

**CBP Partner meeting
Bloemfontein,
31 October - 1 November
2002**

6 November 2002

Project Manager: 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
goldman@internext.co.za
Website www.khanya-mrc.co.za

Acknowledgements

This 4 country meeting was organised by Khanya, with Mangaung Local Municipality organising the previous SA workshop and visits. Thanks to the project partners who have taken forward the CBP project with such enthusiasm and commitment. Welcome also to new partners who joined us at this meeting, Limpopo Department of Agriculture and Greater Tzaneen Local Municipality. This meeting yet again provided considerable impulse for partners to take forward the project into the end of this phase.

Ian Goldman 5 November 2002

This meeting was funded by DFID as part of the Community-Based Planning Project. 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/cbp

Further information and contacts

All project documents can be found on the Community-Based Planning Page at www.khanya-mrc.co.za/cbp. These include: reports on the situation with CBP in each country; reports on visit to India; the core, Ugandan and SA manuals, examples of community-based plans. For further details, please contact the project manager, Ian Goldman (goldman@khanya-mrc.co.za).

Partner contacts in each country are:

South Africa

Yusuf Patel, Decentralised Development Planning,
Department of Provincial and Local Government (DPLG)
JJ Matlole, City Manager, Mangaung Municipality
Penny Ward, CARESA
Jo Abbot, CARESA
Musa Soni, SALGA
Baba Tiert, LADEC, Limpopo Province

Yusuf@dso.pwv.gov.za
ceo@civic.bfncouncil.co.za
pjward@netactive.co.za
JoAbbot@care.org.ls
msoni@salga.org.za
tiertobn@agricho.norprov.gov.za

Uganda

Martin Onyach-Olaa, Local Government Development Programme
Charles Kiberu, Bushenyi District Local Government
Tom Blomley, CARE Uganda
Peter Okiira, Uganda Participatory Development Network (UPDNet)
Joyce Stanley, UNCDF

peri@imul.com
cobsbush@africaonline.co.ug
blomley@careug.org
cdm@imul.com
joyce.stanley@undp.org

Zimbabwe

Ashella Ndhlovu, Ministry of Local Government
Absolom Masendeke, IT Southern Africa
Ronnie Sibanda, Gwanda Rural District Council
Wilton Mhlanga, Chimanimani Rural District Council

anash@africaonline.co.za
absolomm@itdg.org.zw

Ghana

Tay Awoosah, ISODEC
Philomena Johnson, National Development Planning Commission
John Cofie-Agama, Ministry of Local Government
Francis Owusu, Adanse East District Assembly
Sampson Kwarteng, Asante Akim District Assembly

tay@isodec.org.gh
cofieagama@yahoo.com
owusufa@yahoo.com
nashkwart@yahoo.com

ODI

John Farrington

JOHNF@odi.org.uk

CONTENTS

Acknowledgements	i
Further information and contacts	ii
GLOSSARY	iv
2 Overview	2
2.1 Goal	2
2.2 Purpose	2
2.3 Outputs	2
3 Updates	4
3.1 Ghana	4
3.2 Limpopo	4
3.3 Uganda	6
3.4 Zimbabwe	7
4 Evaluations	10
4.1 South Africa	10
4.2 Uganda	15
5 Updating the learnings	18
5.1 Community participation and ownership	18
5.2 Stakeholder involvement	19
5.3 CBP Planning process and methodology	20
5.5 Finance	22
5.6 Link to local government planning process	23
5.7 Follow-up and community management	24
5.8 Changes required	25
6 Learnings about the project process	26
6.1 Overall project management	26
6.2 Four- Country Meetings	26
6.3 Study tours – need to do cost/benefit analysis	27
6.4 Exchange of facilitators	27
6.5 In-country processes	28
6.6 Communication and documentation	29
6.7 In-Country Pilots	29
7 Country ways forward	30
7.1 Action Plans for SA	30
7.2 Ghana	31
7.3 Zimbabwe	32
7.4 Uganda	33
8 Way forward for the project	34
8.1 Activities to complete this project phase	34
8.2 Activities beyond the end of this phase	34
Annex 1 Partners joining the meeting	36
Annex 2 Programme	37

GLOSSARY

CAO	Chief Administrative Officer (Uganda)
CBP	Community-based planning
CEO	Chief Executive Officer (of Council, Zimbabwe)
CFT	Community facilitation team (Zimbabwe)
CSO	Civil society organisations
DCD	Deputy Coordinating Director (Ghana)
DTT	District training team (Zimbabwe)
HPPG	Harmonised Participatory Planning Guidelines (Uganda)
IDP	Integrated Development Plan (SA)
IPF	Indicative planning figure (Uganda)
LADEP	Limpopo Agricultural Development Programme
LG	Local Government
LGA	Local Government Act
LGBFP	Local government budget framework paper (Uganda)
LGDP	Local Government Development programme (Uganda)
MLGPWNH	Ministry of Local Government, Public Works and National Housing (Zimbabwe)
MoLG	Ministry of Local Government (Uganda)
NGO	Non-government Organisation
PC	Parish Council (Uganda)
PDC	Parish Development Committee (Uganda)
PDM	Bolivian Municipal Development Plan
PEAP	Poverty Eradication Action Plan (Uganda's poverty reduction strategy)
PMA	Plan for Modernisation of Agriculture (Uganda)
POA	Annual Operational Plan for municipalities in Bolivia
PRA	Participatory rural appraisal
SA	South Africa
S/C	Sub-county (Uganda)
ToT	Training of trainers
UNCDF	United Nations Capital Development Fund

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1 Introduction

This report is of the 3rd four country partner meeting held in the Community-Based Planning project. The objectives of the meeting were to have identified the main learnings about CBP and way the project has been run, planned for after project end, including any continued pan-African work.

2 Overview

The project goal is *By 2003, community-based planning systems have been developed and are operating in 4 African countries which are integrated into the local government planning and resource allocation system.*

We have achieved implementation of the goal within the project life with CBP systems operating within 6 local governments in the 4 countries, although not yet fully implemented in Ghana, and incorporation of CBP into national policy in Uganda and SA. There has been widespread dissemination and interest in the project internationally.

3 Updates from each country since July 2002

In Ghana the Steering Group has become active and met several times in this period. A training has been held for Area Councils in both pilot local governments. However it did not prove possible to continue to full implementation, nor hold the national workshop due to interference by other processes. These will now be undertaken by February 2003.

In South Africa an additional province (Limpopo) has piloted CBP in 31 villages. A new municipality is now involved (Greater Tzaneen) with whom this will be taken forward.

In Uganda in Bushenyi District refresher training has been carried out with subdistrict officials. A review process has been established nationally for the Harmonised Participatory Planning Guide (HPPG) which has incorporated much of the CBP methodology and which will be partially funded by UNCDF.

In Zimbabwe implementation is nearly complete in Gwanda Rural District Council (RDC) with 19/23 wards successfully completed. Chimanimani RDC has only 5 wards completed. In addition there has been considerable interaction with the Ministry of Local Government.

4 Evaluations

Evaluations have now been conducted in Mangaung and Bushenyi districts. The Mangaung evaluation concluded that CBP had been successful, with 42 wards plans completed and all except one taking projects forward. Wards were very satisfied with CBP and the facilitation, and there has been impact in terms of plan quality, service improvement and empowerment and CBP has influenced the IDP. The planning has addressed the needs of poor people. However there are a number of areas where the process can be improved, including improved facilitator training, improved support, better preplanning and better linkages with the IDP.

In Bushenyi there has also been an impact with 170 parish plans completed, 98 staff trained, high levels of ownership and pride among parish staff and communities and evidence of changed priorities towards “software” rather than “hardware”. The poor were included in the

planning process, although their priorities sometimes were lost. The use of staff across sectors to facilitate the plans built broad ownership and meant that so many plans could be done. There was a problem in the timing of the initial CBP process which did not fit into the planning cycle, issues around incentives for participants, need for more capacity-building, and need to allocate a specific budget for planning.

5 Learnings

During the last 4 country meeting a series of learnings were generated. These were updated at this meeting, around the following themes:

- Community participation and ownership
- Stakeholder involvement
- CBP planning process and methodology
- Facilitation and training
- Finance
- Link to local government planning process
- Follow-up and community management
- Changes required to policies and systems

6 Learnings about project process

As this may be the last meeting of the 4 country partners, a brainstorming exercise was conducted around the strengths and weaknesses of the different elements of the project process covering: project management, 4 country meetings, study tours, exchange of facilitators, national workshops, national reviews, national Steering Groups, communication and documentation, and in-country pilots.

7 Ways forward for each country

South Africa has planned for continuation of CBP in Mangaung and Greater Tzaneen, and the move from project to programme led by a national Steering Committee. Ghana has planned to implement CBP in the two districts by January 2003, with a national workshop in February 2003. Zimbabwe will complete implementation in the 2 districts, as well as do a pilot in the Minister of Local Government's village and hold a national workshop in February. Uganda's process now concentrates on taking forward the HPPG with training of trainers and an on-going review process of implementation of the HPPG.

8 Ways forward for the project

Country reports now have to be completed by January with the overall technical report by February. The project will have achieved its goal (not purpose) by March 2003. Several activities are proposed to be continued during the following year based on advocacy, evaluation in Ghana and Zimbabwe, rolling of the plans with some on-going sharing, which would ideally be funded centrally. DFID will be approached to see if it is possible to fund these additional activities which will help implementation of CBP into policy and practice.

Report from October CBP Partner Meeting, Maselspoort, South Africa

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

This report is of the 3rd four country partner meeting held in the Community-Based Planning project. Most of the partners also joined for the SA national workshop held for the 2 previous days, where they presented on their own experience. The list of people attending is in Annex 1 and the programme for the meeting in Annex 2.

The objectives of the meeting were:

By the end of the workshop we have:

- Identified the main learnings about CBP itself (process and content)
- Identified the main learnings about the way the project has been run
- Planned how to support in-country processes after project end,
- and whether there is a need for expansion/any pan-African work and how we would make it happen

The workshop started on the evening of 30th October with objectives and introductions, updates on country progress and results of the evaluations on the morning of 31st October, and then group work updating the learnings from the Uganda meeting. The 1st of November focused on learnings about the project process, and developing ways forward, in-country and internationally.

2 Overview

2.1 Goal

The project goal is *By 2003, community-based planning systems have been developed and are operating in 4 African countries which are integrated into the local government planning and resource allocation system.*

We have achieved implementation of the goal within the project life with CBP systems operating within 6 local governments, although not yet fully implemented in Ghana. This is likely to happen by February. In terms of resource allocation there has also been considerable impact with the plans directing the municipal plans, and generation of local resources for the plans. Some more work is still needed to integrate this more effectively and develop appropriate systems.

2.2 Purpose

The project purpose is that *realistic plans have been developed in each of 4 African countries for policy change, implementation or piloting of community-based planning (CBP) systems, which participating institutions are committed to take forward.*

CBP has already been piloted in all 4 countries, plus in an additional province in South Africa, Limpopo. It has already been fully implemented in Mangaung Local Municipality in SA, Bushenyi Local Government in Uganda, and most of Gwanda RDC in Zimbabwe. It is likely to be implemented in the two participating local governments in Ghana, Chimanmani RDC in Zimbabwe, and potentially Greater Tzaneen Local Municipality in SA.

In terms of policy change Uganda has already incorporated CBP into a national sub-district planning methodology, SA has incorporated CBP into a national performance indicator for the national Department of Provincial and Local Government.

2.3 Outputs

Output	Indicator By June 2002 (extended to March 2003):	Progress as at 30 September 2002
1 Start-up effective with teams operational and case studies selected	1.1 Two case study sites selected/agreed by hosts 1.2 Consultants commissioned and workshops arranged	1.1 Case studies selected as Madhya Pradesh and Bolivia 1.2 Consultants commissioned in all 4 countries and first phase of in-country work completed
2 Methodology finalised and understood by participants	2.1 Team able to adapt methodology for case study	2.1 Core methodology developed for participating country case studies 2.2 Generic CBP manual developed, and adapted version produced in all 4 countries. 2.3 Manual being adapted based on experience.
3 Case studies completed, clarifying best practice lessons from case studies and recommendations	3.1 Report on existing country experience produced for each participating country 3.2 Report on each of 2 case studies produced identifying learnings	3.1 4 country case studies completed and written up. 3.2 Visits to India and Bolivia completed and written up.

Output	Indicator By June 2002 (extended to March 2003):	Progress as at 30 September 2002
4 Learnings amongst partners workshopped and disseminated in-country	4.1 Workshop happens 4.2 Reference group meets in-country to discuss findings	4.1 All countries have held workshops and country reports have been produced. 4.2 Reference groups have met regularly in Uganda, SA and Zimbabwe and being incorporated into on-going programmes 4.3 Exchange visit happened for facilitators from SA to Uganda in April 2002, from Uganda to Zimbabwe and Ghana in September 2002. 4.4 Learnings from methodology workshopped at Uganda partner meeting July 2002
5 Implementation plans developed which reflect learning and are refined by comments from collaborating partners	5.1 Plans produced for all 4 countries 5.2 Proposals made for how policy should be modified	5.1 Pilots planned in all 4 countries 5.2 Uganda – National guidelines being adapted at present to incorporate CBP. SA – CBP included in indicators for national Ministry. Ghana –piloted. Zimbabwe policy decisions after national workshop.
Unplanned outputs		
6 Pilots run and methodology adapted		6.1 Pilots run in one district in SA and Uganda, and 2 districts in Zimbabwe and Ghana.
7 Methodology applied in all of at least one local government area in each country		7.1 Full implementation in a city in SA (Mangaung/Bloemfontein) and one rural district in Uganda (Bushenyi) covering 1.5 million people 7.2 Implementation started in 2 districts of Ghana and part way in 2 districts of Zimbabwe 7.3 Implementation in sample areas in all 6 districts of Limpopo Province, SA
8 National policy adapted to incorporate CBP		8.1 National Harmonised Participatory Planning Guidelines for Uganda incorporate CBP methodology – DFID and UNCDF funding evaluation. 8.2 KPIs for DPLG in South Africa include CBP

3 Updates on progress with CBP in each country since July

Each country provided an update on what had occurred since the last 4 country meeting in Uganda in July. As during the previous SA workshop there was an update by Mangaung and visit to wards, this was not repeated in this workshop.

3.1 Ghana

National level

A team meeting of key stakeholders was held five times. This covered:

- Reviewing the GANTT chart, assigning responsibilities/and learning about CHIP methodology from MoH
- discussing training and how to proceed
- discussing outcome of training
- discussing country report (format)
- reviewing draft Country report

An advocacy meeting was to have been held with the sector Minister and the National Development Planning Commission (NDPC). However the meetings did not materialise due to district and unit committee elections, the installation of new Assemblies and the development of MTDPs etc.

A meeting with the Ashanti Regional Coordinating Council (RCC) was held and DCDs in Ashanti were briefed about CBP. In addition DFID and SNV were briefed and supplied with CBP reports and video.

It was hoped to review the manual and develop a Ghanaian version. However this activity did not happen. The challenge is to develop a manual that will withstand the test of time while we are waiting for the new planning guideline and the need to bring on board users of similar manuals in the country. It was also not possible to hold the country workshop as this coincided with other national activities and we need to use it as a platform to review and debate the community participation component of the national planning process.

District level

One facilitator from Bushenyi in Uganda participated in the training programme at the district level. A training of facilitators was held lasting 4 days, with 33 participants at Asante Akim South District and 27 participants at Adanse East District.

Expansion of pilots to cover the rest of the district did not happen due to a national directive to the Assemblies to use the new planning guideline to develop the new MTDP based on the Ghana PRSP within a specified time period.

3.2 Limpopo

A presentation was made on the Community-Based Planning Process for Limpopo Agricultural Development Programme (LADEP) which has piloted CBP in 31 villages in Limpopo Province. The initiative was led by the sector unlike other countries, although now the CBP work is likely to move to local government.

Limpopo Province (formerly known as Northern Province) is one of the poorest provinces of South Africa. Many of the districts of the province are former homeland areas where poverty had been acute, and infrastructure development weak. Many development attempts through local and international agencies have been launched, including a joint intervention by the Limpopo Department of Agriculture and the Government of Finland through its Ministry for International Development Cooperation. This joint venture is known as Limpopo Province Agricultural Development Programme (LADEP).

The key objective of LADEP is to support low-income households as well as emerging farmers to access support for undertaking viable income-generating activities for increasing their livelihoods strategies. This is to be achieved through application of Integrated Natural Resource Management techniques in order to promote integrated farming approaches to allow such small holders to engage in diversified production activities for increasing their income and lower/spread risk. To achieve that, the programme decided to undertake joint planning exercises with communities around the province, and the Community-Based Planning (CBP) approach was found to be useful for that purpose.

The CBP Planning Process

The process started with an intensive one-week training session for the district staff of the Department of Agriculture. The training covered core methodologies such as Participatory Learning for Action (PLA) methodologies, the Project Cycle Management (PCM), key areas of the Community-Based Planning (CBP) as well as the Sustainable Livelihoods Approach (SLA). Much of the training revolved around the effective use of the CBP manual for development practitioners. Another week was devoted to applying the newly acquired training into practice, and involving all trainees in a planning process with three communities in one district immediately after training, to ensure that all could use the methodologies effectively in a field situation. 40 people were trained (about 6 or 7 from each district), and the group included Extension Officers, District Coordinators and other levels of management at district level. The trainees in turn trained their colleagues upon return to their respective districts, and a core cadre of trainers/facilitators was formed in each district.

Within the communities, involvement in the planning processes included traditional leadership, Councillors, various social groups (including disabled, youth, unemployed, farmers, women's groups, etc).

The planning process was undertaken using the same manual as in Mangaung, over 5 days per village, and was facilitated by members of the Agriculture District staff of Limpopo. Community members were encouraged to lead the planning process while the facilitation teams assumed a learning attitude and ensured that the process was well structured and generated useful results for its purpose. The product of those planning processes led to the compilation of holistic village development plans based on visions and strengths of each village. A workshop was subsequently held following planning with communities to inform other stakeholders of the aims and objectives of LADEP, and to jointly develop an agenda statement where linkages can be forged. A total of 28 further villages out of six districts underwent the planning process.

Linkages with other sectors

Village Development Plans contain a host of multi-sectoral activities and projects. The focus of LADEP is largely agricultural, and many of the activities and projects suggested in the village plans fall outside the scope of the programme. Because planning was holistic, many of the activities can be supported by other sectors such as local government. In many plans, there are issues of health, education, housing, etc over and above proposed agricultural interventions. Following the workshop where other stakeholders (including local government) were invited, much interest was generated in terms of clear linkages. Local government in particular saw LADEP as an opportunity to link its activities with municipal service plans as contained in Integrated Development Plans (IDPs).

The programme has encouraged communities to market their village development plans to a wide spectrum of stakeholders in other sectors, so that most of the suggested activities and projects can receive support. All communities with whom planning has been carried out have received hard copies of their village development plans. More planning processes will be carried out in other villages with assistance from Extension Officers and other staff members from all districts of the Limpopo Province, and village plans will similarly be produced.

Way forward

- Start working with the Greater Tzaneen Municipality with a view to having the process led by a municipality and eventually spread to other municipalities in the province.
- Meet with Municipal managers and present the integrated plans that were developed during the planning period with a view of having the municipalities buy into the plans and further elaborate them

3.3 Uganda

Progress with CBP has advanced at two levels

- Local level - Bushenyi District. (piloting and capacity building work)
- National Level (policy changes, national processes and programmes)

Local Level (Bushenyi District):

Revisions to the Bushenyi District CBP Manual (copy already circulated) were undertaken in August, with input from the Bloemfontein 4 country review process and the four country meeting in Uganda, Kampala report and evaluation. A refresher training of 89 sub county facilitators in the new planning manual (September) was carried out co-funded by the CBP project and Bushenyi LG. A refresher course for parish facilitators was organised by Bushenyi district - funded by Bushenyi LG, the Plan for Modernisation of Agriculture (PMA) and Local Government Development programme (LGDP), and 160 parishes were trained. The CBP Process is currently on-going across Bushenyi district. Trainer/facilitators went to Ghana and Zimbabwe to support the CBP process there, and Margaret Barihairi to Bloemfontein for review of the CBP manual.

National Level (MoLG/LGDP)

An evaluation/review of the CBP process in Bushenyi district was conducted by an independent facilitator. This involved field work, meetings with district staff and trainers, parish level consultations. The main findings are that we need to look closer at incentives, funding for planning and capacity gaps.

A National Review of the Harmonised Participatory Planning Guidelines (HPPG) has been planned, a 6-8 month “live” review - evaluating as it is being implemented with funding support from DFID and UNCDF. The tendering/selection process is currently ongoing with feedback from various stakeholder groups (LGs, donors, NGOs/civil society organisations). The objectives of the review are:

- To get feedback on the manual and its application by various users across Uganda
- To compile and synthesise comments and present to stakeholders (looking closely at environmental issues, poverty mainstreaming and incentives)
- To produce a final draft for publication by MoLG in June 2003

Training of sub county facilitators in all districts (3 per sub-county) has been conducted at county level - in the use of new planning guide (LGDP). A training of trainers (ToT) methodology to transfer skills to parish levels has been developed, funded by LGDP.

Even with the advent of the National Planning Agency, MoLG is likely to retain responsibility for guidelines for local governments.

3.4 Zimbabwe

National Level

A de-briefing of the Ministry of Local Government, Public Works and National Housing (MLGPWNH) was conducted using a prepared briefing document. The importance of expanding the learning process to include other CBP experiences emphasized. The importance of the participation of MLGPWNH was also emphasized to enable necessary policy reforms should a need for that arise.

Recent developments in relation to decentralisation include the establishment of a Ministerial Committee on Decentralization recently elevated to Cabinet level. This implies greater commitment and willingness to the decentralization process on the part of politicians and commitment by Central Government commitment to the drafting of a definite policy and strategy to ensure the implementation of the policy.

Progress Against Targets set in Uganda

- **Debriefing Sessions** already discussed
- Held a successful **NGO de-briefing and consultative meeting**
- **Revision of CBP Manual** – the team that went to Uganda held a one day meeting to revise and adapt the CBP Manual. A major change was the alignment of calendar of activities to the RDC budget cycle in Zimbabwe, accommodation of traditional leadership and recognition of other structures on the ground.

- **De-briefing of District Training Teams** - DTTs comprise key sector government, local government and non-govt organizations operating in the district. Gwanda had 15 DTT members while Chimanimani had 10. DTTs were familiarized with the CBP manual and a strategy for sub-district training and logistics was agreed.
- **Core Facilitation Team Training** - sub-district training focused on identification of a core team comprising councillor, ward co-ordinator, credible extension worker and one respected person or opinion leader elected by the community. This worked perfectly well in Gwanda where the success rate was 82%. In Chimanimani, local politics affected the plan. Each of the districts were divided into 3 zones for the training of core facilitators for logistical and technical considerations. Training at this level was very thorough to ensure that the planning process would be credible.
- **Pre-Planning** - After the core facilitation team training, each councillor briefed traditional and civic leadership in their areas of jurisdiction. 2-3 community de-briefing meetings were then done in each ward through traditional and civic leaders depending on the size of the ward. This process was very successful and democratised the selection of socio-economic groups to attend the intensive planning sessions. Chimanimani focused on the 9 wards that attended the core facilitation training sessions.
- **Trial Runs** - Gwanda conducted trial runs in one ward while Chimanimani covered two wards for comparative purposes. Core facilitation teams led the process with support from the DTT members and the Ugandan facilitator. The recommended tools and laid down procedures in the manual were followed. The results of CBP were reviewed. In both Gwanda and Chimanimani, well-being analysis and mapping did not yield desirable results and Chimanimani, the SWOT was done at a different stage from the recommended one.
- **Intensive Planning** commenced a week after the trial runs to allow for logistics but there were occasional disturbances to the plan due to unforeseen impacts of the RDC elections. This was more pronounced in Chimanimani. As a result Chimanimani team agreed a conservative target of 9 wards and to expand into all wards after the dust has settled.

Results of Intensive Planning

Gwanda has completed planning in 19 out of the 23 wards - remaining wards are new resettled communities, where the process of establishing structures is currently underway.

Chimanimani has completed 5 out of the targeted 9 wards for Phase 1. Phase 2 to cover 18 wards is yet to begin. Extra facilitation support will be obtained from Gwanda to complete the process in Chimanimani.

Pointers of Success of the Intensive Planning Process

- RDCs remained committed throughout the process.
- All logistics were managed locally with villagers/community leaders playing a major role.
- Service providers were committed throughout the process although more in Gwanda than in Chimanimani where most were taking part in the National Census.

- Traditional and local leadership were fully involved in all the wards covered and felt strengthened by the process.
- Core facilitators were drawn from the communities.
- Selection of socio-economic groups was highly successful as this was evident in the outcomes of planning – the voices of the marginalized were not lost.
- Most planning tools were relevant and critical
- Documentation and feedback were not possible within the planning week - follow up meetings were scheduled.

Emerging Lessons from the CBP process in Zimbabwe

- Timing of CBP activities is critical – it must not coincide with other key events in the community (e.g. elections, census etc).
- Pre-planning is critical if CBP is to be done properly – it can make or break the whole process. In the case of Gwanda, this stage proved to be vital to the success of the process.
- Traditional and civic leadership are key social drivers of CBP.
- A local community facilitation team (CFT) has moral authority – which is important for trust building, localisation of the plan and leveraging of local resources.
- CBP has strengthened local linkages and social, economic and institutional ties.
- Injection of comparative experiences during facilitation can be inspiring and encouraging to communities.
- Tools for building local confidence and breaking dependency syndrome should be used in the facilitation process to strengthen ownership and control by the community

Emerging Lessons from the CBP Process in Zimbabwe

- Space must be provided for communities to mobilise locally available resources for supporting CBP. This can enhance cost-effectiveness of the planning process.
- Five full days are needed for planning excluding community feedback and write-up.
- Documentation capacity of CFT must be fully appraised and developed before the completion of the process. Where capacity cannot be developed, support from the District Training Team must be made available in good time.
- CBP has enhanced the RDC's co-ordination role in the district.
- The deepening of the learning process on CBP with other NGOs is critical for building consensus with other players - there is high receptivity to this approach by NGOs.

Next Steps

National Level

- Hosting a National Workshop on the basis of CBP pilots and other experiences; Information sharing/dissemination and policy briefings;
- Examine the possibility of expanding the CBP processes to other Rural District Councils using the already developed expertise/facilitators;
- Initiate the preparation of community planning guidelines for use by local authorities in Zimbabwe.

District Level

- Integration of ward plans into district plans in line with the budget process.
- Availing the plans to other stakeholders

4 Evaluations

4.1 South Africa

Objectives of the evaluation

The objectives were to establish in Mangaung:

- How widely CBP was applied;
- Whether CBP achieved its objective (notably CBP principles, the improvement of plans and services, and empowerment);
- How much it was integrated into, and affected, the local government planning system.

Methodology

6 wards were covered in depth - 4 wards where the CBP had had some impact (wards 13, 20, 30,42) and 2 wards where it had not (wards 2 and 26). 2 of the 4 were from Mangaung-Bloemfontein and one each from Botshabelo and Thaba Nchu.

Interviews were conducted with the six councillors representing these 6 wards under evaluation; the relevant facilitators for each of the six wards (which included Ian Goldman) and there were focus group interviews with these ward committee members. Information was also received from the MLM from a questionnaire sent to all ward councillors/committees. The statistics quoted are from these questionnaires.

The extent to which CBP was carried out

- 42 out of 43 wards have completed their plans, all of which have been approved
- The R50 000 was issued to 41 wards, to a total of R2,1 million, of which R2,05 million is accounted for
- 41 wards implemented at least 1 project
- 18/20 wards are meeting monthly since

Impact within the municipality

Evidence of better planning

- the results of the plans differ from the normal functions that municipalities provide, indicating that there has been an impact
- Job creation was a major focus of the plans, as well as HIV/AIDS
- There are some allegations that plans were still wish lists
- Technical nature of projects that were planned need urgent attention
- Councillors in white suburbs tended to use funds as donations
- Linkages with the IDP are currently limited¹

Evidence of improved projects / service

- These are orientated to the poor. However it is too early to judge longer term impacts
- Some plans needed better technical assistance
- Should be taken up in the IDP

¹ Although the plans have decided on overall IDP priorities, and contributed to the development programmes and spatial development framework

- Wards were mostly positive about service improvement

Ownership and empowerment

5 of the 6 wards interviewed were positive in this regard and said that if it was not for the CBP process a ward plan would never have materialised.

Improved civil society – government linkages

- CBP resulted in a first engagement between many of the affluent and less-affluent at ward level
- It resulted in improved communication between Councillor, WC and ward community
- This has led to greater willingness of ward members to participate in ward affairs – also a better attendance of meetings

Two of the wards selected were those where there had been no improvement

Planning process

Methodology

- The methodology targeted poor and disadvantaged groups and ensured that their voices were heard.
- Objectives were not set in tangible terms which is positive
- Wards have done things for which no funds are available – again positive
- The methodology was accepted by councillors and facilitators with a high satisfaction rating and it created a spirit of participation and empowerment
- The R50 000 grant also gave it legitimacy
- The manual was seen as very good and helpful

Some areas to strengthen in the process

- Pre-planning meeting was often not conducted early enough, and often was only the day before the planning started
- Time frame in December was difficult as it coincided with the holiday period
- Councillors in former white suburbs complained that the process was too long
- Appropriateness of PRA techniques was questioned, especially in some of the white wards
- MLM was too optimistic in planning the CBP process, especially where the plans were conducted one week after another
- It was difficult to get interest groups in the former white suburbs
- Newcomers came in through the process – which hindered progress in the planning
- In one ward it was reported that perspectives of some interest groups were lost
- Fear being a guinea pig

Comments on facilitation

- Overall there were very high satisfaction ratings with the facilitation
- In later planning sessions there was sometimes only one facilitator, which is too few
- There were negative comments about the intentions of some facilitators who were only interested in getting paid
- Logistical support to the facilitation was not always effective
- Participation in former white wards was low, although it improved and on the whole white participants appreciated the experience

Evaluation of training

The training of the facilitators took place in a learning-by-doing process and later a workshop for additional facilitators that were needed.

- Most of the facilitators said they needed more intensive training. This could be linked with life long learning initiatives and certification
- More training is needed on the methodologies that were used as well as to understand the different concepts.
- Councillors and ward committees should also be trained
- Additional training could be provided on conflict resolution, as well as normal facilitation and communication tools during the participation process.

Involvement of the poor and disadvantaged

- a major positive aspect was that the poor and disadvantaged were involved in the planning through the social groups
- a farm worker project emerged which illustrated that this had happened
- There is still a question as to whether the plans have benefited the poor, and it is early to say

Actors and involvement

- on average 3 CBOs per ward were involved
- on average 4 service providers, typically including police and health
- a key question is what is the format to ensure service provider involvement and how do we structure our institutions to ensure that service quality increase?

Time frames

- To get plans submitted took an average of 4,6 weeks, ranging from 1,5 – 14 weeks
- To get plans approved then took an average of 4.8 weeks, ranging from 1 – 7,8 weeks
- Logistical problems were the main reason for delays

Aspects which might hamper sustainability

- Limited inter sectoral planning
- Linkages with the IDP were not always that clear, as it was being done in parallel to the IDP process
- R50 000 allocation is not enough to realise a medium to longer term vision – and wards were not sure they would receive the larger amounts in the IDP.
- WC not structured in terms of the same portfolios as council committees
- No feedback from the IDP office regarding the implementation of the IDP and to what extent the CBP has influenced the IDP

Allocation of resources

- The R50 000 was allocated to 42 wards
- No extra financial contributions were made, although people did volunteer for action on projects
- the financial implication for the MLM has not yet been finalised

Overall evaluation of impact

Policies

- One of the aspects needing attention is the manner in which ward committees are constituted. The current principle of the democratic election of ward committees is questionable, as the percentage of voters who participated in the elections was extremely low.
- Secondly, one councillor felt that if his/her ward committee was constituted by interest groups, rather than on democratic principles, such a ward committee would have been far more representative of the needs of the poor. Three WCs also shared these sentiments during the interviews.

Towards national implementation

- The Mangaung CBP process has provided a replicable methodology for CBP elsewhere.
- The challenge is to effectively work these ward plans into the IDP, as well as try to account for them in the strategic aspects such as job creation.
- If people want this process to be a success, an effort should be made to change the way municipalities appoint people so that services improve.
- They should also appoint development practitioners that can facilitate processes.

Prerequisites for successful CBP

- A dedicated and hard working councillor.
- Annual planning should be structured in such a way that wards do have at least 10 months of the year to spend the money allocated to them. Most of the WC emphasised the fact that a 3 month period is too short to implement designed plans with sufficient community ownership.
- Political support by various political groupings.
- A good relationship between the councillor, the Ward Committee and the ward.

Dangers of CBP

- Resource implication if service providers are expected to attend meetings in all wards
- Could lose strategic focus, which must balance the bottom-up view
- Limited technical input in plans might result in little impact of plans
- Financial accountability
- If it does not link with the IDP

Recommendations

Service providers

- Consideration to aligning the areas of service providers with ward boundaries. For example, in one of the wards the councillor had to deal with two different police stations during the CBP process.
- Clarify the roles of different service providers

Institutional arrangements

- Align with the concept of area-based management.
- Improve the co-ordination and management of the facilitation process.

- The comparative nature of the CBP research project should be maintained. This can even be expanded to comparisons between wards to assist wards in improving their plans.
- One councillor mentioned that the municipality could have done much more to ensure publicity for the process.

Level and means of participation

- To some degree the planning is still needs based
- Should acknowledge diversity – different people participate in different ways²
- Farmers, farm workers and people in areas of smallholders – low participation
- White people are negative about group work³
- Could look at alternative strategies – however, time frames make it difficult

Role of ward committees

- Election of WCs
- Teach WC members to become facilitators
- Avoid not to over-burden community members

Communication and funding

- Initial communication with wards must improve
- Greater linkage with IDP is essential

Conclusions

- CBP was widely designed and implemented in Mangaung.
- The methodology and facilitation was generally perceived as very good, however the implementation and constant follow-up (monitoring of implementation and mentoring with implementation) were lacking or could have been improved.
- Empowerment is much more than giving people a say in decisions affecting their lives and it also implies a constant feedback. There was a concern amongst many WC members about the lack of ongoing feedback regarding community-planning inputs.
- CBP has achieved its objectives to a large degree. However, there is a concern, especially with the inputs of the Ward Committees that a needs-based approach is still dominating instead of a strength-based approach, which is the essence of the livelihoods approach to sustainable development.
- It is still premature to gauge how much CBP was integrated into, and effected, the local government planning system. Perhaps the proof will be in the extent CBP has impacted upon the IDP and to what extent CBP will influence capital expenditure in the future.
- CBP in itself is good but it should be an ongoing process. The institutional arrangements to entrenched CBP in the functioning of local municipalities are of pivotal importance.
- Municipalities that are serious about CBP should appoint development workers/community liaison officers to work at ward level. They will largely take responsibility with the WC and councillor to oversee the implementation of ward plans, which will inevitably result in a better institutionalised CBP at ward level

² Note that in fact the planning process was adapted for the predominantly white wards to be shorter, have only two community meetings (one for prioritisation/vision, and one for feedback)

³ Although this improved during the planning

4.2 Uganda

As with Mangaung the objectives of the evaluation were:

- to establish how widely CBP was applied in Bushenyi district
- to establish to what extent CBP achieved its objectives
- to assess how CBP was integrated into or affected local government planning in Bushenyi

Note there were some disagreement on the report outputs, and the evaluation fell into a typical evaluation trap of describing the problems but not sufficiently the achievements of what had happened. It is important to state at the outset that CBP was done in 170 parishes, that it was facilitated by subcounties, that it did result in improved plans which were incorporated into subcounty and district plans, all of which is a major achievement.

Methodology

An advisory team was established at national level comprised of LGDP, CARE, and UNCDF, plus an external “mentor”. A core evaluation team in Bushenyi assisted with local arrangements and logistics. The study included interviews, field visits, focus group discussions with poor and marginalised groups, and workshops. The selection of parishes to review was based on an assessment by district staff of the level of understanding and performance of CBP and included:

- 2 high capacity parishes (Kitooma and Mushanga)
- 2 low capacity parishes (Bumbaire and Mayanga)
- 2 medium capacity parishes (Kichwamba and Swazi)

Impact

Findings

It is hard to measure the impact due to the recent nature of the first round of CBP which only took place 6 months ago. However some findings are:

- A high level of ownership and pride at local levels among parish staff and communities
- Strong evidence of changed priorities (“software” and “hardware” appear in parish plans)
- Challenges in upward integration due to methodological conflicts higher up (problem-based and sectoral planning at district levels)
- Limited funds at parish level challenge implementation of some projects and dampen hopes and expectations of community members
- Identification of service providers has assisted implementation of other programmes (NAADS)

Planning Process

Findings

- 98 staff in the district received training and carried out CBP in all 170 parishes, with some variations in quality

- Many of the tools were used, with impressive results
- There were some problems of timing of training versus implementation
- There were problems in endorsement and feedback
- There was a need for incentives for participants (lunch?)

Recommendations

- Harmonise the timing of CBP training and the implementation of CBP process
- Consider a standardised contribution to foster community participation (lunch + soda?)
- Large capacity gaps remain – and there is a need for on-going capacity building through cascade training
- Need to consider how CBP fits with higher-level “sectoral planning” processes at sub-county and district levels
- Costs, time and complexity should decrease with time – the initial planning is more complex than what is likely to be needed in subsequent years

Actors and involvement

Findings

- Deliberate efforts were made for the first time to include the voices of the poor and marginalised, using specific tools
- Livelihoods analysis did not work as well as expected and many groups just did not “fit”
- Use of LG staff from across sectors was a strength as it builds broad ownership and is a solid basis for future
- Limited involvement of the private sector - facilitators seemed unclear about when to involve them
- Civil society organisations (CSOs) gained much in observing the process/tools, which they can take forward in their own work, but appeared unclear about their roles in the planning process and with regards to LG systems and structures

Recommendations

- CBP can be a way to help define roles between LG and CSOs - building trust - but much needs to be done at local level to explore roles of both players
- Define how and when the private sector can engage in planning process (without compromising future procurement processes) and what incentives are needed for their participation

Resources

Findings

- CBP process costs ca. USD 150 - 170/parish - not including in-kind contributions by the community. This is high when compared to overall parish budget (typically around USD 1500/year)⁴

Recommendations

- Central/local government should allocate a planning budget outside and beyond development budgets at parish levels

⁴ Actually at around 10% this could be perceived as not high at all.

External Changes

Findings

- Release of Indicative planning figures (IPFs) appears not to coincide with the planning cycle - need to reconcile fiscal transfer mechanisms from centre and district
- Other funding mechanisms (Poverty Alleviation Funds) do not emphasise empowerment/self reliance resulting in some conflicts with CBP processes
- Political interference in resource allocation (political decisions) conflict with CBP process

Recommendations

- “Clash of cultures” - CBP is challenging traditional systems being used at higher levels of local government such as district tendering, service delivery models and sectoral planning
- Awareness raising of senior political and administrative staff is essential to ensure support and resource allocation for facilitators at lower levels
- Need to harmonise other LG processes (eg sectoral planning at district and s/c levels)
- Link more clearly to IPF process
- Define “institutional home” of planning at the sub county level as there are no sub-county planners..
- Engage with central government institutions beyond MoLG in forthcoming review of Participatory Planning Guide

5 Updating the learnings

During the Uganda workshop the learnings were discussed against a set of headings generated from the process, but which largely matched those identified during the initial research proposal. At this workshop these were reviewed to see if there were any additional learnings since July and the output updated.

5.1 Community participation and ownership

Livelihood grouping	Ownership	Representation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use of various livelihood groupings in planning should be encouraged Should include diversity and vulnerable groups like children Decide what livelihood groups across an area for consistency and inclusivity (being specific and why) Poverty/wealth issues are important 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If high participation there is ownership which creates an enabling environment for participation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Encourage both direct and indirect representative representation Direct are at lowest level (e.g village), with use of representatives as move up levels Representatives should reflect social diversity and livelihood groupings
Unit of planning	Local Institutions (CBOs)	Incentives
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Divergence across countries depending on their systems. SA could consider sub-ward planning/participation Wards/area and parish are the correct units, but in Uganda need to link the village in as part of the planning process 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Programme of action of NGOs (and potentially CBOs), must be fully integrated into the plan 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need to ensure ownership, feeling plan is theirs, so beware of incentives for people which may attract people to CBP for wrong reasons Should happen at local level by locals using their resources May need allowances for facilitators but must be careful of sustainability – don't want to create precedent Resources flowing to plan provide incentive – ensure feedback on what is agreed

Recommendations

- Guidelines for livelihood groupings* should be produced and should be used (interest groups, CBOs, social groups, economic activity groups)
- Issues of *gender and children* must be covered and there should be a special group for children (age 10-18). Need to consult experts such as UNICEF on how to address this. Need to consult a gender expert to review the process/CBP manual
- Unit of planning* - Determined by the constitution or regulation. Around 5000 is probably the right size and the plans can then aggregated to cover the unit stipulated in the constitution
- Ownership* - Must ensure awareness of the process, feedback – during the planning process and after (refer to revised manual) and self-monitoring and evaluation by community
- environment for participation* - ensure CBP does not clash with other local and outside events – use appropriate methods, meeting systems, language, culture, etc – eg to ensure “whites/affluent do participate”. Use well trained facilitators – innovative, tactful, patient

- *Representation* - was developed by Ghana and included in the revised manual but needs to be revised further. Note facilitators need to guard against face-value representation
- *Incentives* - refer to revised manual – this element was developed by Ugandans and use local reward systems
- *feedback (refer revised manual)* - during the planning process – once the planning process has been completed and on-going. There should be a 3 monthly public meeting

5.2 Stakeholder involvement

Where there was consensus	Where divergence
Where traditional leaders are recognised as opinion leaders, their involvement in the planning process is a key to its success	S.A /Zim - Limited public sector involvement in CBP and implementation due to financial constraints (Zim) and time (SA)
CBP process was strengthened by a broad range of stakeholders, i.e civil society, government, private sector (Uganda and Ghana)	
The integrated nature of CBP demands a multi-disciplinary and multi-disciplinary and multi-sectoral involvement/approach	Weak follow-up and commitment of NGOs in CBP process at implementation level (Ghana)
Unwillingness of the various stakeholders to fully disclose their respective sources of funding and budgets to each other	National level discussions between MLG and NGOs/CSOs resulted in a healthy debate about roles and responsibilities in CBP
The CBP process triggered spontaneous local action for the implementation of the plan where minimal external resources were required	

Recommendations

- *Inter-sectoral* involvement is needed at all levels in planning and implementation, including the private sector and civil society. Note CBP can be an entry point for corporate social responsibility programmes
- Where possible integrate *traditional leaders* and opinion leaders in the planning process (mobilization of community, follow-up on actions/plan, pre-planning stage) particularly in Ghana, SA, Zimbabwe
- Facilitators must be *multi-disciplinary* (eg using different technical staff)
- *Accountability and transparency* is needed at all levels – NGOs also need to disclose expenditures by location
- There is a need to build more confidence around *NGOs/CBOs* and their relationship to local government particularly with regard to implementation of plans. The CBP process can help in this. Formulate criteria for NGOs/CBOs that are viable for participation – some NGOs are “briefcase NGOs” created by a family and are not legitimate.
- It is important to ensure *national “buy in”* to CBP. Broader discussion is needed at national and local levels on different approaches, different players and different roles and how they can be harmonized, improving vertical and horizontal integration and linkage in planning. Local authorities must coordinate planning and development with support from provincial and national levels.

5.3 CBP Planning process and methodology

Consensus	Divergence
Visioning, SWOT, livelihoods analysis worked well	The livelihood outcomes not always developed during visioning process
Plans are action-oriented	
The timing of CBP process is influenced by National/local planning cycle, politics, environment and local factors (availability of facilitators)	
It is important to sensitise sub-district structures e.g wards, sub-county, parish, village before the actual planning – to raise awareness, to ensure high participation	
More emphasis needed to bring on board higher level stakeholders (e.g sectoral departments, ministries, private sector, national NGOs, agencies, departments)	Gap between strategies, activities and projects
More emphasis needed what communities can do for themselves without external support	
The prioritisation of (projects/activities) development outcomes on the ranking/voting and most of the issues of vulnerable groups were lost	
Need to improve documentation of planning process below the parish/ward	
More focus needed on mainstreaming environment, gender issues, HIV/AIDS issues	

Recommendations

The CBP methodology works but we should consider reviewing the manual to cover:

- Expanding the planning terminology (terms) – with definitions
- Re-emphasising that a pre-planning session is required with sufficient time gap between pre-planning and planning sessions (for gathering background information and logistics) of at least one week, and that where appropriate traditional leaders must be engaged before pre-planning. Community entering must follow local tradition and practices
- Use of local resources and strengths
- Consideration of vulnerable groups and their livelihood outcomes. Use of livelihoods groups must not result in disadvantaged people being confined to only one group or there may be a problem when representatives are chosen that they may be under-represented. Consider including the most vulnerable groups priority outcomes – eg must include at least one priority
- Mainstreaming of environment and gender issues (HIV/AIDS) – linked to projects
- Simplifying strategies /activities/projects – and adapting them for local languages
- Monitoring and evaluation of implementation and the impact on livelihoods
- Include community budget management (funds raising, local resources, leveraging)

Other issues to improve are:

- Need to improve documentation at ward/village/parish levels
- There is a time problem to ensure external service providers participate in planning- don't know priorities until day before you need them to participate so difficult to organise
- Use community-based management information system (CBMIS) such as village record books and parish register for developing parish profiles and as a base for planning
- CBP should be linked to budgeting at local level

5.4 Facilitation and Training

Consensus	Divergence
Use of extension workers trained by a higher level team contributed to the success of CBP	Zim/Ghana – in Ghana due to timing
A multi-sectoral team in facilitation was effectively in CBP	Failure to link plans with available funds/budget – in Zim as no IPFs
Contribution of NGOs in training core teams was critical in success of CBP or similar organization like Khanya	
TOT/ cascading process was effective in CBP	
Little attempt to budget for the planning process at lower levels (people planning for themselves – CBP)	Divergence in facilitation allowances paid to facilitators – Zim pays normal LG rates, Uganda pays LG rates for staff – S.A. pays overtime rate
Pilot nature of CBP means that a broad coverage is yet to be realised	
High level of involvement and participation of elected leaders and opinion leaders (politicians) in mobilisation and awareness meetings on CBP	

Recommendations

Positive aspects to be continued:

- Building CBP planning capacity at parish/ward levels and maintaining the inputs and mentoring of technical staff from higher levels
- Multi-disciplinary/multi-sectoral approach in facilitation
- TOTs for lower level extension staff
- Involvement and participation of political leaders and opinion leaders in CBP processes
- Involvement of NGOs/Civil society in capacity building of local government staff

To be improved:

- Building local ownership and sustainability
- Use of at least 3 facilitators for each plan
- Use/include some community members to facilitate some sectors of the methodology and try to involve the community in the write-up
- Simplification of the training manual and training (CBP) eg use of local language and illustrations
- Needs time during the day for planning and reflection by facilitators
- Release IPFs to guide community to produce realistic plans
- There should be an appropriate focal person at sub-district level to co-ordinate planning at lower levels and include planning responsibility in the job description of every government office at all levels
- Documenting must be made manageable e.g allow one week between planning sessions and be submitted within 4 weeks.
- Need for access to equipment for write up, e.g computers and consumables

Additional training and support

- More training is needed in vision/goal at community level to increase understanding
- Improving use of: Venn, outcomes, strategies to build on strengths
- Add conflict resolution, some basic facilitation skills
- Strengthen PRA skills for facilitators at lower levels to enrich CBP

- Develop a training manual which incorporates a facilitators manual, and develop initial training (eg 3 days) combined with doing a ward/village plan, and then debriefing, covering 10 days total.
- A need for back-up following training
- Encourage ward-ward links and competitiveness

5.5 Finance

Key issues around finance are:

- Funding the planning process (including whether to provide incentives) - note that the cost of fuel and meals for each ward in SA was about \$130, plus costs for cascade training (around \$15000), and some overtime.
- whether to guarantee funding (eg the R50k provided by Mangaung to each ward)

Consensus	Divergence
For successful CBP process must be a budget line for the planning process at all levels	There are varied mechanisms in different countries for linking resource allocation to the CBP process
Use of existing local resources (material, human and financial) for cost effective and sustainable planning	
Funds flowing to the plans (such as R50k I Mangaung) is an incentive to participation for communities	There are varied levels of financial support to the decentralisation process
Local revenue generation and management is critical for CBP – can be directly for community use	There are varied approaches to financing plan implementation like co-financing/self-financing/full (100%) financing
Budget line should include “incentives” ie transport and subsistence for government and other facilitators	

Recommendations

- *Funding* – the problem of funding would be solved if the process is mainstreamed into the existing systems. CBP processes must also be timed to link with the local budgeting process. As a long term measure there is also the need for advocacy to influence the harmonisation of local and provincial budget cycle e.g SA’s system
- *Management of funds* - legitimate structures such as ward/parish committees are needed at the local level to manage funds and local projects As capacity for planning and management grows at lower levels – more funds should be allocated for lower levels to these structures
- Communities and other stakeholders need to be fully *involved in budgeting* to ensure resources are allocated according to the local plans (e.g use of budget conferences)
- Need emphasis on involvement of *service providers* in planning to ensure that the budgeting and project planning process is adequate
- Need to balance *co-financing* and self-financing in planning. It is important to allocate specific budgets for planning especially at lower levels of governance, eg from revenue locally generated. Where the culture of co-financing does not exist a more diplomatic way should be used to make communities contribute to project in kind.
- *Fund flow* - grants should be based on the nature of the ward, content of their plans, and prudent use and management of past grants
- Develop a mechanism for promoting budget allocation for *disadvantaged groups* (i.e in the guidelines, use of prioritisation criteria, etc.)

- Emphasis on public *feedback* and display of how resources are allocated for accountability
- Tapping *local resources* - can take advantage of local NGOs and funding agencies, use of retired civil servants, and use of students
- *Incentives* - incentives should be given at planning sessions except perhaps snack or food (issues must be made clear at pre-planning stage)⁵

5.6 Link to local government planning process

It is very important that CBP integrates into the local government process. It is also important that local government is able to integrate sectoral agendas at local government level, as well as at ward/parish level.

Consensus	Divergence
Need to build consensus (e.g SALGA agenda in SA, ministerial committee on decentralisation, in Zim, NALAG in Ghana towards a common understanding and integration approach at LG level)	Only in Uganda is CBP formally part of LG planning cycle
LGs must take into account national frameworks but national departments must also recognise and build on LG plans	
National policy to adopt and adapt the CBP methodology – DPLG ready and sensitised, Uganda already agreed, Zimbabwe and Ghana to be debated	
Need for appropriate timing – had to rush the process to meet IDP deadlines. To fit into planning cycle, CBP should start in June in SA and around September in Uganda. Jan/Feb in Zim, be finished by August in Ghana	
Need for sharing of indicative budget lines with communities leads to realistic plans	
Need for LGs to build consensus across LGs and internally about use of CBP	

Recommendations

- Ensuring CBP is institutionalised/integrated into *local planning cycle* - national LG planning cycle also needs to allow adequate time and appropriate timing for CBP and CBP should be incorporated into national planning guidelines, as has happened in Uganda
- Strong government policy needs to be made that *sectoral plans are integrated* with LG plans at LG level
- Need for *strategic guidance* to communities prior to CBP starting in relation to strategic things the municipality is likely to support. This would include announcing indicative planning figures for LG (all countries) and parishes (Uganda) as well as budgets for sectoral departments at LG level. These should be provided prior to the CBP process if possible and shared with LGs and sub-LG structure as part of planning process
- An *information pack* for services and initiatives government departments, NGOs and municipality supports would be very helpful to wards/parishes prior to starting the planning process (Oxfam in SA has developed such a pack and has offered to share it)⁶
- *Planning formats* in CBP must be harmonised with Local Government system
- Need *planning support* at sub-district level
- Mechanisms need to be strengthened to *link ward planning with main plan*, eg methodologies still need to be developed for appraising and integrating ward plans into IDP, including appraisal of ward plans need by a technical team

⁵ There is considerable debate about how the incentives issue should be handled – facilitators and ward committees working full time on the planning need to be recompensed for costs incurred, or meals provided. Where communities are involved full-time they will also need to be fed. Where they are not this is not necessary.

⁶ Ian Goldman has also developed booklets on this line in the UK on Support for Small Business, Training

- Needs to be a *feedback* mechanism to communities on what approved for LG and sectoral funding
- In terms of *advocacy* there should be presentation and discussion with national government, LGs, provinces and NGOs on gains and process of CBP

5.7 Follow-up and community management

Consensus	Divergence
Structure - LG structures are generally in place	Uganda structures are better understood and functional
Feedback: Horizontal and vertical feedback and linkages needs to be improved (informal + formal) - need to outline a basic system	
Transparency – there is a common need for increased transparency and accountability	
Community action in implementation of plans to be encouraged	
Prior stage needed on sensitisation/increasing awareness/building commitment	
Community budget management	
Monitoring and evaluation (self by community)	
Developing implementation skills	

Recommendations

- *CBOs, NGOs* and other institutions should be involved in CBP processes
- Fundamental to CBP is the involvement and *participation* of “people” in plans including poor/disadvantaged
- *Incentives* for participation can be immediate delivery eg by having the funds available, involvement in self-monitoring and evaluation, development of representative structures, use of performance indicators for projects from plans, schedules
- People need to be made *aware* of development structures such as ward committees/parish development committee/ VDC for active participation. This will help their legitimacy
- *Publicise* information and build transparency and accountability using mass media (newsletter, radio, churches) to publicise the CBP process as well as for feedback, as well as information in public places as with the flipcharts in subcounty offices in Uganda, village/ward notice board, also other public notice boards in shopping centres
- *Monitoring mechanisms* should be clearly put in the plans and PDCs/Ward committees should monitor and evaluate implementation as well as Local Government (eg Councillor + ward committee should form a formal accounting structure).
- To ensure *ownership and involvement* of all citizens and not just representative structures there should be quarterly public meetings with feedback from lowest level of local government as well as from community/beneficiaries on progress and their felt and real benefits
- There is also an *external monitoring* or watch dog role of plan implementation by CSOs - an NGO forum need to qualify what and how.⁷
- In terms of on-going *community management*, the centre and LG Association needs to be informed and involved in discussions about lessons and future of CBP and the rest of the project cycle (implementation, monitoring and evaluation and management)

⁷ This could be similar to the legally established Vigilance Committees in Bolivia comprised of members of local CBOs and with the legal role of oversight of the local government and implementation of the plans

5.8 Changes required

Consensus	Divergence
Structures and system linkages – all countries have a statutory structure which can be used for CBP (ward, area, parish)	All have wards or equivalent – however SA does not have structure below ward level
Ward councillor/parish councillor needs the authority to manage development - this can be delegated	In some countries (Zim/Ghana) wards/area councils are not functioning, nor villages/units
Policy change and enforcement – planning process needs to be more strategic in addressing economic issues as well as social infrastructure	
Need to enforce transparency and accountability by local government	
Training and support – need to strengthen planning capacity at district and sub-district level through the cascade approach – Zim	Nationally promoted/provided sub-district planning guidelines only exist in Uganda
Need for champion at national, district, local municipality level for CBP	

Recommendations

- Need for *champion* in national MoLG and LGs, and also allies to advocate for CBP
- *Integrate sectoral planning* into local government planning and ensure this links with CBP
- Ensuring CBP is institutionalised/integrated into local planning and budgeting cycle - national LG planning cycle also needs to allow adequate time and appropriate timing for CBP and CBP should be incorporated into national planning guidelines, as has happened in Uganda
- *Planning formats* in CBP must be harmonised with Local Government system
- Review *functions and powers* of area/ward so that they can carry out delegated development management. Need clear definition of roles between ward, municipality, district and province
- Uganda – PDC should become statutory – SA to consider creation of sub-ward representative structure and technical/intersectoral representative structure between ward and municipality⁸
- Allocate specific *budgets for planning* especially at lower levels of governance
- Establish, equip, assign responsibility and train *ward/area councils*. Train/re-train LG staff (and service departments) to facilitate CBP and to train lower structures as part of cascade process
- Integrate *traditional leaders* and opinion leaders in the planning process
- Formulate *criteria for NGOs/CBOs* that are viable for participation – some NGOs are “briefcase NGOs” created by a family and are not legitimate.
- Need for regular *review of planning procedures* perhaps every five years
- Need for regular *review of performance* of LG and sub-structures
- There should be mandatory *feedback* from national – provincial – district – municipality – ward - community
- In terms of on-going *community management*, the centre and LG Association needs to be informed and involved in discussions about lessons and future of CBP and the rest of the project cycle (implementation, monitoring and evaluation and management)

⁸ The latter may be created through an area-based management approach

6 Learnings about the project process

6.1 Overall project management

Strengths	Weaknesses
Used existing networks and relationships with which to identify partners in each country	Start-up/selection of partners was rather ad-hoc and country specific (no standard process)
Strong and compatible relationships between national government, local government and NGOs	Khanya's relationship with facilitators (ISODEC, ITDG, CARE) is rather informal, - no agreements, MoU, budget
Good communication, documentation and updates - e-mail system has worked	No financial contribution (or little) to facilitation institutions overheads/time
High quality technical advice and input from Khanya	Core-teams in country – informal, personal basis – lack of institutional commitment in some cases
Ensuring four-country co-ordination (e.g X-visits, writing up reports quickly, organising and facilitating workshops)	Pilots were not funded by the project, or only certain aspects funded, which made it hard to get started
Mainstreaming of concepts into facilitator organisations (ITDG, CARE, but some issues with ISODEC where this was not core to their activities)	Some lack of clarity within Khanya on who was taking the lead for what (James, Ian or Joe?) “Push” for mainstreaming and national results has been a challenge (+/-?)

6.2 Four-Country Meetings

Strengths	Weaknesses
Consistent attendance by core group	Consistent attendance by the same people (high level people)
Moral support	Difficult to get buy-in (especially with R.T the recommendation)
Developed common understanding	Cross-country network poor
Opportunity to share	Takes time and expensive
Broadens knowledge base (exposure)	
Strengthens the in-country network	
Broadening of the networks	
Encourages participants to meet targets	
Face to face discussions	

6.3 Study tours – need to do cost/benefit analysis

Strengths	Weaknesses
Team building among partners – energy	India team too large – 16 – difficult for learnings, facilitation, expense
Allowed for international comparison	Inadequate preparation by in-country host in India and Khanya
Sharing of experience among partners and with study countries	India - choice of participants
Advocacy for CBP with those attending	Some have not participated since (debriefing)
Raised project and CBP profile	Inadequate sharing (i.e debriefing) with host country and various SH's at all levels (process)
Got specific learning re best/improved practice (positive and negative)	Inadequate dissemination strategy of findings – report, briefings, presentations, etc
Local Government structure/representation in India	Choice of countries – need to decide criteria – revisit
Broadened experience of individual	Inadequate time (Sao Paulo ⁹ , Delhi)
Reassurance of partners that on a good path/right track	
Influencing and strengthening the processes for local governance and participation amongst the	
Allowed for international comparison	

6.4 Exchange of facilitators

Strengths	Weaknesses
Learnt different tools and skills	Could not follow local languages and other cultures
Learning from other local government structures	Video making process – caused some distraction in Bushenyi
Learning how other countries organise logistics e.g food	Facilitation manual
Sharing of mobilisation skills	Time frame too short at community meetings
Helped to identify common themes, problems in CBP process	Inadequate preparation – e.g matching needs with skills. Would have been good if host had prepared some terms of reference
Motivated participation as CBP process was seen in international terms	Writing up lessons and experiences not always done (done for SA-Uganda).
Learning different cultures	

⁹ Sao Paulo the team took advantage of having to spend the day in transit in Sao Paulo to visit the City Administration

6.5 In-country processes

National workshop

Strengths	Weaknesses
Brought wide spectrum of interest	Once off event – challenge of linking wide group with pilot process and steering group – Uganda used UPDNET to assist
Generated consensus to proceed with pilot	Zimbabwe – 2 pilot councils not well prepared – needed to build up commitment politicians
Opportunity for on-going link	
Opportunity for teaming from each other	
Generated information about what people were doing	

Review

Strengths	Weaknesses
Informed the national workshop – and helped selection of case studies	Difficult to find enough examples of participatory planning – not broad enough search
Opportunity to reflect on achievements	Didn't raise enough policy weaknesses (Zimbabwe) to provoke action by Minister
Opened dialogue	
Report helped bring common understanding of Local Government and its relationship to communities	
Helped to see what was happening in other areas	

Steering group

Strengths	Weaknesses
Worked very well in Uganda where strong role from ministry and willing NGO	In Zimbabwe the Steering group only really worked after Uganda meeting - not formal in SA or Ghana
Worked recently in Ghana and Zimbabwe	
Worked informally in South Africa, and process approach with regular teleconferences	
Helped to develop a constituency and commitment to CBP	

6.6 Communication and documentation

Current means	strengths	weaknesses	Way forward
website	Updated on regular basis Assist in networking for all agencies in CBP	Website on Khanya – not partner countries ¹⁰ Internet is inaccessible for some countries, only privileged few benefit Sustainability of website (continuity) in doubt	Develop CBP website Use other media
Project identity	Common covers and leaflets and same planning methodology give sense of identity	There is not copyright on cover page as there are other agencies in CBP (mixed identity)	Need for copyright on coverage
e-mail	Fast and efficient communication	Based on national telecom system and expensive hardware support	Supplement with other media (e.g courier services)
WSSD	Exposure for networking – 3 levels – municipality, National, international	Audience limited participants	WSSD and other events

6.7 In-Country Pilots

Strengths	Weaknesses
Community empowerment	Continued sectoral planning e.g Limpopo
Active participation and ownership	Lack of effective linkage between the pilot processes and sector departments/ stakeholders especially the private sector
Capacity building	CBP not yet integrated or mainstreamed into the national and local planning cycle
Holistic approach to development process	Inadequate funding for planning process and projects implementaion
Emphasise the need to cater for the vulnerable groups	Lack of capacity on the part of beneficiaries
Pilots plans developed focus and engenders community action	Improper feedback mechanisms
It breaks away from problem-based approach to community ability and strengths	
Awareness	
Advocacy	

¹⁰ Note Mangaung has its own website with its own documents and all partners are free to do this. In addition the Khanya website is not Khanya badged and can be reached directly without going through the Khanya website using www.khanya-mrc.co.za/cbp.

7 Country ways forward

7.1 Action Plans for SA

SA overall

Objective	Activities
Broadening CBP in SA	Steering committee meeting should develop TORs
Awareness creation and advocacy	Steering committee to determine their roles (as well as role of other networks, committee) in awareness and advocacy Develop commitment from service providers (including sectors and national government) to respond to CBP
Documentation	Write up CBP overview and CBP manual Develop training manual (MLM and Limpopo experience) (+ video?) “Guidelines” (or other paper) on linking CBP to IDP process
Training	Support to other municipalities wanting to implement
Community follow-up and management	Design and implement the monitoring system Develop concept and process for community management

Action	When	Who
Reconstitute steering committee	20 November	Members defined at SA workshop
Complete SA report	30 November	Ian
Deal with issues from Minister	5 November	Teboho, Armie, Lorrette, Ian
Write up TORs (brief) for steering committee	20 November	At Steering Committee
Write up SA (MLM) workshop report	14 November	Ian

Mangaung

Mlm activities	When	Who
Complete financial audit	Nov	Internal Audit, IDP
Refresher training of facilitators, Councillors, ward committees	Jan	Speaker's office, CS
Internal advocacy and awareness	Dec 2002 – Mar 2003	Executive office
Complete write up of evaluation	Nov	CDS
Review ward plans to inform budget cycle	Nov 2002 – Mar 2003	Executive office
Process of feedback to community as how plans are implemented	Dec	Ward committees
Linking projects to sectoral departments	Jan	Executive Office
Update ward plan manual	Dec	Executive Office
Decision on discretionary allocation (Council – Mayoral projects)	Dec	
How CBP fits into restructuring process (budget/resources) transformation, IDP vote (all)	Nov Mar	Executive Office

Limpopo

Limpopo activities	When	Resources
Awareness creation - Tzaneen, DPLG, SALGA, Sector Departments, Other service providers	6 th Nov - march	Budget, stakeholders
Training <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • identify prospective facilitators • training of trainers • implementation of agreed process 	Jan 2003	Budget CBP project
Beyond March – discussion with various municipalities on the village plans	Jan 2003	

7.2 Ghana

Activity	When	Who
Team meeting (DFID) (Bimonthly)	2 weeks – Nov 2002	MLGRD
Information package on CBP	2 weeks – Nov 2002	ISODEC
Memo on CBP to MLGRD and NDPC	3 weeks Nov 2002	MLGRD
Appointment/meeting with MLGRD and NDPC	End Nov 2002	MLGRD
Meeting with NALAG	1 week – Dec 2002	MLGRD/ISODEC
Mobilisation of CSOs/Devt partners	2 weeks Nov 2002	MLGRD
Completion of pilots	Jan 2003	DAs
Monitoring and Technical Support	Nov-Jan 2003	MLGRD/ISODEC
Country Report (Final)	Dec-Jan 2003	CBP - Team
Review and validation of manual	Dec 2002	CBP and ext participants
Evaluation		Khanya
Country workshop	Feb 2003	
Country dissemination and scale up	Nov 2002 – March - 2003	

7.3 Zimbabwe

Activity	When	Who
Completion of ward plans - Gwanda (4) - Chimanimani (4)	Dec 2002 Nov 2002	CEO CEO
Country report – final draft	15 Nov 2002	ITDG
National workshop	23-4 Jan 2003	Steering committee
Review of plans by communities	Dec 2003	CFT
1 st quarterly review of CBP	15 Feb 2003	Steering Committee
Review of CBP manual	15 March 2003	Steering Committee
1 st stab at National CBP guidelines	15 March 2003	Steering Committee
Guidelines for integrating ward plans	15 March 2003	Steering committee
Initiation of CBP in Zvimba RDC	30 Nov 2002	Steering committee
Refresher course for facilitators	Feb 2003	
Beyond March 2003		
Completion of ward planning in Chimanimani (14 wards)	May - 31 Aug 2003	CEO
Half –year review of 1 st round plans	May - 30 June 2003	CEO/CFT
2 nd round of planning	April - 31 Aug 2003	CEO/CFT
CBP planning in Zvimba RDC	April - 31 Aug 2003	Steering committee
Evaluation of Gwanda/Chimanimani	Sept 2003	Steering committee/ consultant
Integration of ward plans into L.A. Budget	1-30 Sept	CEO
2 nd national workshop to discuss exp	1-30 Nov 2003	Steering committee

7.4 Uganda

Activity	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sept	Resources
1 Conduct ToT for sub county facilitators in HPPG												
Development of ToT materials and resources												
Selection and orientation of facilitators drawn from PMA, LGDP, MoLG, MGLSD, OPM, MoFPED, ILM/CARE												
Creation of training groups and organisation of training on a district by district basis												
Conduct Training												
Parish and sub county planning conducted nationally												
2 National Review of HPPG												
Selection of consultants												
Formation of advisory group, representing MoLG, PMU/LGDP, MGLSD, OPM, NAADS, PMA, CARE/ILM, Local Government, UNCDF												
Inception report written and presented												
Visit of Khanya (Ian) to advise HPPG review process												Yes
Review of implementation of plans in Bushenyi as part of rolling planning process												Ush 5 m
Draft final report produced and presented at national stakeholder workshop												Ush 10 m
Final report produced												
Draft presentation of revisions to the HPPG to wider stakeholder group												Ush 15 m
Finalisation of HPPG												
Publication and dissemination of Manual												
Routine training and refresher courses in HPPG implementation												

8 Way forward for the project

Based on the plans made for each country, possible activities for the project as a whole were brainstormed, to the end of this phase of the project (March 2003). Possible cross-country activities that would benefit in-country processes beyond the end of this phase were then discussed.

8.1 Activities to complete this project phase

Activity	Who	By When
Develop indicative budget for the following year	Ian	08 November
Complete 4 country partner workshop report	Ian	08 November
Finalise CBP manual	Ian	08 November
Editing comments on country reports	Ian	08 November
Brief DFID	all	08 November
Revise budget	All	15 November
Advocacy strategy	Jo/Martin	30 November
Doc/NRP, etc.	Ian/all	On-going
Quarterly report	All	13 January
Final country reports	All	31 January
Introductory document on CBP	Ian	31 January
Training manual + video	?	31 January
Overall report	Ian	28 February
Completion report	Ian	10 March
Exchanges at national workshop	various	Zim – 23-4 January, Ghana-Feb

8.2 Activities beyond the end of this phase

If CBP project were to continue	Duration needed
Guidelines for integrating CBP into Local Government plans	By June 2003
Some support and sharing experience	1 year
Evaluation in Zimbabwe and Ghana	1 year
Rolling of plans	September or October 2003
International advocacy	1 year
expansion	1 year
CBM – concept proposal?	mid - February

This indicated that it would be beneficial to have a limited extension of a year, to enable the full implementation in each country and rolling out, evaluations in Ghana and Zimbabwe, and a couple more meetings to share experiences. The next logical step with this work is to extend beyond the planning to community-based management, and the support of ward and parish

committees to implement the plans, monitor and evaluate, review the plans etc. It is proposed to draw up a proposal by mid-February for DFID.

Annex 1 Partners joining the meetingZimbabwe

Ashella Ndhlovu	Deputy Secretary, Ministry of Local Government
Absolom Masendeke	IT Zimbabwe
Andrew Mlalazi	Development in Practice
Ronnie Sibanda	CEO, Gwanda Rural District Council

Ghana

Tay Ernest Awoosa	ISODEC
John Cofie-Agama	Director, Fiscal Decentralisation Project, Ministry of Local Government and Rural Development
Sampson Kwarteng	DCD, Asante Akim District Assembly
Francis Owusu-Ansah	DCD, Adanse East District Assembly

Uganda

Martin Onyach-Olaa	Head, Local Government Development Programme, Ministry of Local Government
Charles Kiberu	Deputy CAO, Bushenyi District Local Government
Tom Blomley	CARE Uganda
John Rusoke	ILM Project/CARE Uganda

South Africa

Jo Abbott	CARE Uganda
Teboho Maine	IDP Manager, Mangaung Local Municipality
Lorette Verwoerd	Planner, Mangaung Local Municipality
Amie Molelekwa	Mangaung Local Municipality
Baba Tierto	LADEC, Limpopo Province
Edna Netshirembe	Department of Agriculture, Limpopo Province
Steve Mohlabi	Department of Agriculture, Limpopo Province
Morongoe Ramphele	Greater Tzaneen Local Municipality

Khanya

Ian Goldman	Project Manager/Member
James Carnegie	Member
Joe Marumo	Member
Keatletse Sebate	Office Manager

Annex 2 Programme

Time	Session	Objective	Process	Responsible	Resources
Wednesday 30th October					
18.00	Objectives and programme Introductions	For participants to be ready to start the next day, and also they are comfortable with each other	1. Presentation on objectives and programme 2. Introductions exercise	James	Powerpoint and flip chart
19.00	Dinner				
20.00	Observatory				
Thursday 31st October					
8.30	Overview	For people to be reminded as to where we are at overall in the project	1. Draw on quarterly report	Ian	Powerpoint
8.45	Updates from each country	Participants aware of what has happened since last meeting	1. Each country does presentation in some detail of what they have done since the last meeting (15 mins each + 5 discussion) 2. Plenary discussion (15 mins)	Chair: Cofie Presenters:	Powerpoint/OHP
10.10	Tea				
10.40	Evaluations	For people to understand the detail emerging from the evaluations in Uganda and SA	1. Presentation on Uganda evaluation using standard headings plus additional (30 mins + 15 mins questions) 2. SA evaluation (30+15) 3. Discuss our conclusions from this (overall)	Chair: Andrew Mlalazi Tom Blomley, Lucius Botes	Handouts from presentations for use later
12.15	Learnings about content and process	We update learnings from Uganda meeting with results of evaluation and work since	1. Cross-country groups look at specific issue areas 2. Each group refers to what was produced in Uganda (table) 3. They then consider what has come out of the evaluations/country reports and add to the table	Facilitator: Jo Abbot	Uganda report- 10 copies 5 country reports from Uganda and Zimbabwe Tables and text copied large (section 8)
13.00	Lunch				
14.00			Continue		
14.30	Report backs		1. Groups report on what has emerged highlighting changes. (10 mins plus 5 mins discussion)	Ashella Ndlovu	
15.30	Tea				
15.45	Learnings 2	As above but with 4 new topics	Repeat for next 4 tasks	Lorette	

Time	Session	Objective	Process	Responsible	Resources
Friday 1st November					
8.30		Report backs	1. Groups report on what has emerged highlighting changes. (10 mins plus 5 mins discussion)	Absolom	
9.30	Learnings about project process	We have drawn out the key lessons of why the project has worked/not	1. Present Uni of Bradford's findings (15 mins) 2. Buzz groups discuss strengths and weaknesses – put on cards (20 mins) 3. Feedback and group by topic not S/W (15 mins) 4. Ask whether the picture make sense 5. What would we do differently next time? (15 mins)	Tom Blomley	Blue and pink cards Brown paper on wall
10.40	Tea				
11.00	Way forward in each country	Each country/cluster has planned how to take forward their process	1. Brainstorm and put on cards the main activities that are needed to take forward CBP, within and beyond the CBP project (including dissemination, policy work and advocacy) 2. Do a GANTT chart until Dec 2003 3. Who will drive this? 4. What resources will be needed to make this happen, and from where	James	Cards Brown paper
13.00	Lunch				
14.00	Report back		1. Groups run through the points above (10 mins + 5 mins questions)	James	Hand out evaluation forms
15.00	Way forward internationally	We have thought through whether any support is needed to help take forward CBP over the next year	1. Go group by group and ask whether needs support from outside 2. List 3. How much does the networking matter and is email/website good enough?	Ian	
16.00	Closure			Ian	
16.30	Tea				
17:00	Depart for airport for 18:00 flight				