



**KHANYA**

**Report for a Four  
Country Workshop on  
Community-Based-  
Planning**

30 Jul-01 Aug 2001

**Khanya – managing rural change cc**

17 James Scott Street, Brandwag, Bloemfontein, 9301, Free State, South Africa  
Tel +27 (0)51 430 0712 Fax +27 (0)51 430 8322 Email [khanya@khanya-mrc.co.za](mailto:khanya@khanya-mrc.co.za)  
Website [www.khanya-mrc.co.za](http://www.khanya-mrc.co.za)

## Acknowledgements

© Khanya-managing rural change cc, 2001

*This research was funded by DFID. However the findings, interpretations and conclusions expressed in this paper are entirely those of the author(s) and should not be attributed to DFID, which does not guarantee their accuracy and can accept no responsibility for any consequences of their use.*

The report is available from [www.khanya-mrc.co.za](http://www.khanya-mrc.co.za)

## **CONTENTS**

### **Part A: Introduction**

- 1.0 Introduction
- 1.2 Opening
- 1.3 Workshop programme and objectives
- 1.4 Introductions
- 2 Why Community-Based-Planning

### **Part B Country presentations**

- 3 Presentation by Uganda
- 4 Presentation by South Africa
- 5 Presentation by Zimbabwe
- 6 Presentation by Ghana
- 7 Presentation by India

### **Part C Developing the approach**

- 7 Building a common approach
  - 7.1 Core concepts
  - 7.2 Group work on content of the community based plan
  - 7.3 Group work on methodology
  - 7.4 Group work on the process
  - 7.5 Group work on training and support
  - 7.6 Group work on roles and structures
  - 7.7 Group work on funding
  - 7.8 Group work on incentives

### **Part D Way forward**

- 9.1 Planning for India
- 9.2 Uganda
- 9.3 South Africa
- 9.4 Zimbabwe

**Glossary**

CAMPFIRE	Community Areas Resources Management for Indigenous Resources
CAP	Community Action Plan
CATWOE	Clients, Actors, Transformation, World view, Owners and Environment
CBO	Community Based Organisation
CBF	Capacity Building Fund
CBP	Community-based Planning
CCD	Community Capacity Development
CDC	Community Development Committees
CG	Central Government
CPR	Community Participatory Review
DA	District Assembly
DDP	District Development Programme
DEAP	District Environmental Action Plan
DFID	Department For International Development
DIP	
EIP	Environmental Implementation Plans
FIS	Facilitation Investment Plan
IDP	Integrated Development Plan
IRWSSP	Integrated Rural Water Supply and Sanitation Programme
IT	Information Technology
ITDG	Intermediate Technologies Development Group
LDF	Local Development Fund
LG	Local Government
LGP	Local Government Plans
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MLM	Mangaung Municipality
MOFPED	
MoLG	Ministry of Local Government
NDPC	National Development Planning Commission
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
NPPA	
NRCO	
ODI	Overseas Development Institute
PMA	
PMU	
PNDCL	
PPA	
PUIP	Peri-Urban Infrastructure Project
RACC	
RDC	Rural District Council
SWOT	Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Education Fund
UNCDF	United Nations Capital Development Fund
UPD	
USAID	United States Aid
VIDCO	Village Development Committee
WARDCO	Ward Rural Development Committee

## **FOUR COUNTRY WORKSHOP ON COMMUNITY-BASED-PLANNING**

### **Part A: Introduction**

#### **1.1 Background**

Following on the in-country workshops that were held in Ghana, Uganda, Zimbabwe and South Africa, a three days workshop that brought action-research participants from the four countries together was held in Bloemfontein on 30 July – 01 August 2001. All four countries, but Ghana, send their representatives. The full list of participants is in the annexure. Other partner organisations such as CARESA, CAREUganda and ODI were also present. The purpose of the workshop was to bring the participants together in order to share experiences and to agree on the methodology for pilots.

#### **1.2 Workshop objectives**

The workshop objectives were that by the end of the workshop the participants would have:

- An understanding of the key learnings across the 4 countries in relation to the application of community-based-planning,
- An understanding of core concept of CBP developed and,
- Developed proposals of how to take CBP forward in-country and
- Identified how to make best use of the visits to India/Bolivia to fill the gaps in our knowledge

#### **1.3 Workshop programme**

The programme covered the following core elements:

- Introduction (background, opening and personal introductions)
- Country presentations (Uganda, South Africa, Zimbabwe and India)
- Developing the approach (CATWOE, discussion groups on emerging themes)
- Way forward (country plans and planning for India visit)

Mayor Mokoena and Councillor Zumane of Mangaung Local Municipality opened and closed the workshop, respectively. The programme is in Annex 1.

## **2 Scene setting – Why community-based-planning?**

As an introduction to the concept of community-based-planning, Ian Goldman of Khanya-managing rural change made a presentation that is entitled: **“Linking the village to local governments - the need for community-based planning and management”**. The presentation further demonstrated the link between community-based-planning and the sustainable livelihoods approach.

## 2.1 Addressing poverty - the sustainable livelihood principles

The community-based-planning project, an action-research exercise, uses the concept of sustainable livelihoods approach method of analysis. The approach argues that poverty-focussed development activity should be:

- **People-focused:** sustainable poverty elimination will only be achieved if external support understands the differences between various groups of people and works with them in a way that is congruent with their current livelihood strategies, social environments and ability to adapt.
- **Build on positives:** a respectful approach to rural people as people with strengths (assets) and opportunities and not just needs.
- **Participatory and responsive:** poor people themselves must be key actors in identifying and addressing livelihood priorities. Outsiders need processes that enable them to listen and respond to the poor.
- **Holistic:** it should recognise the holistic nature of people's lives, their use of multiple livelihood strategies, and need for holistic responses, rather than organisation-driven sectoral approaches.
- **Micro-macro links:** poverty alleviation is an enormous challenge that will only be overcome by working at multiple levels, ensuring that micro-level activity informs the development of policy and effective enabling environment, and that macro-level structures and processes support people to build upon their own strengths.
- **Sustainability** (economic, environmental, institutional, social): there are four key dimensions to sustainability – economic, institutional, social and environmental sustainability. All are important – a balance must be found between them.
- **Dynamic and flexible** – so learning process approaches: external support must recognise the dynamic nature of livelihood strategies, respond flexibly to changes in people's situation, and develop longer-term commitments.
- **Partnership:** it implies a partnership approach between state, community and private sector – with the role of the state as the facilitator, animator, or provider.

## 2.2 Summaries of six governance issues for Sustainable Livelihoods

Projects aimed at poverty eradication need to ensure that:

1. **Poor people** are active and involved in managing their own development (*micro*)
2. There is an active and dispersed network of **local service providers** (community based, private sector or government) (*micro*)
3. That at the **local government level**, services are managed and coordinated effectively and responsively (*lower meso*)
4. At level above, there is capacity to provide support and supervision (*upper meso*)
5. The **centre** is providing holistic and strategic direction around poverty, redistribution, and oversight of development (*macro*)
6. **International level** is strengthening capacity in-country to address poverty

### 2.3 Key for this topic

Three points are very central for the CBP project. The Project should in particular ensure that:

- **Poor people** are active and involved in managing their own development (*micro*)
- There is an active and dispersed network of **local service providers** (community based, private sector or government) (*micro*)
- At **local government level**, services are managed and co-ordinated effectively and responsively (*lower meso*)

### 2.4 Critical issues:

The critical point for highlighting the above is that the project will ensure involvement in:

- Developing a vision/goals for their community
- Resource allocation (budgeting)
- Managing/implementing local initiatives
- Maintenance

And empowerment as an end in itself – overcoming dependency and mobilising local energy

### 2.5 Planning process at present

Current decentralisation initiatives tend to emphasise local government, at most to ward. The implications are that power is with the institutions, not the people. For example, Uganda is promoting sub-county and district planning, nominally village and parish. South Africa's integrated development plan looks good – but participation is not clearly defined. Zimbabwe's cascading planning system failed. Often most planning processes comprise of thousand PRAs, PPAs, CAP. Yet are very resource intensive. What is needed is a system that can be replicated and does not depend on donor resources.

### 2.6 Types of community-based planning depend on

1. Nature or scope of activities/problems (project, sector).
2. Linkages with higher level planning processes, eg district
3. Stage of planning cycle community involved
4. Degree of community involvement at each stage
5. Type of external organisation (if any) which initiates and supports the planning activity (NGO, local government).

### 2.7 Objectives of community-based planning

Objectives of a community based planning initiative are:

- To make *development plans* more relevant to local needs and conditions
- To make *services* more relevant
- To *hand over responsibility* as government capacity declines
- *Empowerment* - to increase people's control over their own lives and livelihoods

## 2.8 Community-based planning that is integrated with the planning system

Planning needs to be empowering and so about broad action in the community, not just begging for resources (holistic). It must be based on strengths and opportunities, not needs. But must identify where additional support is needed from outside, including government and NGO (partnership). It must be by legitimate structures that can take funds. It must be sustainable so using resources that can be maintained, but also planning for short-term-long-term trade-offs. It must link local structures and local government/services (micro-macro links).

## 2.9 Critical questions in making community-based-planning happen

In making a community-based-planning that is integrated with the planning system we need to decide on:

- What level of planning is needed – in Uganda parish would seem appropriate (about 3000 people) - in SA Ward is the only structure with 8000 people?
- What structure should do the planning?
- Who should facilitate the planning?
- What type of planning and process would be sustainable yet empowering - 3 day annual, plus follow-ups?
- What training is required to make this happen?
- Are there budgets against which people are planning?
- What incentives for stake holders are there for participatory planning to happen?

## 2.10 Discussions on the presentation

In a plenary session participants made several observations. Comments were made about **participation** – that is, how effective; **sustainability**- who facilitates. These therefore raise questions like: whose project/ who owns? The concept of poverty was also scrutinised. The discussions looked at how poverty is defined – that is, what is the benchmark?

Given the present experience with planning, the other question is; how do we manage the bottom-up with the top-down? The implications of governance issues in relation to community-based-planning require a closer look, too. That is, what does this mean for improving community-based-planning. The challenge is to improve local governance and the role of people in the process.

The success with decentralisation is key to the success of community-based-planning initiatives. The challenges with decentralisation, though, are:

- Defining the role of CBOs/NGOs/Private sector in relation to changing government role;
- Getting the private sector involved in CBP processes,
- And the need to decentralise basic set of budgeting principles.

A methodological question such as; how do we do it to ensure that objectives are met needs to be addressed as well.

## **Part B: Country Presentations**

Country's representatives from Uganda, South Africa, Zimbabwe and India made presentations on the experiences with community-based-planning in their respective countries. Ian Goldman made Ghana's presentation, as its delegates could not make it to the workshop due to flight problems.

### **3 Uganda**

#### **3.1 Policies in relation to local government planning**

The Local Government Statute of 1993, the Constitution of 1995, the Local Government Act of 1997 have all contributed to the decentralisation process. Especially in relation to fiscal decentralisation, local revenue collection and participatory planning, budgeting, and investments.

The process of decentralisation was aimed at the transfer of power downwards and away from central government, transfer of political and administrative control to the end users of development, to reduce workload on central government, and reduce tension between local and -national interests, to improve accountability by establishing linkages between locally-paid taxes and -provision of services.

#### **3.2 Administrative Structures in relation to local government planning**

There are 5 levels of local government administration: District, County, Sub-County, Parish and Village. At District and Sub County levels, elected councillors oversee locally appointed technical staff (executive functions). Since the passing of the Local Government Act in 1997, there has been an increasing transfer of responsibility for planning and development from district to sub county levels

Other relevant structures are:

- **Council:** Approval of investment projects, plans and budgets, three year development plans and to ensure integration of lower level plans.
- **Executive Committee:** Oversees implementation of council decisions, monitor and supervise projects, ensure co-ordination with external players
- **Sectoral Committees:** Prepare sectoral plans (health, education, water etc), monitor progress of sector plans, report to council..
- **Technical Planning Committee:** (Technical staff) Prepare and integrate sectoral plans into overall investment plans, appraise investment projects.
- **Investment Committee:** Design and costing of investment projects, forwarding to sectoral or Technical planning Committee.

At the Parish level one finds a mixed structure. That is, a mixture of Council, Executive committee, Parish Development Committees, Production and Environment, project management committees, some NGO-created committees. Political and administration of structure of Uganda is shown below on table 1.

**Table 1. Political and administration structure of Ugandan Government**

	Political	Admin
Centre		
District (53)	Elected local government	Locally appointed technical staff
Subcounty (1000+)	Elected local government	
Parish	Parish Council and development committee	
Village		

### 3.3 Current (existing) planning mechanisms at sub county level

Planning mechanisms at sub county level take place in the following manner:

- **Information dissemination** (roles, timetables, Indicative Planning Figures Allocation).
- **Needs assessments:** Carried out at community and parish levels, plans forwarded to sub county. Reviewed at Sub County Planning and Budgeting Conference.
- **Appraisal/Allocation:** Sub County Technical Planning Committee appraises plans in detail, finance committee allocates costs and Sub County Council approves plans and budgets.
- **3-year investment plan (rolling):** Technical Planning committees/Sectoral committees combine sectoral plans into three year rolling investment plan. Council approves 3 year plans. Forwarded to district for incorporation into DDP.

### 3.4 Roles of local government and other institutions in community based planning

The roles of local government and other institutions in community based planning are highlighted in table 2.

**Table 2. The roles of local government and other institutions in community-based-planning in Uganda**

Institution	Role
Local Governments	At sub county and district levels, principle planning agent, through planners and technical staff.
NGOs/CBOs	Have skills, interest and resources, so heavy involvement of NGOs in planning.
Private Sector	Minimal involvement – more in implementation and service delivery.
Traditional or cultural institutions	Rarely involved in planning processes.

### 3.5 Sources of revenue for local governments

Local governments generate revenue through:

- Personal Graduated Tax (21%)
- User charges, private (14%)
- Sector service tenders,
- Levies, market taxes etc
- Central Government Grants (65%)
- Donor/Project funding (Variable)

### 3.6 Funding flows to local governments from central government

- **Unconditional grants:** These covers the minimum amount required to run service delivery in local governments.
- **Conditional grants:** This is for particular targeted areas. In this regard, consideration is given to National Priority Programme Areas - NPPAs (eg water, roads, health and education)
- **Equalisation grants:** These are grants that are given to local governments that are "lagging behind" in development terms.
- **Local Government Development Programme:** Financial allocations related to performance on "minimum conditions" (good governance criteria like accountability, planning etc).
- **Programme for Modernisation of Agriculture (PMA Grants):** Non sectoral condition grants for removing constraints affecting productivity in the agricultural sector.

### 3.7 Challenges and gaps in CBP

These are listed in table 3 below.

**Table 3. Challenges and gaps in CBP in Uganda**

<b>Methodological</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mainstreaming cross-cutting issues (gender, environment, HIV/AIDS etc.) into planning processes and integrating sectoral plans into integrated development plans</li> <li>• Ensuring wide participation of all social groups in planning (marginalised groups)</li> <li>• Mechanisms of capturing (not losing) the priorities of marginalised groups in higher-level plans as they become progressively amalgamated</li> <li>• Tension between constraints (needs) based planning versus opportunity-based planning</li> <li>• Reconciling the planning periods of Local governments and those of other agencies (NGOs, projects)</li> <li>• Moving "best practice" to scale - moving from a 'perfect' (project driven) process, to a replicable, government driven planning process</li> </ul>
<b>Incentives</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Incentives for deepening CBP processes at lower levels (villages, parishes and sub-counties)</li> <li>• Motivating communities to participate in planning</li> <li>• Motivating local government staff to participate effectively in facilitating the planning process</li> <li>• Voluntarism versus reward/benefit systems</li> <li>• Sharing resources between different levels of local governments</li> </ul>
<b>Others</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agendas, roles and decision making</li> <li>• Tension between national (NPPA) and local priorities</li> <li>• Tensions between local development needs versus considerations of capacity &amp; sustainability</li> <li>• Balance between social interests and technical feasibility in deciding on priorities</li> <li>• Raising community expectations (open ended planning versus budget constrained planning) and impacts on community participation</li> <li>• Role of external actors like NGOs/CBOs</li> </ul>

### **3.8 Key Conclusions/recommendations of Uganda workshop**

There is a need for a "vision-based" (appreciative) planning process, based on assessment of assets and opportunities. This gives people opportunity to work with what they have rather than being frustrated about their problems and what they lack. It can also address underlying and cross cutting issues more readily, as constraint based planning often addresses only symptoms. It also allow for an explicit focus on negotiating within and amongst the visions of different community groups.

The planning process should have broad principles. Looking at the present situation - including a situational analysis of poverty, development and negotiation of future visions - reconciling visions of different community groups, and articulating assumptions about investments and their impacts on poverty reduction and beneficiaries (feeding into M&E).

The planning process is action-oriented. It defines actions that communities can undertake on their own and actions that require additional (external support) and matching this with available services or resources. The action-oriented planning process ensures an understanding of existing services offered by local authorities and service providers. It also defines partnerships needed to realise future visions.

Incidentally, a National Review of Local Government Planning Guidelines is planned for August/September in Uganda. This will possibly provide an opportunity to discuss/plan a pilot.

### **3.9 Discussions on Ugandan presentation**

Uganda's legislation should provide clear institutional framework at community level to manage CBP process and link with LG and other institutions, such as NGOs and traditional leaders. NGOs have resources, therefore power, and are able to form own structures. There is a need to link NGO activities with government processes and act according to agreed principles. NGOs should be part of decision-making process at community level in CBP.

Local government development plans should be informed by plans from the lower level. For example, subcounty-district plans and village-parish-subcounty development plans. Encouraging enough is the fact that there is political commitment to decentralisation demonstrated by acts amendments and implementation.

In terms of Uganda's legislation, the role of traditional institutions/ leaders is seen to be more cultural, not service provision/planning, therefore separate. As a result local government and traditional leadership have different roles and functions. The role of traditional leadership in CBP is unquestionable since traditional leaders are able to engage/influence people, therefore, they are important agents of change. Uganda has developed popular versions of Acts in local languages. This move is seen to be likely to empower the institution of traditional leadership.

Training should receive the highest attention. Especially the training of local councillors, and trainers. And it should be ongoing, with every election.

The systematic budgeting and planning cycle of LG in Uganda provides framework for allocation, planning, etc.

## 4 South Africa

### 4.0 Review of community-based planning (and management) in South Africa

#### 4.1 Background to SA

The South African government has 3 spheres of government, namely: national, provincial, local, each with specific (sometimes shared) competencies. Most implementation capacity is with Provincial Governments eg Agriculture, Health, Education, and Social Security. However, Constitutional objectives of local government provide democratic and accountable government for local communities in order to ensure sustainable provision of services; promote social and economic development; encourage the involvement of communities in the affairs of local government and to promote a safe and healthy environment. The political/administrative structure is tabled below.

**Table 4. The political/administration structure of the Republic of South Africa.**

Level of Government	Political	Admin
Centre		
Provincial	Provincial governments (Can't generate revenue Metros (A) can generate revenue	Mostly development services
District Municipalities – 47 (B)	Can generate revenue	
Local Municipalities 231 (C)	Can generate revenue	
Ward s	Ward committees	

#### 4.2 Legislative framework

Key legislation to developmental local governments are:

- **Municipal Demarcation Act (1998)**: It reconfigures local government to enable it to play developmental role.
- **Municipal Structures Act (1998) and Systems Act (2000)**: Creates accountable local government structures and systems to involve communities in determining development priorities and monitoring performance.
- **Property Rating Bill (200)**: Redresses disparity in revenue sources and ensure equitable treatment.

#### 4.3 Local government transformation

The transformation of local government in South Africa saw the re-demarcation of municipal boundaries to create non-racial cities, and viable local government institutions. The process resulted in the reduction of numbers of local government municipalities from 843 to 284. This comprises of 6 Metropolitan, 47 district, 231 local municipalities. The district system has been extended to rural, combing both rural and urban local municipalities. Moreover, the district systems have established political structures and basic functional administrations. Transformation is, presently up to 2002, in a stabilisation phase. This will be followed by a consolidation and sustainability phases (2011+).

#### 4.4 Our case studies

The in-country workshop held in Umhlanga Rocks, Durban, 19 & 20 June 2001, several case studies that have an element of community participation in planning were reviewed. Examples are:

1. **QwaQwa and Bloemfontein TLCs** IDP, set up representative structure as there were no formal structures, involving representatives, with whom livelihoods analysis done, and outcomes by Ward
2. **Mvula Trust**, involving communities in planning for water points - using participatory methodology
3. **EDA Matatiele** - participatory planning for community tourism
4. Participatory planning in central Johannesburg (**Hillbrow**)
5. **Diepsloot** (Planact) - participatory planning to empower people in process of housing
6. **Natal Midlands** - strategic planning with 8 communities.

#### 4.5 Planning Process

A 3-year MTEF process for provincial and national government was put in place. The provincial Growth and Development Strategy, and the Integrated Development Plans followed this at municipal level. The IDPs were supposed to cover all sectors and to be based on participatory planning. Lately, Ward Committees have been established. Each Municipality will decide roles of Ward Committees.

#### 4.6 Planning process in practice

IDP - Planning for capital and operations, not clear whether covers activities of government departments. The next round will include provincial departmental projects. The processes of participation beneath local government level were just consultation. The opportunity with Wards Committees is to be considered. Short-term versus long-term issues, for example, in relation to environment were not well considered. Also provinces are doing EIPs. Quite obviously, there are no examples of systematic process for CBP. The new Wards offer an opportunity to take this up, although Ward is large (average 20,000 pop in Mangaung).

#### 4.7 Funding

Municipal budget comes from central government (1.5% of government budget) and charges for water, electricity. During the first round of IDPs, budget was not known. In most cases municipalities has their own budgets, and it was not clear whether they included technical departments budgets. It is still not clear what budget is to be considered with Ward Committees. In thinking through pilot we are recommending that budget be provided per Ward so that Wards can start acting immediately.

#### 4.8 Involvement of stakeholders

Relevant stakeholders are normally invited to participate in IDP process, but participation is very limited, especially from provincial government departments who are not clear how the process is related to them. Examples of participatory structures in many local municipalities were established, for example in QwaQwa, but there was no sustainability. Traditional structures are very important in some areas. However their involvement in IDPs is not clearly defined. Nevertheless attempts have been made in some areas to involve them in planning

services, eg Mvula, where an Inkosi (traditional leader) was an ex-officio member. Regrettably there have been very little involvement from private sector.

#### **4.9 Proposed approach in Mangaung -Type of CBP envisaged in Mangaung**

Khanya in partnership with the Mangaung Municipality want to pilot a community-based-planning process. The pilot will be based on ward, although that has limitations with large size (20,000 average in Mangaung). The pilot will start this year with a twin track approach, with say a 3 day intensive planning process in a certain number of wards this year, plus follow-ups, and a brief exercise in the others, completing all wards with a more detailed process next year. There is a need however to ensure flexibility in IDP allocations for next year so they can respond to more detailed community-based plans done then. Initially pilots will be conducted in both a predominantly black and African National Congress ward and a predominantly white and Democratic Alliance ward, and try and get the white community involved. It is hoped that KwaZulu/Natal and Eastern Cape will get pilots going soon.

#### **4.10 Transformation envisaged**

It is envisaged that by 30<sup>th</sup> November we shall have developed a CBP methodology; involved and trained Ward Committees, Municipal officials and councillors, and service providers to implement this and developed X CB Plans from X wards. These define local vision and actions and external support required, and are a good basis for developing the IDP. We have informed and convinced the Mangaung Local Municipality (MLM) and other stakeholders that this is an effective way to have participatory planning in the IDP process. The objective is that by 30<sup>th</sup> November 2001 we have a tested CBP model, which MLM is committed to implement and extend, and a significant skills base has been developed in MLM and other stakeholders to implement this.

#### **4.11 Pilot outputs**

Outputs for the community-based-planning pilots are:

1. Development of preliminary model planning process and follow-up
2. Dedicated allocation for pilot wards approved by MLM
3. Participatory planning skills for CBP developed in MLM and other stakeholders through a learning by doing process
4. Planning and follow-up process refined based on first 2 pilots
5. Plans developed for X wards which include vision, opportunities, local actions, support required and link to wider plans, especially the IDP
6. Local activities initiated in first 2 wards
7. All major groups involved in planning in relevant pilot wards
8. Refined model approved by MLM for replication
9. The national Department for Development and Planning considers wider applicability of model for the IDP

#### **4.12 Issues for future in relation to CBP**

- There is a need to develop and test planning process for the CBP element (eg vision-based such as DEAP work in Bushenyi)
- There is a need to clarify process to link with IDP, and with IDP timeframes, and with municipal and sectoral budgets

- There is a need to develop a process of training stakeholders to facilitate planning - clarify role of councillor, departments and planners - allocate planners
- There is a need to get budget linked and known in advance
- The need to use Ward Committee structure, but may need to develop, eg ward development committee involving departments
- The need to consider how to link with on-going community management.

#### 4.13 Discussions on the SA presentation

Several observations regarding community-based-planning in South Africa were made. These are outlined in the table 4 below.

**Table 5. Key observations regarding community-based-planning in South Africa**

Key points	Issues
<b>Resources allocations</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• introduce resource for planning within the visioning process (not at the beginning)</li> <li>• planning that is open-ended or within a given budget framework (which can constrain depth &amp; breadth of thinking)</li> <li>• recommendations for line departments budgets to be included in IDP – because of service delivery follow-up from the plan</li> <li>• also disproportionate resources to provinces over municipalities/districts</li> <li>• LGs raise own revenue, the majority of revenue is self-generated particularly for the large cities, but now will have to use this service to a large (rural) area and population</li> <li>• central support to LG is low, mainly through grants</li> <li>• 60-80% of provincial budget goes to salaries/administration</li> <li>• planning allocation for sectors are set by central government</li> </ul>
<b>Co-ordination</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• co-ordination/competition between spheres of LG – questions of economies of scale</li> <li>• globalisation – requires better co-ordination between central and local governments</li> <li>• is there a clear demarcation of roles in service delivery between different spheres of LG</li> <li>• there are functions/competencies in the Constitution</li> <li>• big functions at the province, although aim for further decentralisation</li> <li>• IDP needs to become a strategic process for dialogue ( as well as physical products) around key policy debates, eg public/private partnership, development priorities, etc</li> <li>• this is under policy review but there are difficulties to harmonise as capacities of different spheres of LG varies</li> <li>• reconciling the balance of power between the province and the district</li> <li>• can the power really be pushed down to the district/municipality</li> <li>• this is an area of debate not clear policy</li> </ul>
<b>Rural-urban dichotomy</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• definition of municipalities – how does it relate to rural development</li> <li>• linking urban-rural areas in Zimbabwe has caused tension as towns see themselves as subsidising rural areas</li> <li>• the aim in SA is for towns to be service centres for rural areas and promote interlinkage</li> <li>• need rural areas to be well linked with market centres</li> <li>• IDPs need to reflect such issues</li> </ul>

## 5. Zimbabwe: Presentation

### 5.1 How the process is unfolding in Zimbabwe

In Zimbabwe there is a Core Steering Team that oversee community-based-planning. This consists of the ITDG; Ministry of Local Government, Public Works and National Housing, and Development In Practice. Some partnerships with Local Authorities have been forged, for example, the Gwanda Rural District Council in the Matebeleland South Province.

### 5.2 Evolving learning network

Learning networks have been established to facilitate information sharing regarding community-participation. These are tabled below.

**Table 6. List of Learning Networks.**

Local government institutions		NGOs
-Association of Rural District Councils -Provincial Administrators Association -District Administrators Association -Chimanimani Rural District Council -Nkadi Rural District Council -Department of Natural Resources		-UNDP -UNICEF -World Bank -USAID -DFID
Key projects and programmes	Private Sector	Interested Individuals
-Rural District Capacity Building -Smallholder Dry Areas Resource Management -South East Dry Areas Programme -Integrated Rural Water Supply Programme -Community Action Plan (card)	-PriceWatersHouse and Coopers	-Diana Conveyers -Chris Matumbike

### 5.3 Background and history

Zimbabwe gained its independence in 1980. Pre-independence period was dominated by Centrally-driven strategies. Radical, new planning perspective was ushered in at independence. In 1984, Prime Minister's Directive saw the creation of Provincial, and later Rural Councils. At village level, new planning structures were established to enable bottom-up planning, for example, the Ward Development Committees and Village Development Committees. The marginalisation of traditional institutions still continued in the first decade of independence. Hence institutional re-organisation and capacity-building of traditional structures was emphasised. In addition, the Traditional Leaders Act saw the establishment of Village and Ward Assemblies. The political/administrative structure of Zimbabwe government is tabled below.

**Table 7. The political/administration structure of Zimbabwe government.**

Level of Government	Political	Admin
National		
Provincial	Provincial governors represents the President	Admin level with provincial offices of national departments
Districts	Rural District Councils, Town Councils District administrators represent provincial governors	Departments managed by sector ministry, co-ordinate via district Development committees
Ward/ Assembly (formerly WARDCO)		
Village assembly (formerly VIDCO)		

#### 5.4 Administrative Structures and Policies in relation to planning

Zimbabwe lacks a coherent rural development policy. However, there are several strands impacting on rural development. In terms of the decentralisation policy/process, local authorities have been created in both rural and urban areas, and key legislative instruments have been passed to support decentralisation, e.g., Rural District Councils Act (1988), Prime Minister's Directive (1984), Provincial Council's and Administration Act (1985), Traditional Leaders Act (1999).

Furthermore, commitment to decentralisation is shown in the Issuance of 13 Principles of Decentralisation in 1996, implementation of Rural District Council capacity building programme as well as complimentary initiatives on Poverty Alleviation, Land Reform & Environment.

Other Legislation impacting on local governance are:

- The Regional Town and Country Act of 1976 (Amendment in 1999)
- The Communal Land Act (1982).
- The Provincial Councils and Administration Act (1985)
- The RDC Act of 1988 (Amendment, 1996)
- The Local Authorities Election Laws Amendment Act of 1997.
- The Traditional Leaders Act of 2000.
- The Customary Laws and Traditional Courts Act.
- The Environment Management Bill ,2000
- The Local GVT. Bill (2001)

#### 5.5 The Institutional Landscape

A number of new institutions and structures have emerged to support the decentralisation. These are indicated in table 7 below. The general observation is that there are multiplicity of structures and institutions with a variety of uncoordinated roles and responsibilities. This further complicates the planning processes and outcomes at all levels. It also undermines the success of community based planning.

**Table 8. Rural Development Institutions And Structures At Central, Provincial District And Community Level.**

Level	Structure	Key responsibilities
National level	Cabinet Committee on Rural Development..	
	.Min of Local GVT	
	Ministry of Rural Resources of Water Development	
	Ministry of Agriculture & Rural Resettlement	
	Min of Environment and Tourism	
	Ministry of Youth Development, Gender & Employment	
Provincial level	Provincial Development Council	
	District Administrator	
	Provincial Development Committee.	
District level	Govt Extension.	
	RDCS.	
	NGOS	
Community level	Ward Assembly	
	Chiefs And Traditional Heads	
	CBOS & Interest Groups	
	Councillor	
Others	NGOs, Donors.	

## 5.6 Roles in relation to participatory planning.

### RDC Centrality

In theory, Rural District Councils are key in local level planning. In practice, there is a huge disconnection between district level planning and resource allocation on the one hand, and community interest and priorities.

### Role of councillor

In theory, the councillor should be the main link between the people (through wide consultations) and the council (through participation in RDC meetings). In practice, councillors do not consult and often misrepresent the people.

### Legislation and bye-laws

In theory, RDC'S are empowered to create new structures at community level in conformity with local realities and formulate bye-laws to strengthen local governance at the local level. In practice, control and governance remains centrally driven and there is very little local institutional and legislative innovation taking place.

### Behaviour of external agencies

In theory, external support agencies are supposed to work with, if not to strengthen local institutions and governing bodies. In practice external agencies by-pass local institutions and governing bodies and even establish their own structures.

### Conclusion

A lot of fragmentation, duplication, conflicts, competition and lack of co-ordination in relation to participatory planning is evident in Zimbabwe.

## **5.7 Other roles in relation to participatory planning**

### Strategic planning and resource allocation

In theory, RDC's are required to engage in participatory strategic planning to inform the resource allocation process. In practice, mere shopping lists are used to allocate resource at district level.

### Responsive bye-laws and enforcement.

In theory, RDC's are required to formulate responsive bye-laws and regulations while in practice bye-laws are just copied and adopted from model bye-laws irrespective of situation on the ground. In practice no enforcement of bye-laws take place.

### Collections of local levies and revenue

In practice collection of levies has been sporadic and poor administration and internal systems of most RDC's have remained weak.

## **5.8 Key lessons**

Need for a clear institutional framework that is defined in a participatory manner. RDC's need to be empowered to provide leadership and direction at local level. By-passing of the RDC and other local institutions can undermine local governance and community based planning processes where institutional weaknesses are observed by external agencies strengthening of these institutions should be a priority.

## **5.9 Planning in practice**

Current planning processes concentrate on planning of sectoral activities like roads, water, health, agriculture and education. More emphasis is being made on provision of capital and operations. Maintenance of infrastructure has been poor.

At local Government Level, RDC is weak to co-ordinate and lead planning process. Councillors act autonomous and accountability to constituency is weak. There is very little or no community participation in planning and resource allocation.

Beneath Local Government, voluntary groups, associations and organisations managing their affairs. There is a huge desire for participation in local government. Nevertheless a lot of activities, projects and programmes are not properly co-ordinated. Many of the programmes are of short-term nature mainly due: to shortage of funds; short term donor & NGOs' interventions.

## **5.10 Key learning and Gaps**

Sector based planning lead to lack of integration and frustrate community by forcing them to address issues sectorally. It also threatens resource/revenue base of local authorities. It further

reinforces the dependency syndrome at community level. Inadequate funding-always cited as a major cause for unsuccessful planning and decentralisation efforts in Zimbabwe.

### **5.11 RDC Source of Revenue**

The RDCs receive revenue from: Development Levies, Property Taxes, Central GVT Loans and Grants, Donor Loans and Grants. Development levies are meant for provision of and maintenance of infrastructure. In practice very little is collected and hardly any maintenance takes place. Loans and Grants under the Public Sector Investment Programme are usually meant for specific capital projects. No participatory planning process is undertaken before allocation and disbursement. Disbursement and allocation of grants and loans in other programmes require evidence of community planning before allocation. Monitoring systems to ensure such planning processes are weak, except some government programmes involving a partnership with donors such as: CAP-World Bank involved, DEAP-Danida involved, CAMPFIRE-USAID involved and RDC CBP-DFID. Lessons from these public supported programmes have not been institutionalised by the key operational structures that are hosting the programmes.

### **5.12 Localisation of funds and decisions**

Central government is still keen to control loans and grants allocated to local authorities due to lack of confidence in their capacity to manage funds. Very few programmes have decentralised funds to communities, for example, CAMPFIRE & CAP. Sector agencies still controls their budgets at local level.

As a result, most plans remain unimplemented. Slower decision making processes at local level have generated frustration with local authorities at community level. Poor monitoring and control systems as a result of the divorce between financing and implementation.

Key lessons are: as much as possible, planning needs to be linked to budgeting; good plans should lead to effective and efficient utilisation of available resources and mistrust and suspicion creates an environment which is not conducive to success of decentralisation and participatory development.

### **5.13 Relationship of community structures to community planning**

This section looks at the involvement of other community structures in community planning. Most of communities are in full control of their lives and livelihoods. Informal links exist with formal groups and institutions.

This implies that there is no systematic effort to understand and harness the energy and potential of these informal groupings. There is no clear role of these informal groups in local level planning although most are a reflection of the failure of local level planning processes. The key lesson is that there is a need for more integrative and inclusive planning systems.

### **5.14 Involvement of traditional structures in community based planning**

Government has recently recognised the role of traditional structures in local level planning through the Traditional Leaders Act (1995) which seeks to promote linkages between the

traditional and modern structures. Traditional leaders tend to wield sufficient authority at grassroots to mobilise communities for planning, implementation and maintenance. Moreover, traditional leaders and structures have been instrumental and effective in revenue collection in GOKWE North and BUHERA.

The key lesson is that community based planning should be done within an inclusive framework that also includes Traditional structures.

#### **5.14 Involvement of other stakeholders**

##### Private Sector

The private sector can promote investment and financial motive through involvement in community-based-planning initiatives. The private sector can become involved through social responsibility programmes.

##### NGOs

Most invest in CBP projects and programmes at community level. They nevertheless, tend to by-pass existing structures and institutions. There is pressing need for the establishment of parallel systems and structures.

##### Government Departments

Government departments promoting various forms of CBP are:

- Ministry of Local Govt; RDCC BP & IRWSSP.
- Ministry of Environment & Tourism; DEAP
- Ministry of Public Service; CAP
- Ministry of Agriculture; SEDAMP
- Dept of Wild Parks; CAMPFIRE

#### **5.15 Follow up the plan-community management**

Ineffective follow up mechanism have led to failure of many planning Initiatives eg. videos/wadcos and failure to allocate resources to support the process. Where measures are defined and funds are allocated, there is still need to define sustainability measures. An example of a Community Management is: Integrated Rural Water Supply and Sanitation Program.

#### **5.16 Training & support needs**

Training and support needs in relation to community-based-planning are:

- Awareness Raising and Civic Education.
- Transformational training/change management.
- Leadership/Institutional Capacity

#### **5.17 Key learnings**

Key lessons from the Zimbabwe experience highlighted the need to:

- Clear separation of powers between CG and GG.
- Approach planning & decentralisation in integrated mines.
- Develop clear policy on RD-broader framework also linkages to be developed

- Ensure full use of existing structures.
- Link planning to budgeting.
- Develop resources to communicate.
- Strengthen community management.
- Strengthen institutional frameworks that links modern traditional structures.

## 18 Discussion

Generic discussions on the Zimbabwe presentation are presented in table 9 below. The discussions centred on governance and NGO related issue, hence the grouping in the table.

**Table 9. Generic discussions on Zimbabwe's presentation**

Sector	Issues
Government	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• accountability of councillors – they are elected but act autonomously</li> <li>• power base of parallel structures – who hires and fires</li> <li>• need a rotational period of councillors – a short period can increase accountability</li> <li>• institutions, legal and policy frameworks are in place to support grassroots planning</li> <li>• local governments have powers to hire and fire staff</li> <li>• central government seems to work sectorally – with sectoral departments functioning throughout</li> <li>• support lower or lowest structures so they will demand and push for change at higher levels</li> <li>• tri-partite balance between government, communities and development practitioners</li> <li>• balance depends on balance and opportunities</li> <li>• training of councillors is done on a continuous basis</li> <li>• how to deal with turn over in political personnel</li> <li>• district training team needs to be in place so it can be systematic and ongoing</li> </ul>
NGOs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NGO &amp; government linkage – should NGO have to work in support of government if government is not believed to be progressive and accountable where parasitic, this may drive NGOs to by-pass structures</li> <li>• NGOs should work in support of government</li> <li>• normally NGOs by-pass governments as they are powerful</li> <li>• there should be a tri-partite balance between government, communities and development partners, eg NGOs</li> </ul>

## 5 Ghana

### 5.1 Historical Background

The first attempt was by the British colonial government through the native authority (hand picked chief or unit of local royalty) to administer law and order. The Municipal Ordinance of 1859 established municipalities in the coastal towns of the country. In 1943 a new Ordinance set up selected town councils for Accra, Kumasi, Sekondi-Takoradi and Cape Coast. The Municipal Council Ordinance and the Local Government Act, Act 54 were passed in 1953 and 1961, respectively.

All the above legislation maintain the distinction between the central and local government institutions. The Dual Hierarchy Model of Administration consists of the Central Government bodies at the local level dealing with national issues alongside with the Local Government bodies dealing with the local matters. It was realised that the Dual Hierarchy Model promotes duplication and confusion, ineffectiveness and slow development at the local level. As a result a number of Commissions and Committees of enquiry were formed:

- Watson Committee (1949)
- Sir Coussey Committee (1949)
- Sir Sydney Philipson (1951)
- Sir Fredrick Bourse (1955)
- The Greenwood Commission (1957)
- The regional Constitutional Commission (1957)
- The Akuffo-Addo Commission (1966)
- The Mills-Odoi Commission (1967)
- The Constituent Assembly (1969)

Attempt to decentralised could not materialise until 1974. The Single Hierarchy Model came into being in 1974 under the Local Administration Act, 1971, Act 359 which was amended before its commencement by the Local Administration (amendment) decree, 1972 ,NRCD 258 – 65 District Councils were created. In 1988 a reform combining the best of the two models was made under the Local Government Law 1998 PNDCL 207 to create the current New Local Government System. The political/adminisatration system of Ghana is tabled below, table 10.

**Table 10. Ghana's political/administration structure**

	Political	Administration
National		
Region	Metro	Regional Co-ord. Council
District	DA Committees	Departs. Report to DA
Town		
Unit Committee	Elected	

### 5.2 Policies

The new planning system in Ghana is based on the following five basic legislations:

- a) The 1992 constitution of Ghana: Articles 86 to 87 and 240 to 256, of the 1992 constitution outline the basic concepts and principles of decentralisation in the New Planning System. Articles 86 & 87 call for the establishment of the National Development Planning

Commission whiles Article 240 (e) advocates for the effective participation of people in the governance of their areas of jurisdiction.

- b) The 1993 Local Government Act 462 and LI 1589: These two legislations established the 110 District Assemblies and together empower the population to participate in the Development Planning process at various levels.
- c) The 1993 Civil Service Law (PNDCL327): The Civil Service Law restructures the Service to render it more responsive to the development needs and direction of the country.
- d) The 1994 National Development Planning Commission (NDPC) Act 479: Act 479 of 1994 established the NDPC as the highest Planning authority in the country.
- e) The 1994 National Development Planning (System) Act 480: Act 480 of 1994 specifies Institutions and Agencies as Planning Authorities and also defines roles, functions and procedures.

### 5.3 Learnings and Gaps

Community initiated projects normally follow the planning process. However, fund raising Management skills are always a big problem. NGOs in Ghana are in the forefront in Promoting CBP process. The problem is that they create structure that are parallel to and compete with government's. there is need to avoid competition and duplication and to work through existing structures.

The private sector play a very limited participation (Contract). It only gets involved through in-kind and financial contribution, and social contracts.

### 5.4 Lessons

- Politics and self-help spirit
- The link between Unit Committee and the Assembly
- Unit Committees (size / Population threshold)
- NGO/Assembly relationship
- Training needs & Support
- Facilitating Participation
- Advocacy and Lobbying Skill
- Networking and Coalition building
- Roles and responsibilities of personnel manning the base structures
- Resource support to NCCE to conduct any effective national campaign.

### 5.5 Summary of learning to date

The above situation highlights the need to

- Delink the local Government Structure from party politics
- Compel stakeholders to work through the existing structures so as to strength their existence
- Effect effective collaboration between DAs. NGOs and other service providers at the community level.
- Conduct a structured revision of long term development plans for the DAs.

## 5.6 Follow up areas

The following areas need a follow-up:

- Actualising vision based planning processes
- Using CBP as a tool for empowerment
- Improving Micro – Meso dialogue links
- Improving revenue mobilisation base for DAS
- Awareness creation on Local Government structure
- Policy change to enhance local Government structure

## 5.8 Executive Summary

The concept of CBP is not new to development practitioners (Government and Non-Governmental Agencies) in Ghana. However its application differs from Project to project. Its definition covers issues like: Bottom-Up Approach; Grassroot Participation; Participatory Participation; Popular participation; Perceived Benefits.

The advantages with this project are that it:

- Promotes ownership of projects ( effective operation and maintenance)
- Produces plans that are relevant to conditions on the ground
- Builds the confidence level of communities to take their destiny into their own hands
- Promotes unity and oneness at the community level

In Ghana, there is enough provision for CBP in the Local Government Structure. There is strong legal backing, for example;

- 1992 Constitution of Ghana
- The 1993 Local Government Act 462 and LI 1589
- The 1993 Civil Service Law (PNDCL327)
- The 1994 National Development Planning Commission (NDPC) Act 479
- The 1994 National Development Planning (System) Act 480
- Institutional Arrangement (The sub district structures – Unit Committees/area councils)

Participatory planning is well thought processes. However, the link between the Micro and Meso is very weak and in most cases not functional. Factors contributing to the unhealthy link Include:

- Inadequate public education;
- Infiltration of traditional/party politics;
- The lack of skill to facilitate participation
- Inadequate resource base for the DAs /Area Councils
- Large size of unit committee members
- Lack of understanding of roles and responsibilities by the community and the committee members themselves.
- Power struggle between the Assembly persons and the Unit committee members
- The appointment of the District Chief Executive by the President
- Breakdown in feedback mechanism between the unit committees and the assembly
- The recent change in government

In Ghana, civil society organisations are very strong and are active in service delivery. The danger is that they may by-pass decentralised structures. Traditional structures seem to be strong at all levels. Most development plans may be consultant-driven but may not be locally owned. Moreover, planning is at meso rather than micro level and there is little link between the two. However, although legislation for CBP is in place, there is a need to sensitise people to the opportunities.

## **6 India**

### **6.1 Background information**

India's population is estimated at 60 million people with very large population of indigenous people. The literacy rate stands at 65 %. It has income poverty of 35 percent, especially among marginal groups. Health status is also poor - IMR of 90, Life Expectancy of 65 years. Sources of revenue are: mining, industrial base, large water and forest resources.

India has some scheduled area or reservations where tribal communities reside - protection and reservation. Mostly, primitive tribes are found in these protected areas. Large forested areas are also under protection.

### **6.2 Panchayati Raj System**

Panchayat means a group of five. It reflects a very old village council system that was changed during the last four to five hundred years. For example, Indian Constitutions Directive Principles speaks of bringing in Panchayat system.

### **6.3 Recent History**

Committee report in 1956 recommended the establishment of a three-tier Panchayat system that consists of a district, block and village. States were to enact legislation. Nevertheless, political and administrative powers and responsibilities remained in the hands of states. Traditional and modern roles were envisaged and were even brought in many places. The 1960s saw a period of growth and spread of Panchayats and regular elections.

State Legislation was very diverse, and over time Panchayats were subverted. Elections were not held, Panchayats and municipal bodies were superseded and bureaucrats replaced elected representatives. Institutions remained, but elections were not held and leadership was active, but not involved. Communist States developed powerful Panchayats.

National Government in 1980s dreamt of a new constitutionally supported Panchayat system. Supreme Court judgement on basic structure of constitutions was kept in mind. 73rd and 74th amendments brought in constitutionally mandated Panchayat system in 1992.

### **6.4 The structure**

The structure of newly established Panchayats system consist of:

- District President and District Council Members, supported by a District Council Office
- Block President with Block members and an executive office

- Village Chief and ward members, with selected executive support  
Positions are filled through direct elections.

## **6.5 Panchayats in MP**

MP was the first state to legislate and hold elections in 1993, and again in 1999. Reservations of positions for women were 1/3rd, SC, ST and OBCs. In 1993 440,000 leaders were elected. Nearly 80 percent changed in 1999.

Twenty five departments in MP have decentralised powers and programme implementation. Funds transfer include 2.94 percent as untied direct funds, salaries for Panchayat staff, travel costs, and equal funds for employment activities. Nearly 20 percent of development funds are routed through Panchayats. Moreover, MPs have certain powers to levy taxes and cess. Panchayats had the strongest and highest political support consisting of a constituency amongst bureaucrats, politicians and NGOs -which is powerful. The process of handing over powers and provisions were pushed along with awareness campaigns, involving government agencies and NGOS in training.

Decentralisation, giving power to the people became a “good” by itself, where the rest did not matter. In the early stages, there were constant changes and advances in Panchayats that relate to powers, provisions, capability enhancement and support systems. Financial powers as well were increased.

The audit systems consisted of financial and social audit.

The Impact has been substantial. Most common belief is that the pace of development has gone up. Focus on remote habitats, marginal communities, poor areas increased. New leadership has emerged, especially amongst women, even though surrogate leadership was rampant, but changing.

## **6.6 Panchayats in MP - Impact**

Leadership amongst poor communities has entered public space. There is greater political participation - numbers directly involved and voting. Greater accountability - lower costs of projects, many cases of money returned, common knowledge of dishonesty. Contests have become fierce. Leadership from all quarters, eg. Eunuchs

## **6.7 Training for Leaders**

All Presidents and block and district leaders undergo training. State level training institution and department. NGOs, government officials and other agencies involved in training, including Panchayat secretaries. All personnel get both starting and in-course training. Support for leadership is through monthly magazine, circulars and linkages with NGOs.

## **6.8 Planning Process**

### National Planning Process

- Planning Commission
- State Planning Commissions
- Five Year Plans
- Finance Commission

- State Finance Commission
- District Planning Committee

#### State Planning

- Five Year Plans
- Departmental Plans based on approach papers, amalgamated into state plans
- These are then adjusted to funds availability, and then centre-state dialogue on centre contribution

#### District Plans

District Planning Commissions are supposed to undertake district plans based on plan inputs from gram and block Panchayats. DPC make district plans including department budgets to State Planning Commission. District wise plans to be discussed and accepted, and voted in state budget. 30 % state funds to be routed through districts.

#### District Planning Committee

District Planning Committees enjoy a great degree of constitutional support. In MP they were constituted and re-designed in 1998 as district government posts. Some of the functions of District Planning Committees include:

- Co-ordination;
- Preparation of district plans
- Brings together rural and urban
- Brings together, Panchayats, municipalities, state assembly and parliament members
- Involves others from a district

### **6.9 Role of Gram Panchayat in planning, programmes**

There are three streams in funds and activities, namely:

- Direct funding, both untied and tied to objectives
- Beneficiary selection, or demand based
- Tied Fund utilisation - department schemes and programmes

### **6.10 Panchayat Plans**

Annual GBM are held where plans are proposed, proposals discussed and a plan is developed. For different programmes beneficiary lists are generated. List of demands are prioritised for different government programmes. Panchayat then puts in these as proposals and Gram sabha ratifies them.

These are then submitted to Block and then onto District, depending on the division of sanction powers and programme designs. Plans are put together by the District Planning Committees. Village and Block Chiefs and members meet and negotiate with senior levels.

### **6.11 Panchayat Planning & Functions**

#### Direct Funds

- Village Assembly has to make proposals and then vote on them.
- No external interference in this

Programme Implementation

Programmes are run by centre and state govt - based on norms select the targets/ beneficiaries. Efforts are made to avoid external interference.

Government Schemes and provisions

They are based on demand from Village assembly. Higher levels decide allocations amongst village Panchayats. Basic audit procedure is normally adhered to.

**6.13 Panchayat Finances**

Panchayats receive funds directly from Government of India, and State Governments. Taxation is another method used to generate revenue. However, tax collection methods generally have a poor record.

**6.14 Towards Mahatma Gandhi's Gram Swarajya**

The idea is that the planning process should go to every village and habitation. Village assemblies are empowered and given status and powers. Assemblies made statutory body, which can sue and be sued and are a legal entity. This consists of eight permanent committees and temporary works committees of stakeholders. All work is directed through them.

Village assemblies are to prepare a village level plan. Assembly meets every month, with a quorum of at least 1/3 rd women, and all decision aimed to be unanimous. Panchayat leaders act as facilitators for village assemblies. There are over 50,000 Village assemblies (Gram Sabha), over 400,000 committees, with nearly 4,000,000 members - selected by Village assembly and chair on rotation. All developmental activities to be done with the knowledge of the assembly.

**6.15 Needs of Today**

- Gram Swarajya has changed almost everything
- Awareness of duties and powers, of systems and opportunities
- Planning systems for Villages and Districts need to be established

**Table 12. Political/administration of India's government**

	<b>Political</b>	<b>Admin</b>
National	Parliament (elected)	Government of India and elaborate sectt.
State	Assembly (elected)	State Government
District	District president and District Council	District Council
Block	Block President and Block Council	Block Office
Village	Village Presidnet and ward members	
Panchayat		

## **Part C: Developing the approach to Community-Based-Development**

### **7 Building a common approach**

#### **7.1 Concept for the Community-Based-Planning Project**

Using the CATWOE (Clients, Actors, Transition, World view, Owners and Environment) development planning soft system, attempt was made to build a common approach to community-based-planning.

##### Values and principles for the project

Values and principles of the community-based planning project are that it:

- Should include poor in planning
- Needs to be realistic and practical
- Should plan from vision and strength/opportunities not problems
- Should insure that plans are people focussed
- Is holistic – all sectors
- Should ensure that planning process is implementable using available resources within district
- Mustn't be a once off exercise, should be part of longer process
- Must link in and integrate with existing processes, particularly local government planning
- Must be learning oriented
- Must be empowering
- Mutual promote accountability between community and officials
- Must be flexible and simple
- Should have clearly defined objectives
- Must ensure commitment by councillors and officials
- Must get someone responsible to ensure it gets done
- Must be a legitimate structure that can take funds

##### Clients for the project

Clients for the CBP include: Communities/interest groups/individuals, politicians at local/community levels, service providers (including national/provincial. Departments, NGOs), technical staff.

##### Actors

Important actors in the project would be; clients, central government to check it relates to policy, traditional leaders, business, training organisations, funders.

##### Owners

Owners of CBP are: communities, council, technical staff of council.

##### Transformation

The first column of the table gives the picture of the current situation. The last column depicts the desired situation in five years time. The middle column is about what will/should be done to accomplish the desired outcomes.

**Table 13. The CBP transformation process**

Now	Transformation	Future (in 5 years)
Communities not involved in planning	Involve, raise awareness, drive, train, plan, establish systems	Communities participating effectively in planning through CBP system
Sceptical about planning	Inform, deliver, instil, feedback	Confidence in planning system
Unimplemented plans	Prioritise, plan, implement, do	More realistic plans that are being implemented
Communities not aware of their rights	Educate, inform, involve, exercise, simplify, translate, train	Civic awareness of rights and government activities
Communities overestimate available resources	Inform, be transparent, feedback, involve, prioritise	Communities understand available resources and priorities
Communities dependent in relation to government	Be flexible, empowering, involve, liberate, drive, motivate, inform, do, take initiative, mobilise, changing approach/systems	Communities taking initiatives and mobilising internal and external resources and acting
Unsynchronised planning	Systematise, co-ordinate, integrate, commit, co-operative, network, invite	Co-ordinated planning through CBP and council plans
Council weakened by organisations entering in name of participation	Support, strengthen, co-ordinate, facilitate, dialogue, invite, commit, work together, trust, integrate	External agencies working to support implementation of effective community and district plans
Plans do not reflect local peoples plans	Include, consult, amalgamate, listen, appraise, learn, prioritise, share	Local government plans integrate inputs from communities
Uphazard planning, not systematic	Co-ordinate, systematise, link, align, legislate, organise, commit, incorporate, sustain	Integrated and aligned planning system linking community, local government and other stakeholders Co-ordinated planning within local government
Lack of integration of sectoral plans with council		
Ad hoc PRA/participatory planning		
Lack of co-ordination in planning in municipality		
Reactive/ crisis management planning	Inspire, motivate, develop, train, advocate, commit, consolidate	Short & rolling plans

### Environmental constraints

This section looks at the constraints inherent in the environment in which community-based-projects operate.

- Lack of trust by communities
- Procedures needs to be in line
- Political commitment
- Resources – possibility
- Security –eg. Uganda
- Willingness to participate by some
- Accessibility
- Conflict
- Unwillingness of officials to release power
- Cultural and system constraints to women
- Changing mindset of both communities and officials

Transformation statement

By 2006 a realistic, sustainable and aligned vision-based community and local government planning system has been developed and implemented countrywide in four countries. This will link all stakeholders, empower communities to initiate, mobilise internal and external resources, and to take forward their own development.

Objective

By 2006 a sustainable and integrated vision-based community and local government planning system has been developed and implemented.

## 8 Group Work

Through CATWOE key issues were identified and discussed in groups.

### 8.1 Group work on the Content of a community based plan

It's been proposed that the content of the business plan should the following:

1. Title: Parish/Ward Plan – 2001-2004
2. Executive summary
3. Process
4. Situational analysis
  - Social and poverty analysis/trends
  - Activities and services/stakeholders
  - Resources (resource maps)
  - Cross cutting issues, e.g. environment/HIV/AIDS
  - SWOT analysis
6. What do we want to achieve
  - vision
  - goal
  - objectives
  - prioritised objectives
7. Projects and activities
  - 7.1. Economic
    - a) Project 1 Build a crush pen at....
      - Location and project owners
      - What involved
      - Inputs required (including cost), support and resources
      - Who benefits and how much
      - Monitoring and evaluation (how)
      - Timeframe
      - Risks
      - Responsibilities and roles

**Table 14. Projects and activities**

Economic	Own	Local government		Provincial/National	
		Capital	Recurrent	Capital	Recurrent
Project 1					
Activity 2					
Service 3					

### 8.2 Group work on the Methodology

#### *Assumptions*

- Policy and institutional context of local authority has been completed
- Review previous plans/secondary data
- Opportunities

- Allocations

#### *Pre-planning*

##### Office

- define planning unit and entry point for planning process
- composition of facilitation team and allocation of roles
- synthesis of background data

##### Field-based

- briefing local leaders and raising awareness on the process so they can mobilise the communities/own the process
- stakeholder analysis and define social groups for the planning phase

#### *Planning phase*

##### Visioning

- community meeting – explain process/facilitators introductions
- visioning on realistic preferred outcomes in a given time period
- validation of social groups and interest groups/CBOs for action-planning
- agree time-table for action planning - seasonality

##### Action planning in community groups

- social groups
- CBOs
- interest groups

##### *SL Approach*

- SWOT
- preferred outcomes/vision
- define projects
- priorities projects

##### Consolidation in Community meetings

- groups share plans and priorities
- develop planning matrix

##### *Feedback phase*

- community meeting
- feedback inputs reform local authority
- finalise and endorse plans
- consider service providers, when and how they are involved
- need to think about who is facilitating, training teams, including multiple levels
- may not need local government facilitators at all
- need for documentation and thinking about feedback to different indicators

### 8.3 Group work on the process

#### Assumption

-CBP already exists and communities are participating

**Table 15. Stage of the process of the CBP and activities be undertaken**

Stage	Activities
Information dissemination – 5 <sup>th</sup> month	-Indicative planning figures -Roles/responsibilities -Plan/content/duration/cycle -Process explained -Training of facilitators/planners
Planning and budgeting meetings – 7 <sup>th</sup> month	-First draft of community plans developed
Prioritisation of areas for intervention	-Done by communities -Shortlist produced
Appraisal and integration process – 9 <sup>th</sup> – 10 <sup>th</sup> months	-Appraisal of plans by LG -Inclusion of regional/strategic issues with community plans -Integration of sectoral issues with community plan -Quality control
Feedback to community and finalisation	-Feedback to community on agreed elements -Endorsement and communities revises plans
Implementation plan – month 10-12	-Design -Costing -Work plans -M & E –milestones on plan -progress towards alleviation of poverty

### 8.4 Group work on training and support

The table below discusses areas and types of training and the trainees.

**Table 16. Areas and types of training, and trainees.**

Area of training	Type of training	Who to train
1. Make communities and government officials aware of their rights responsibilities in CBP	Social and poverty analysis of communities Communication (whole range) Benefits of CBP Understanding power relations, leadership and representation in community institutions Policy and legal context CPB (popular versions, local language)	Communities Local government staff Elected local representatives
<b>Indicators:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Communities actively participating in planning process</li> <li>Communities have influence in planing process</li> <li>Realistic goals are being implemented</li> </ul>		
Area of training	Type of training	Who to train
2. Format and structure and conducting of planning process	Plan format, Planning cycle, Planning framework, Communication skills, Facilitation skills, Vision-based planning, Plan development,	Government facilitators and planners, Practitioners, Technicians
	Plan format, Planning cycle, Overview of vision-based/opportunity/outcome planning, Planning framework	Elected local representatives
	Type of exposure	Who to invite

3. External Agencies working in support of CBP	Exposure to plan content, Exposure on possible roles and responsibilities in implementing CBP,	Representatives of training institutions/consultancies, NGOs, Parastatals, business
How: Awareness/issue raising seminars, lunches, eg. With government		
	<b>Type of support</b>	<b>By whom</b>
4. Communities actively involved in training	Organising community meetings, Drawing up timetable of planning and when community/government is available, On-going guidance in facilitating planning process, Cross visit/exposure to communities with completed plans	Local leaders and government facilitators
How: Local leaders on call		

### 8.5 Group work on roles and structure

This group identified structure that should play a leading role in CBP and their specific roles.

**Table 17. Roles and structures in South Africa, Uganda and Zimbabwe**

Roles needed	SA	Uganda	ZIMBABWE
Co-ordination of CBP	IDP Manager	Parish chief; Parish Development Committee (PDC)	Planning officer
Information Education and Communication	Public Relation Officer, Ward Committees	Line Ministries, External Agencies; PDC	District Training Team
Dissemination/awareness	Ward Committees, Public Relation Officer, Community Based Organisation, Faith Based Organisation	Line Ministries, External Agencies, Sub-County Secretary for Information; PDC.	District Technical Team, extensionists, village assembly, ward assembly
Mobilisation	Ward Committees, Development Committees	Parish secretary, village councillor; PDC	Councillor; ward assembly
Training and capacity building	Human Resources Division, NGO, Ward Committees, External Agencies	District Resource Team, Sub-County Resource Team, External Agencies	District Technical Team, Extensionist, External Agencies
Linkage and alignment and integration	IDP Manager, Line Departments	Sub-County Technical Planning Committee	Resources sub-committee; District Planner; councillor; Rural District Development Committee.
Documentation of community demand, assets and SWOT	IDP Manager (and a Technical Team).	Sub-County Investment Committee; Sub-County Technical Planning Committee; District Technical Planning Committee; External agencies; PDC	District Training Team; District Monitoring and Evaluation Team.
Review of CBP documents	IDP Manager (and a Technical Team)	Sub-County Investment Committee; Sub-County Technical Planning Committee; District Technical Planning	District Technical Team

		Committee; PDC	
Preparation of CBP draft document	IDP Manager (and a Team)	Sub-County Technical Planning Committee; PDC	District Planner and District Training Team
Presentation and appraisal	IDP Manager (and a team)	Sub-County Investment Committee	District Training Team and Council
M & E	IDP Manager, Ward Committee; and Councillors	Community; Council; Sub-County Technical Planning Committee.	District Monitoring, Evaluation Team, Communities and Council.

## 8.6 Group work on funding

The group identified areas for which funds should be made available. These are tabled below.

**Table 18. Purpose of funds**

Purpose of funds	Explanation
Discretionary fund for ward/parish	Require assured budgets for small projects/activities as an incentive to be involved in two planning
Training facilitators	We will need to establish a trained team of facilitation, including planners, councillors, departmental staff, traditional leaders, business, communities to facilitate planning
Intensive planning exercises budgeting	This will be the main planning exercise in the community, this will include a pre-visit
Appraisal and integration	To do the appraisal there may be a need for costs to facilitate, e.g., incentives for staff
Feedback	Provide feedback to the community on what has been approved or not. Suggestions to modify plan

## Budgeting

The group further provided an example of how a budget should be broken down.

**Table 19. Example of how a budget for CBP should be broken down**

Activity	Fees	Travel	Subsistence	Others (specify)
Discretionary fund				Capital allocation
Training facilitators	5days /2facilitators	Travel to training sites for facilitators/learners Travelling during training	Sub-during training	Stationary, photocopying, training manuals
Develop manual	5days/2facilitators, 2days to revise			Stationary, photocopying, training manuals
Intensive planning/budgeting exercise		Travel to site and around and pre-visit	X nights/X people	Stationary, copying material
Appraisal/integration			Incentive	Photocopying
Feedback		Travel and sites	Allowances	Photocopying

### 8.7 Group work on Incentives

The group looked at the incentives for communities and external agencies for participating in community-based planning. These and issues for consideration are discussed in table?, below.

**Table 20. Who to compensate, issues, recommendations and who should take the lead.**

Who	Issue	Recommendation	Who
Community incentives	Lack of information on the planing process	Improved civic education	
	unclear intentions	Publicising the plan in appropriate media, regular feedback to community	
	non-availability of progress report		
	no tangible short term benefits	Ensure short-term community-managed actions from locally available resources	
	Limited involvement of traditional leadership	Ensure prominent role of traditional support	
	Ignorance on the local calendar	Consider and agree on the local way of doing things	
culture and beliefs			
Incentives for external agencies	Commitment of local government to support CBP	Relevant skills, adequate budget, logistical support, adequate time, creation of policies that are supportive of CBP, availability of clear guidelines on CBP	Planner, politicians and senior management
	Commitment by NGOs to work with and support local government structures and processes	Confront weaknesses identified in local government instead of avoiding them, provide opportunities for NGOs to influence government processes, regular co-ordination meetings with NGOs to eradicate suspicion, integrate local government plans with those of NGOs	Senior NGO staff, government officials

## **Part D: Developing the approach**

### **9 Wayforward**

#### **9.1 Planning for India**

##### Objectives of the visit

By the end of the visit we will have:

- Used the study as a strategic contribution to advance the learnings from the project in 4 countries
- Influence process in countries – advocacy with influential people (managers and politicians) Zimbabwe; Learning issues – how it can work, sharing experiences  
Specific outputs
- Understanding of Indian development situation
- Learned from India CBP experiences and systems
  - in general
  - areas of success and failure
  - areas to enhance problem areas and questions
- Enhanced country and Africa concepts and pilots
- Report documenting key issues

## 9.2 Planning for Uganda

**Table 21. Planning for Uganda**

Milestone	Activities
Indian trip – who?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• LGDP (Eng. Kasule/Assumpta)</li> <li>• District LGs (Charles Kiberu)</li> <li>• MoLG (Sam Emurut)</li> <li>• ULAA (Raf Magezi)</li> </ul>
Field methodology for CBP (Parish)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Summary of the SA Workshop by Thursday August 2, 2001. (Skeleton related to Uganda Context by Joe)</li> </ul>
Role of “Uganda team” in guideline review	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Selection of consultant – LGDP</li> <li>• Initial briefing Session with Consultant (CK/TB/JA/MO) ½ day by mid August, 2001 co-ordinated by PMU</li> <li>• Review inception by end of August 2001.</li> <li>• Preparation of draft report by last week of September 2001.</li> <li>• “Peer Review Group” meets (inc. TB/JO/CK) by end September 2001</li> </ul>
Communication back to wider audience	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Presentation (20 minutes) back to UPD Net at Annual meeting by September 2001.</li> <li>• Dissemination of Uganda and SA workshop reports by UPD Net by end of August 2001 (TB/UPD Net).</li> <li>• LGDP Regional workshops (20 minutes) by last week of September 2001 including Newsletters to all LGs (MO).</li> </ul>
Links to UNCDF project on capacity building	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• MO shares UNCDF PCD with TB/CK/JA by August</li> <li>• Stakeholders workshop on Draft Project Document by September 2001.</li> </ul>
Advocacy process to MoLG	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Commissioner Local Council Development</li> <li>• Asst. Commissioner Policy &amp; Planning</li> <li>• Kasule/Magezi/Assumpta</li> <li>• Desk officer for LG link person in MoFPED</li> <li>• PMA secretariat.</li> <li>• (MO to organise for the above persons to attend)</li> </ul>
Finalisation of Uganda report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CK/JA forward comments to TB to consultants</li> <li>• Assumpta comments to consultants</li> <li>• Consultants finalise report</li> <li>• Circulation</li> </ul>
SA trip report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Team meet at 5:30 pm</li> <li>• Copy to supervisors, peers and staff</li> </ul>

**Table 22. Activity Chart for India trip**

Activity	Who Leads	August	September	Oct	Dec
India Trip (MoLG/BDLG/ULAA/LGDP)	CARE: Tickets LGDP: Visa	Start 22	Ends 7		
LGDP Review of Planning Guideline	LGDP: Coordination & informing CK; TB; JA	Give CBP Doc Brief	Review inception report Wshop to review draft		
CBF Methodology	JA	Summary framework by A			
Trip Report	All Copy to supervisors, Dfid and Peers				
Communication of CBP	Coordination: LGDP TB to coordinate UPD Net discussion	analyse Uganda Workshop Distribute Workshop report	GDP Regional Workshop PD Net		
UNCDF Project on Deepening Lower LC planning process	LGDP Coordinate	Comments on PCD	stakeholders workshop on raft Prodoc.		
Advocacy	LGDP Coordinate C/LCD; Asst C/PPU; PMA Secretariat; All Indian Trip participants; LG Desk officer at MoFPED		PD Net		

### 9.3 Planning for South Africa

**Table 23. Planning for South Africa**

Pilot Area	Month						
	A	S	O	N	D	J	F
<b>Mangaung</b>							
Planning – validate workshop outputs							
Begin to implement							
Review and refine concept extend to other wards							
Dev dissemination skills for participatory planning							
<b>KZM (Oxfam)</b>							
Meet with Oxfam							
Design concept and plan							
Implement pilot							
Review and refine							
<b>Other pilots</b>							
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Check and assess progress</li> <li>• What future prospects</li> <li>• Share information</li> <li>• CARE pilot-Penny?</li> </ul>							

## 9.4 Planning for Zimbabwe

**Table 24. Planning for Zimbabwe**

Activity	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Who
1. Brief Ashella	06				Jacob
2. Feedback to Gwanda	09				Absalom
3. Document Chim and finish Zimbabwe report					
4. Steering committee <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Briefing on w/s</li> <li>• How t raise awareness</li> <li>• ARDC &amp; UNICEF as members?</li> <li>• Plan who goes to India</li> <li>• Refine timetable</li> </ul>	13	10			IT, MLG, DIP, Gwanda
5. Adapt the generic concept to Zimbabwe <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Decide on planning unit</li> <li>• Proposal for pilot</li> <li>• Budget</li> </ul>	20				IT, MLG, DIP
6. Work on how to get funding including discretionary funding		01-20			
7. Communicate workshop outputs to CBP network	26				ITDG
8. Visit to India		22-07			ITDG, MoLG, Gwanda
9. Review new insights/lessons from India			25		ITDG, MoLG, Gwanda
10. Finalise Pilot design and operational framework				26-10	ITDG, MoLG, Gwanda
11. Implement, monitor and document pilot (2002)					ITDG, MoLG, Gwanda