



**Action learning  
case-study:  
Community Based  
Planning (CBP)**

**October 2007**

**Khanya-African Institute for  
Community-Driven Development  
(Khanya-aicdd)**

Head office: 16A President Steyn Ave, Westdene, Bloemfontein, 9301, Free State, South Africa  
Tel +27 (0)51 430 0712 Fax +27 (0)51 430 8322  
[admin@khanya-aicdd.org](mailto:admin@khanya-aicdd.org)  
[www.khanya-aicdd.org](http://www.khanya-aicdd.org)

Rachel Searle-Mbullu  
Kian Reynolds

© Khanya-African Institute for Community-Driven Development (Khanya-aicdd)  
[September 2007]

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

This case-study is also available from [www.khanya-aicdd.org](http://www.khanya-aicdd.org)

Khanya-aicdd's vision is to be a world class Institute making a major contribution to sustainable development in Africa. Our mission is to promote sustainable livelihoods and community-driven development to address poverty in Africa.

To do this we work in action-learning processes linking government, communities, civil society and business, providing advice, facilitation, action research, implementation, sharing of experience and training, while drawing from global development thinking.

Registered in South Africa under Section 21 of the Companies Act  
as a non-profit company Registration number 2005/006514/08  
Registered in Lesotho as an External Company in terms of Section 286  
of the Companies Act (Act No. 25 of 1967) Registration no. 2005/620E

## Contents

Acronyms.....	iii
1. Overview of case study.....	4
2. Objectives and main components .....	4
3. Creating conditions and capacities.....	4
4. Guiding the project strategy .....	6
5. Ensuring effective operations.....	7
6. Developing and using an M&E system/creating a learning environment .....	10
7. Impacts .....	12
8. Lessons .....	13
Annex 1: References .....	16

## Acronyms

AICDD	African Institute for Community Driven Development
CBP	Community Based Planning
CBOs	Community Based Organisations
CFT	Core Facilitation Team
DFID	Department for International Development
Dplg	Department of Provincial and Local Government
DTT	District Training Team
EU	European Union
HPPG	Harmonised Participatory Planning Guide
LG	Local Government
LGDP	Local Government Development Programme
MoLG	Ministry of Local Government
MLGPWNH	Ministry of Local Government National Housing and Public Works
NGOs	Non governmental Organisations
PPU	Policy and Planning Unit
IDP	Integrated development Plan
RDC	Rural Development Council
PAF	Poverty alleviation Fund
UBOS	Ugandan Bureau of Statistics

## 1. Overview of case study

Planning is a key tool which influences decisions about priorities and resource allocation, and aims to influence the direction, and pace of development. Undertaking development planning requires an understanding of the development process as well as planning skills. Implicit to the concept of development planning is the need for learning through doing so that mistakes of the past are not repeated. (Khanya, 2004) Community-based planning (CBP) is a form of participatory planning which has been designed to promote community action. The methodology was originally developed through a project involving South Africa, Uganda, Zimbabwe and Ghana and was refined in a second phase in South Africa where it is now being rolled out nationally. This case study focuses on the original project drawing on the experiences of South Africa, Zimbabwe and Uganda.

## 2. Objectives and main components

Regional partners who were interested to see how to operationalise decentralisation at the community level came together in April 2001, to inform the planning of a DFID funded action-research project. The focus of the work was how to link citizens more effectively with the state through a participatory planning system linked to the local government planning system. The key partners in the process in each country included partners national government ministries/departments, local government structures, NGOs or other organisations working with participatory planning.

Project activity included:

- In-country review processes of the status of community based planning (April-June 2001)
- Cross-country workshop in South Africa to share learnings (August 2001)
- Development of core methodology and manual (September 2001)
- Study tours to India (September 2001) and Bolivia (May 2002)
- Adaptation of manuals in each country
- Piloting in each country (September 2001-March 2002)
- Workshop to share learnings (July 2002)
- Implementation across the whole of 6 local government areas (October 2001+)
- Dissemination of findings in country and internationally (on-going)
- Proposals for changes to methods, systems and policies (October 2002)
- Final reports by country and across the countries (November 2002)

## 3. Creating conditions and capacities

### 3.1 Where did the idea of the intervention originate and from who?

In 1998-2000, Khanya-aicdd undertook action-research funded by the UK's Department for International development (DFID) looking at 'Institutional Support for Sustainable Livelihoods in Southern Africa'. The main focus of the work was on institutional issues arising in South Africa, Zambia and Zimbabwe, if sustainable livelihoods (SL) were to be promoted. Linking with decentralisation approaches, the work identified that if livelihoods of poor people were to improve the linkages between micro level (community), meso level (local government and district service providers) and macro level (national government departments) would need to be improved, both in terms of improving participatory governance and in terms of improving services. Three key governance requirements were identified at the micro and meso levels if poverty was to be addressed:

#### Micro level

- Poor people must be active and involved in managing their own development (claiming their rights and exercising their responsibilities)

- The need for a responsive, active and accessible network of local service providers (community-based, private sector or government)

#### Meso level

- At local government level (lower meso) services need to be facilitated, provided or promoted effectively and responsively, coordinated and held accountable

The first of these requirements implies community involvement in planning and management of local development and formed the basis of the CBP action-research project.

### 3.2 Identification of stakeholders/partners

Potential partners were approached directly by Khanya who represented a range of sectors, actors and levels in the development system. This was a critical step as one of the critical challenges the project was seeking to address was how to facilitate more effective linkages between the various levels of government planning. Bringing together a diverse group of stakeholders with different interests and agendas and exploring a common goal laid the foundations beginning to address this challenge. It also assisted with identifying critical areas for research and review during the course of the project.

The initial focus was primarily directed towards the macro and meso levels as communities themselves were not involved in the conceptualisation or the initial CBP planning within each of the countries. However, in terms of piloting the CBP concept community members were the essential stakeholders within the process.

### 3.3 Involvement of stakeholders

Efforts were made in all countries to ensure local stakeholders drove their respective in-country processes and that they were central to the learning activities. The establishment of Steering Committees within South Africa and Zimbabwe naturally evolved whilst in Uganda the HPPG project implementers invited stakeholders to workshops at District and National level and their concerns were incorporated into the CBP process within the country.

### 3.4 Influence of funding on motivation

Partners became involved in the project because it was a means to contribute to the developmental processes in-country and a means to involve communities in meaningful developmental planning. The funding provided by DFID did not fund the activities in-country - such as the discretionary funds provided to wards - which had to be raised and mobilised internally. Rather DFID provided funding for overall project support to each country and also for regional and national workshops as well as additional learning activities such as a study tour.

Whilst additional central funds may have enhanced internal capacity and commitment to the CBP process there were certain issues surrounding funding in-country which impacted upon the motivation of stakeholders and processes within the project including:

- In Zimbabwe the initial funds were not sufficient to enable stakeholders to develop a clear understanding of the CBP process. In addition the limited funding hindered potential upscaling of the CBP process within the county, although a lot of interest and enthusiasm was created.
- Funds directed towards the CBP process which by-passed local authorities limited the political buy in of the project and limited the potential for upscaling the process. For example in Zimbabwe in the Binga region where Save the Children UK gave funds

directly to the community without much involvement of the Rural District Council, the process has just remained in one ward whilst in Nyami Nyami Save the Children channelled funds through the local authority to support four wards and due to their acceptance of the process was extended to an additional four wards.

- In Uganda certain developmental grants were used as a form of incentive to ensure participatory planning was carried out. If local governments fail on participatory Development Planning they stand to lose a significant proportion of their development grant from central government. This obliges the district to look for sources of funding for CBP; even at times utilising local revenue. In this regard funding was a definite influence on motivation where holding back of development grants was used as a form of incentive

## 4. Guiding the project strategy

### 4.1 How was the intervention designed?

A set of principles were developed based on the sustainable livelihoods approach which were central to the design of the project, these include:

- The need to ensure that poor people are included in planning;
- Systems need to be realistic and practical, and the planning process must be implementable using available resources within the district/local government, and must link in and integrate with existing processes, particularly local government planning;
- Planning must be linked to a legitimate structure that can handle funds in a legitimate, accountable and transparent manner – in South Africa a ward
- Planning should not be a once off exercise, but should be part of longer-term development process;
- The plan must be people focused and empowering;
- Planning must be done from peoples' visions and using their strengths and available opportunities, not problems-based;
- Plans must be holistic and cover all sectors;
- The plan and process must be learning oriented;
- Planning should promote mutual accountability between community and officials;
- There must be commitment by politicians and officials, and there must be someone responsible to ensure it gets done.

A core methodology was developed across by partners at an initial cross-county workshop and adapted in each country. Generally a similar process was held in all of the other countries although the actual implementation of the CBP pilots varied according to the developmental context within the country of implementation. For example in Zimbabwe the Rural District Councils took the lead in each district. District training teams were established and trained to support the planning process at district level whilst core facilitation teams were established at a ward level. Local leaders such as headmen and Councillors mobilised the different socio-economic groups to participate in the planning process within the wards and sharing was then done at district level involving socio-economic group representatives, who later provided feedback to the broader community.

### 4.2 How did the intervention link into the development system?

One of the key challenges identified in stimulating meaningful community development and a major justification for the CBP action research project was the poor linkages between the

micro, meso and macro levels of governance and administration. So it was vital that the project linked very closely to the existent development system within each country.

This was achieved in a number of different ways within the different countries. In South Africa CBP established a participatory process for mobilising communities and planning around grassroots issues which could be related to the broader municipal planning perspective. Linking CBP and the formal local planning system based on the Integrated Development Plans (IDPs) created the opportunity to ground IDPs in the local context, and gave greater meaning to the participatory requirements of the Municipal Systems Act. CBP also enables sector departments to have a detailed understanding of the situation in the municipal area, which can assist them to plan and implement their programmes appropriately.

In Zimbabwe, the CBP process mainstreamed community empowerment and inclusion principles in the decentralisation framework. The principle and concept of the creation of village and ward assemblies was noble because it sought to ensure the inclusion of all adults in the planning process. NGOs, donors and government departments therefore also recognised community structures as important entities within the developmental framework within the country. The process also used the existing structures based partly on the fact that in the past, traditional structures had held such responsibilities and this had ensured harmony and good governance in the villages.

In Uganda the Government of Uganda was committed to decentralisation of decision-making and service delivery obligations to Local Governments. Accordingly development planning was adopted as an approach through which the provisions of section 36 of the Local Governments (Amendment) Act of 1977 could be fully realised. The approach encouraged participation and involvement of all key stakeholders in development planning and implementation. Among those to be included in the planning process at parish/ward levels are representatives of livelihood groups, parish councils, village councils, Parish Development Committees, service providers, NGOs, CBOs and private sector organisations.

## **5. Ensuring effective operations**

### 5.1 How was the intervention managed, led and facilitated?

The overall project was led by Khanya who drove the overall process and coordinated the learning activities and actual findings emerging from the project. However, the intervention was led by different partners within each of the counties; by MoLG PPU in Uganda, by Practical Action in Zimbabwe and by Khanya in South Africa. Their roles in-country were to co-ordinate activities, document and disseminate information and drive the CBP action learning process.

In Uganda for example the MoLG PPU designed the vision of the HPPG, solicited the views of various stakeholders, drafted the strategy, and designed the TORs for a consultant to prepare a HPPG manual and field test it. They solicited for the funding of the HPPG manual and subsequent roll-out throughout the country was done through LGDP II, with DFID, EU and Danida support

### 5.2 Management of intervention

Whilst Khanya was accountable to the donor and played an overall coordination role, management of the intervention was devolved and shared by all stakeholders including macro level policy decision makers within participating countries. This helped pave the way for CBP processes to be incorporated into national policy at the end of the initial funding period.

For example in Zimbabwe stakeholders recognised at the outset that if the CBP process was to be sustained beyond the period of external funding, the government line ministries and the rural district councils needed to be fully aware of and committed to the process. The process therefore prioritised the need to work with and strengthen the local capacity of all institutions to facilitate the process at both district and ward levels. The ward planning was facilitated by a combined team made up of district representatives and local facilitators drawn from the wards. At national level the MLGPWNH led the co-ordination of all national sharing events such as workshops.

### 1.5.3 Ownership and commitment of partners

The levels of ownership differed considerably between stakeholders within the different countries which impacted upon the overall maintenance of the projects in numerous different ways.

In South Africa ownership of the project tended to be dominated by individual partners, particularly Khanya themselves. Thus, in some instances certain partners did not share an equal sense of ownership within the project. These tensions were especially evident within the initial stages of the project and to combat this, an in-country steering committee was formed which would drive the expansion of the project into eight additional pilot municipalities. An additional problem in terms of maintaining ownership was that much of the commitment and ownership of the project sat with individuals as opposed to institutions, which became problematic when the relevant stakeholders changed positions or were replaced.

In Uganda the MoLG PPU fully owned the process of the HPPG; championing its design and roll-out right from the grassroots to the national budgeting process. Other key players were considered partners but definitely did not own the CBP process. The type of partnerships to the HPPG also differed with certain partners providing technical expertise, funds or a combination of both. Importantly some of the stakeholders did not remain with the Ministry throughout the entire process and their contribution declined along the way; these partners amongst others included Austria Aid and the Population Secretariat.

### 5.4 Process support provided

In order to roll out CBP at the various levels major process support was required at these different levels of the intervention. The extent and variation of this support can be clearly seen in the Zimbabwe case study illustrated below on table 1.

**Table 1: Process support in the Zimbabwe CBP study**

<b>Process support provided</b>	<b>To whom</b>	<b>By whom</b>
Revision of the CBP generic and training manuals and guidelines.	Practical Action Facilitation Team and DTT	Khanya, Practical Action, Development in Practice.
Training of DTT and CFT	DTT and CFT in each district	Practical Action
Conducting trial runs in two wards	Pilot wards in Gwanda, Binga, Chimanimani and Bulilima	Practical Action, DTT, CFT.
Conducting intensive planning	CFT	Practical Action, DTT

Process support provided	To whom	By whom
Knowledge sharing workshops at national level	CBP stakeholders (NGOs, Line ministries, RDCs)	Practical Action, MLPWNH
Provide process funds for the implementation of community based initiatives	Ward socio-economic groups	Practical Action, Rural District Councils
Giving technical back up of the CBP process	NGOs (Save the Children, SNV and five RDCs)	Practical Action.

One of the elements noticeable in the above table was that Practical Action, the project implementers, were involved in all of the support processes and activities thereby essentially driving the support process within the country. This was not exactly the case in Uganda as the MoLG hired consultants to support implementation, but they did oversee this process and ensured the performance of the consultants and thus were critical in the support process within the country.

So significant support was needed from many different players in order to develop full ownership and commitment of stakeholders and to ensure that the actual planning processes were implemented effectively within the various pilot sites. To some extent this support also allowed for a level of oversight across and between the pilots with regard to quality and outcomes.

### 5.5 Flexibility in design and operation

Flexibility was built into the design of the project. For example in South Africa as the process was piloted, lessons were drawn which were then implemented into the design of the project:

- The CBP process was modified in certain situations to fit communities availability and preferences, notably in affluent and commercial farming areas;
- Ethekwini Municipality reworked the CBP and changed it in terms of how to document the ward plan.

In Uganda the HPPG was designed in a very participatory and flexible manner. It endeavoured to incorporate the interests of all stakeholders. Due to this the actual design of the project took over a year because it was constantly revised to incorporate emerging needs and recommendations. The pilots were also continually monitored and reviewed in national stakeholder workshops and recommendations emerging from these events were also factored back into the design of the project. For example the LG stakeholders contended that the monitoring formats suggested in the HPPG for the pilots were too detailed and complicated and as a result the formats were amended and drawn into the project.

### 5.6 Piloting

Country	Pilot
South Africa	The initial pilot in South Africa was rolled out in Mangaung in the Free State. The municipality implemented CBP in all 43 wards; both in the city of Bloemfontein and rural areas. This occurred over the period of September 2001 to March 2002. 42 of the 45 wards completed their plans and 41 of the 42 wards spent their R50,000 allocation. In 18 of the 20 wards surveyed, ward committees met regularly afterwards, implying that the planning was giving them some impetus (CBP comparative report, 2004). Subsequent to the initial pilot in Mangaung CBP was then piloted in eight other municipalities in South Africa

Country	Pilot
Zimbabwe	The project was piloted in the Gwanda and Chimanimani districts. The piloting process was very successful in Gwanda while in Chimanimani it was affected by increased political polarisation. Chimanimani district was then controlled by the Movement for Democratic Change, the main opposition political party in Zimbabwe. There was a tug of war among the Councillors. Only half of the wards conducted the CBP process. Subsequently some organisations like Save the Children UK and SNV who had resources have used the experiences from the initial pilot districts to implement CBP in the Nyami Nyami and Bulilima districts respectively.
Uganda	Fourteen higher local governments (10 districts and four municipalities) representing the four regions of Uganda and with different experiences in local government planning processes were sampled for the piloting exercise. Municipalities and town councils were included in order to capture their unique issues pertaining to urban planning using the HPPG.

Key lesson from the piloting experience in the three countries included:

- Piloting in one location before scaling up the project to other locations can be a useful exercise allowing refinement of the process and identification of problems.
- Political interference and power play have a major impact and thus it is essential to get political buy-in from all political players in the region before implementing pilots.
- In order to be effective piloting needs to be conducted in diverse regions including urban, peri-urban and rural areas in order to identify specific challenges in these areas. For example in South Africa the CBP process needed to be shortened in commercial farming areas due to time constraints.

## 6 Developing and using an M&E system/creating a learning environment

### 6.1 Learning and M&E

Documentation and sharing amongst all stakeholders were the primary tools to promote learning. However, there were no detailed programmes in any of the counties to specifically address issues around learning, but this did not lessen the central role of learning activities within the project.

In Zimbabwe the learning process occurred on three levels. At the national (macro) level learning was mostly through national workshops where papers and case studies from the districts were shared amongst stakeholders. At district level (meso) annual review workshops and institutional level case studies were used to share lessons whilst at a community level (micro) level review and reflection meetings were held at ward assemblies and lessons generated were used to realign identified activities.

In South Africa learning was shared through a range of events and activities. These included National workshops both before and after the piloting, multi-country workshops e.g. SALGA conference in South Africa and regular steering committee meetings that were generally held every 2 months. In addition CBP processes were documented from the concept to actual CBP implementation plans for wards. These were then shared and distributed to the partners attending the national workshops. In addition a newsletter was published on CBP process and experiences in South Africa.

In Uganda training materials on the HPPG were produced and disseminated and over 30,000 copies were distributed to relevant stakeholders. Training of LGs on the use of the HPPG was also provided and district and urban planning guides were developed as well as an operation manual.

These learning channels were fed by the monitoring activity that took place during the project. In Uganda the HPPG process is monitored through spot checks by the PPU and Inspectorate department of the MoLG as part of their regular inspection duties. These activities were funded by the Poverty Alleviation Fund (PAF) programme of the Ministry of Finance. In South Africa there is a detailed CBP/IDP Management Guide which has a detailed section on M&E. Specific monitoring actions include that ward committees monitoring and reporting on activity, usually on a monthly basis, and feeding the information to the municipality.

Despite the need for evaluation not all of the countries undertook formal evaluations. For example, in Zimbabwe no major CBP evaluations were conducted except for self-evaluation exercises done by Practical Action. The actual process in the countries which did adopt a formalised evaluation process also differed considerably. In Uganda one of the assessments of LGs was an indicator of development planning, which was to a large extent a proxy for HPPG. In South Africa the evaluations were performed at a ward level and were performed by the ward committees and the evaluation process was incorporated into the actual planning process.

The inability of Zimbabwe to undertake a formal evaluation process was a major limitation to their ability to upscale the process in-country and again highlights the challenges of not being able to source additional internal funding

## 6.2 How learning was fed back into intervention processes

The CBP project set out to learn from and build on previous experiences of attempts to increase participation in resource allocation and community development planning. The initial project methodology was then adapted as the process of implementing CBP developed within each country. Learnings were fed back into the intervention via regular in-country meetings and national workshops where representatives from each of the countries would meet to discuss and share learnings. These learnings were then fed back into the CBP process within each county (Toner, 2006).

Positive examples of this were seen in South Africa where numerous learning workshops were held for individual municipalities. The proceedings of these workshops were documented and later shared at a national workshop which resulted in the CBP guide. However the experiences were not always positive. In Zimbabwe for example, the steering committee were at times disconnected with field staff on the ground and meetings between the committees, community structures and NGOs occurred only on an ad hoc basis or failed to take place. This limited opportunities for review and re-assessment.

## 6.3 How the intervention shared its lessons

Sharing of lessons between stakeholders happened between stakeholders in-country through meetings and workshops and also at a regional level between countries. However the project invested considerable time in trying to share the CBP experience and lessons with a much wider audience. Material was available on partner websites and a video was produced detailing the process undertaken in each country. Articles were written for various publications including the ODI Briefing series (reference) and PLA notes (reference).

## 7 Impacts

### 7.1 Livelihoods

In Zimbabwe there was evidence of increased uptake of food production and diversification technologies by vulnerable socio-economic groups as result of the CBP process as the approach encouraged a community culture that focused on maximising the community's capacity to enrich and enhance the quality of life of all socio-economic groups. It also made local communities come up with local risk management strategies such as local food aid systems. The CBP process was therefore a useful tool for increasing local resilience and increasing adaptive options bringing in more coping mechanisms for vulnerable communities.

According to Ugandan Bureau of Statistics (UBOS) reports, between 2003 to 2006 social service indicators improved in the area in which CBP was applied, which can in part be attributed to social investments influenced by improved bottom-up planning through the HPPG

### 7.2 Policies

Policy influence was able to occur in Uganda because the PPU in the MoLG championed the HPPG. The unit has a large stake in the national budgeting process through the Local Government Budgeting framework. This clearly illustrates that if the project implementers are in a position to influence policy it is that much easier to upscale the project and to incorporate it into existing policy.

In Zimbabwe limited policy influence has occurred but the CBP although still in its infancy stage it is trying to address the current confusing arrangements where line ministries have developed their own policies and guidelines independent of the potential roles of other players like the communities, the RDCs, NGOs and other relevant line ministries. The policy influencing thus remains the agenda of the CBP process. It however, needs to find a champion within existent government structures if it is likely to take this concept further and will also need to identify additional resources to advance policy interventions.

In South Africa the CBP project has led to a change in policy through the National Policy Framework for Public Participation which was heavily influenced by the CBP process. The close links established with the dplg, the effective piloting of the concept and subsequent dissemination activity generated from the pilots helped promote positioning of CBP within the National Policy Framework for Public Participation. In addition CBP is now included as a mandatory part of the curricula/ modules that Ward Committees in South Africa undergo.

### 7.3 Systems/practices

Essentially the CBP project was implemented to link the various levels of government. In order to achieve this outcome the CBP process was designed to impact on existent structures and developmental practices in a number of ways.

The Zimbabwean Case study highlights this point by indicating that the results, lessons and experiences from pilot districts identified benefits which can be realised from the application or integration of CBP with any development intervention:

- CBP brought new levels of commitment from communities, CBOs and service providers working within a collectively agreed vision

- Use of CBP, results in plans that are based on local strengths, opportunities and a collective vision rather than a shopping list of problems faced by communities and other vulnerable groups.
- CBP promotes inclusiveness of marginalized groups in the planning and development process as it encourages involvement of all the socio-economic groups in the planning and visioning process.
- The CBP process is powerful in convincing local powerful elites to support people and livelihood focused initiatives after the agreement on a shared vision. The CBP strengthened the developmental and facilitation role of traditional leaders, councillors and the local authority in a manner that give local communities new confidence about improvement of their well-being. This confidence tended to increase the levels of community participation and their ability to build on their strengths and opportunities around them.

#### **7.4 Capacities**

Improvement of local capacities was significant within all of the countries. In South Africa initial training was done with selected municipal officials so that they would be in a position to train others within the municipality. The second stage was to assist the trained people within the municipality to undertake training on their own although this process was overseen by Khanya. The CBP process was also seen as an ongoing process promoting a continual improvement of capacity at a municipal level. Local community capacity was also enhanced through participation within the planning process and by being able to influence their developmental outcomes.

Positive elements of capacity development were also seen in Zimbabwe and Uganda. In Zimbabwe each participating representative became a local resource from which knowledge and skills could be cascaded to others. In Uganda the annual National Assessment of the Local Governments from 2003 to 2006 revealed that there had been a dramatic improvement in the quality of participatory planning in the higher and lower levels of local governments, parishes and villages, which was largely attributed to the CBP processes.

### **8. Lessons**

#### **8.1 Rolling out CBP**

- In terms of the CBP methodology the sequencing of tools and decisions about which tools to actually utilise within the process was extremely important. In South Africa the sequencing was guided by the ward structures and the context of the ward. In this regard it is important that those who do the CBP training are familiar with the tools.
- Another important lesson drawn from South Africa was that there is a need to develop a learning framework before the actual initiation of the project.
- In Zimbabwe the ward plans were mostly supported by resources from the local community (85%) with very little (<15%) or no resources coming from the local authorities and other support institutions. This clearly shows that the intensive planning lacked consultation with other key stakeholders and that the available resources from external stakeholders were not fully explored before the initiation of the project. However, a positive element that arose from this point was that the CBP process made the local communities demand self identified and locally resourced initiatives. However the lack of funding significantly impacted on the ability to effectively implement M&E activity that could have served as a platform for more rigorous learning.

Overall the CBP approach is a powerful development process; key elements of the process which promote community driven development include:

- Identifying and creating 'learning linkages' between active and non-active as well as informal and formal groups at community level. The linkage among groups created space for sharing needs and developmental priorities.
- Creating an enabling environment for more transparent and inclusive mechanisms and processes of identifying, mobilizing and strengthening different socio-economic groups (including the marginalised) and their leaders into a dialogue on issues that affect them.
- Developing a shared understanding of the communities desired developmental outcomes.

## 8.2 Exit, upscaling and replication

- The CBP process requires the support of local governance structures and opinion leaders in the community. It is extremely difficult to influence policy at a national level if the correct stakeholders are not on board at the onset of the project. This will ensure participating communities and stakeholders have a long-term commitment to the planning process that is taking place.
- Good facilitation is essential to ensure the correct implementation of the project; inherent in this is the need to select the right tools for the process and to apply them patiently and carefully through enlightened facilitation.
- Upscaling and policy influence will generally require resources eg need to have evidence of effectiveness and these outcomes will need to be shared and advocated. If these funds are not readily available as was the case in Zimbabwe it can severely impact upon the process.

## 8.3 Action learning process in the intervention

- Despite limited resources for learning and sharing, with the commitment of partners to use their own resources and leverage others, the project has achieved an impact way beyond its original conception, particularly in South Africa and Uganda, with wide interests internationally.
- Financial resources can often limit the extent to which monitoring happens but effective monitoring and evaluation can be a forum for learning and also provide useful feedback and evidence to inform review and reflection.
- Stakeholders and partners need to have some ownership of the process. Without this there is a tendency for wavering commitment.
- Even where there is dual ownership there is a tendency for one partner to dominate. However, this in itself may actually be necessary to ensure to project progresses. The formation of a steering committee may ease the dominance of certain partners while still ensuring the process moves forward.
- Ownership and commitment needs to be focused on institutions as opposed to individuals to ensure both factors are continuous throughout the projects duration.

## 8.4 Future civil-society government partnerships

- It is critical that awareness and understanding of the process is built amongst government officials and councillors from the onset of the programme. This will strengthen their commitment, making the forging of relationships with civil society more valuable.
- As was the case in South Africa the identification of champions within the process can go a long way to ensuring government participation and action within the relationship.
- However, potential champions should be aimed at specific departments as opposed to individuals within the Departments.

- Coalitions with government are an essential outcome if civil society is to affect policy changes within the country.
- Civil society and other traditional leaders that have the ability to influence community decisions should be involved in the planning and learning processes

## **Annex 1: References**

(Primarily taken from the three individual reports on SA, Zim and Uganda)

Toner. A, 2006 A review of key features leading to the success of the Community-Based Planning Action Research project'. Bradford Centre for International Development.

Khanya-aicdd. 2004 'Comparative report on CBP experience in Uganda SA Ghana and Zimbabwe'. Khanya-mrc, Bloemfontein. Available online at <http://khanya-aicdd.org>

Khanya-aicdd. 2003 CBP Update, Number 1. September 2003. Available online at <http://khanya-aicdd.org>

Khanya-aicdd. 2003 Making the link between micro and meso: learning from experience on Community Based Planning (CBP) . Available online at <http://khanya-aicdd.org>