporating the non-state institutions because in some areas like Karamoja, the elders for example are key decision makers and if they are not involved they can frustrate attempts for CBP.

Funding should only be made to investments derived from the local government comprehensive development plan. Some of the structures like the parish development committees; the PMCs at the project level and Investment Committees at the lower LG levels that have proved to be effective could be made part of the law (statutory structures). However, the roles and relationships of these structures to the local councils should be made
very clear. Amendments of the various regulations should be a continuous process based on the lessons learnt by practitioners of CBP.

8.8.5 Recommendations

There is a need to harmonise policies at the national level. As an example the National Environmental Statute provides for the establishment of different environment committees from the village to the district level. One of the main purposes of these committees is to come up with environmental action plans but which are supposed to finally be integrated in the local government development plans. The members of these committees are commonly similar to those on the other committees (including local councils). Since planning for the environment should not be different from development planning it would have been prudent to have the same planning process under similar structures to minimise overlaps and reduce workloads.
9 WAY FORWARD

As the 4 Country Project completes, concrete actions will need to be undertaken to sustain and entrench the salient principles of the CBP as a permanent feature of grass roots development efforts in the HPPG. A few of them are outlined below.

9.1 In the sub counties directly involved

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.

9.2 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 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. 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.

9.3 Across CBP and other partners

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.
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