

community-based planning

**MAKING THE LINK BETWEEN
MICRO AND MESO – LEARNING
FROM EXPERIENCE ON
COMMUNITY-BASED PLANNING
AND MANAGEMENT**
Research Scheme R7981CA

Final Technical Report

6 October 2004

Project Manager:

Khanya – managing rural change cc

16A President Steyn St, Westdene, Bloemfontein, 9301, Free State, South Africa

Tel +27 (0)51 430 0712 Fax +27 (0)51 430 8322

Email lebo@khanya-mrc.co.za

Website www.khanya-mrc.co.za

Acknowledgements

The CBP project has been an interesting journey, based on initial work Khanya did in 1999 and 2000 in Zambia, Zimbabwe and South Africa on the institutional implications of implementing the sustainable livelihoods approach. This pointed to the importance of linking communities with local governments, and that participation in planning could be one way of achieving this. DFID were interested to support an action-research process around this and we started with a limited number of partners in the 4 countries who were interested to see how to take decentralisation to community level. This touched a common chord, and like a rolling snowball has built increasing commitment and interest along the way, particularly in South Africa and Uganda, with wide interest internationally.

The project had very limited resources primarily for learning and sharing, but with the commitment of the partners to use their own resources and leverage others, the project has achieved an impact way beyond its original conception. In this way it has also been an interesting example of a peer learning process across Africa, and has spawned a sister project on Community-Based Workers which looks like generating similar interest and energy.

The list of key partners is below, many of whom are very committed to CBP in their various organisation. It is also important to mention others such as Tom Blomley (previously of CARE), James Carnegie of Khanya, Jo Abbot of CARE, Francis Owusu (formerly of Adanse East District Assembly) and Sampson Kwarteng (formerly of Asante Akim District Assembly), all of whom were very involved in the project and made major contributions, but have now moved on to other posts or roles.

Lucy Ambridge was research manager throughout this project, and she played a quietly important role, supportive throughout and always willing to be flexible to support practical implementation. We wish her well in her new role in NRI. Other key DFID staff who were instrumental in supporting the project include Mike Scott as head of Rural Livelihoods, Helen Wedgewood, Alwyn Chilver, Tom Barrett, and Richard Thomas. We are very grateful to all of you.

Viva CBP, viva!

Ian Goldman 6 October 2004

© Action Research on Community-Based Planning project

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

The report is available from www.khanya-mrc.co.za/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, Department of Provincial and Local Government (DPLG) Yusuf@dplg.gov.za
 Lechesa Tsenoli MP mgobozi@parliament.gov.za
 Free State Dept of Local Government and Housing kadimo@lgh.fs.gov.za
 Joseph Leshabane, SALGA jleshabane@salga.org.za
 JJ Matlole, Mangaung Local Municipality, ceo@civic.mangaungcity.co.za
 Morongoa Ramphele, Greater Tzaneen Local Municipality morongoer@tzaneen.gov.za
 Ntsiki Magwaza, Ethekewini Municipality magwazantsiki@durban.gov.za
 IDT signetm@idt.org.za
 Hajo Junge, GTZ hajoj@dplg.gov.za
 Jo Abbot, CARESA/Lesotho JoAbbot@care.org.ls
 Marc Feldman, Development Works marcfeld@global.co.za
 Sam Chimbuya, Khanya-managing rural change sam@khanya-mrc.co.za

Uganda

Sam Emorot-Erongol, Ministry of Local Government bsmolga@infocom.co.ug
 Joseph Okello, Ministry of Local Government jokello@yahoo.com
 Paul Kasule-Mukasa, LGDP peri@imul.com
 Charles Kiberu, Bushenyi District Local Gov. bushlocalgovt@infocom.co.ug
 Uwe Korus, CARE Uganda korus@careug.org
 Peter Okiira, Uganda Participatory Development Network (UPDNet) cdn@imul.com
 Pamela Batenga, Department of Gender PBatenga@yahoo.com
 James Opio-Omoding, UNDP james.opio-omoding@undp.org

Zimbabwe

Ashella Ndhlovu, Ministry of Local Government anash@africaonline.co.za
 Absolom Masendeke, IT Southern Africa absolomm@itdg.org.zw
 Ronnie Sibanda, Gwanda Rural District Council
 Wilton Mhlanga, Chimanimani RDC
 Andrew Mlalazi diphre@ecoweb.co.zw
 Phomolo Maphosa, SNV pmaphosa@mweb.co.zw
 Jelda Nzhiliyo, UNICEF

Ghana

Tay Awoosah, ISODEC tay@isodec.org.gh
 National Development Planning Commission
 John Cofie-Agama, Ministry of Local Government cofiejagama@yahoo.com
 Adanse East District Assembly
 Asante Akim District Assembly

CONTENTS

Acknowledgements	i
Further information and contacts	ii
GLOSSARY	iv
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	i
1 Background	3
2 Project Purpose	4
3 Research Activities (see also Table 1)	4
3.1 Outputs originally planned	4
3.2 Unplanned outputs (ie developed as part of project extension towards implementation).....	5
4 Outputs	8
4.1 Progress against outputs	8
4.2 Learnings against research questions	9
5 Contribution of Outputs towards DFID's developmental goals	11
5.1 Link to DFID Target Strategy Paper on making Governments Work for Poor People 11	
5.2 Promotion pathways to target institutions and beneficiaries.....	12
Annex 1 Publications	15

GLOSSARY

CBO	Community-based organisation
CBP	Community-based planning
CBRDP	Community-Based Rural Development Programme
CDD	Community-driven development
DFID	UK's Department for International Development
GPRS	Ghana Poverty Reduction Strategy
GTZ	German technical assistance
HPPG	Uganda's Harmonised Participatory Planning Guide
IDS	Institute of Development Studies (Brighton, UK)
LGDP	Local Government Development Programme (Uganda)
M&E	Monitoring and evaluation
MLGPWNH	Ministry of Local Government, Public Works and National Housing (Zimbabwe)
NGO	Non-government organisation
PRA	Participatory rural appraisal
RDC	Rural District Council (from Zimbabwe)
SA	South Africa
SALGA	SA Local Government Association
SL	Sustainable livelihoods
ToT	Training of trainers
TSP	DFID Target Strategy Paper

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The project addresses the poor linkages between micro level (community) and meso level (local government and district service providers) using community-based planning as an entry point. The project purpose was that “*realistic plans have been developed in each of 4 African countries (Uganda, South Africa, Zimbabwe and Ghana) for policy change, implementation or piloting of community-based planning systems, which participating institutions are committed to take forward*”.

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

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

Evaluations showed improved community control over development, significant community action, improved planning and improved services. This has led to national programmes in Uganda and SA, with CBP incorporated in the Harmonised Participatory Planning Guide being extended over Uganda, and in SA upscaling to 9 municipalities covering some 5 million people. Partners have raised significant local funding, more than matching what DFID has contributed.

The learnings point to the importance of planning using legitimate local structures. CBP should be linked with local management of funds, so that communities can take their plans forward themselves, while larger projects will require external support. The methodology focuses on prioritised livelihood outcomes rather than problems, helping to transform planning from expensive infrastructure delivered by external agents, to what the community can do, with external support. The CBP methodology is not simple and requires significant political commitment, trained facilitators, and a 3-5 day intensive planning process in each community. CBP needs to be integrated with the local government planning system, and local governments need to provide support for implementation.

CBP contributes to several of DFID’s capabilities required to Make Governments Work for Poor people. As community plans influence higher level plans and spending decisions, and should lead to accountability back to communities for those plans, it helps to promote:

- political systems which provide opportunities for all people, including the poor and disadvantaged, to influence government policy and practice;

- implementation of pro-poor policy and to raise, allocate and account for public resources accordingly;
- Development of honest and accountable government that can combat corruption (as above).

There are some areas where further work would be valuable, assisting the partners to continue their networking, and also in taking forward the implementation aspects and learning (rather than around planning). All the documents arising are available free at www.khanya-mrc.co.za/cbp.

1 Background

The project is addressing the poor linkages between micro level (community) and meso level (local government and district service providers), even in countries such as Uganda where there is an active programme of decentralisation to local government. Unless poor people can influence the resource allocation system, the ability to promote sustainable livelihoods for poor people is limited. The planning system is a key system for resource allocation. Current attempts have usually focused on ad-hoc, expensive and unreplicable PRAs (Participatory rural appraisals). This project has learned from best practice as to what system for community-based planning can be developed and implemented so that poor people can influence resource allocation.

The project aimed to identify issues of best practice including:

- what sort of community-based planning organisation is established, and how should it link to local government and other government services?
- what position (if any) should traditional authorities have on it?
- what should be its terms of reference, ie roles and responsibilities?
- what sort of planning process seems to be cost-effective?
- what should planning cover, projects of whatever type in the community, capital projects, local services, maintenance, etc?
- how to deal with short vs long-term issues, eg over the environment?
- what sort of community management is appropriate, and how should this be structured?
- should there be locally held funds, or at least locally allocated funds? If so for what? How would this link to the district planning system?
- what should be the link to civil society?
- what training is needed for the members of the CBPO/others?
- once the role and functions are clear, how should this capacity be built?
- what support role is needed and who should provide it?

Demand for the project was identified through a previous project funded by DFID and managed by Khanya looking at “Institutional Support for Sustainable Rural Livelihoods in Southern Africa” (R2788). The main focus of the work was looking at institutional issues arising if a sustainable livelihoods (SL) approach is to be implemented. This identified the need to look at micro-meso linkages if livelihoods of poor people are to improve.

All the countries that have been involved in this project are those where Khanya has worked on decentralisation-related issues. They have a major national focus on decentralisation and have shown considerable interest in the project, which is reflected in the strategic nature of some of the institutions that have decided to be involved. Extensive pre-project work was undertaken to ensure that partners were those ready and committed to using a community-based planning approach, and where the resources for learning that will be provided by this project will help catalyse the use of own resources for implementation. The DFID offices (notably in Ghana and Uganda) also showed considerable interest in this work, to the extent of the Uganda office funding a scoping visit from their own resources.

2 Project Purpose

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

The purpose therefore was to look at the micro-meso link using community-based planning as an entry point, and see what methodologies could be developed and piloted, and how these addressed the technical issues identified earlier.

The project was initially scheduled to finish in 14 months, but as the project purpose had been achieved by January 2002, the project was extended as it moved towards full-scale implementation, finally finishing on 30 September 2004. The Project goal was “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”. By June 2003 the goal has been achieved in all 4 countries in specific districts, and subsequently have been upscaled in Uganda and South Africa.

3 Research Activities (see also Table 1)¹

3.1 Outputs originally planned

1 Start-up effective with teams operational and case studies selected

Partner steering groups were established in each country, which evolved into national Steering Committees in Uganda and South Africa. Research was undertaken into possible study visits and two cases were selected, India based on its experience with the Panchayat system, and Bolivia with its experience with the Participation Law.

2 Methodology finalised

A series of steps were undertaken:

- a core methodology was developed and then implemented in all 4 countries for a review of current experience, culminating in a national workshop to test and validate that review (mid 2001) (reports of review and workshops available at www.khanya-mrc.co.za/cbp)
- a 4 country meeting then reviewed the experience across participating countries and developed a core approach
- a small group then developed this approach, producing a generic CBP facilitators’ manual
- this was then adapted in each of the 4 countries
- The generic manual has been revised once in October 2002 and Uganda, SA and Zimbabwe have adapted the manual, with further revisions in SA in 2003, including a Training of Trainers manual.
- In South Africa the methodology has been extended to include how the local government planning system can use the information from CBP effectively and a new Guide has been

¹ detailed descriptions of all the research activities (research studies, surveys, experiments etc.) conducted to achieve the outputs of the project. Information on any facilities, expertise and special resources used to implement the project should also be included.

developed for planners from local government for this, as well as to manage the rollout of CBP.

- In Uganda CBP was incorporated in a Harmonised Participatory Planning Guide (HPPG) for parish and subcounty level planning. A revised HPPG was produced in 2003 as well as a trainers guide and these are being revised again at present. Gender planning guidelines have been produced and the HPPG is being linked to the physical planning system.

3 Case studies completed

The main steps involved here were writing up the experience in each of the 4 partner countries, as well as the results of the visit to Madhya Pradesh in India in September 2001 (with 17 people) and the visit to Bolivia and Sao Paulo (Brazil) in May 2002, with 6 people.

4 Learnings workshopped in-country

The main action-research steps here have been:

- 2 **national workshops** in each of the 4 countries to review emerging lessons, revise practice, and build a coalition to support the use of community-based planning approaches;
- Conducting of **evaluations** in Uganda and South Africa (SA) on the two pilot municipalities, the results from which were highlighted into the national workshops;
- **Peer exchanges** - 3 people involved in the South African ward planning visited Uganda and participated in the parish planning in Bushenyi in April 2002. Facilitators from Uganda participated in the Zimbabwe and Ghanaian planning, Ugandan trainers and a Zimbabwean participated in the CBP ToT in SA, as well as in the training for planners. There have been exchanges between the 2 Zimbabwean districts with 5 people involved. Someone from South Africa assisted in the national training of trainers in Uganda this quarter. This was an addition to the original plan.

5 Implementation plans developed

Plans for implementation of pilots were developed in all countries and have been implemented in at least two districts in each country. Plans for upscaling have been developed in Uganda and SA. In Zimbabwe it was planned to extend to Zvimba and Umguza districts but lack of funds has constrained this. Khanya will be presenting to a stakeholder group on CBP (and the related community-based worker project) in November 2004, and this may present opportunities for taking CBP forward in the country.

3.2 **Unplanned outputs (ie developed as part of project extension towards implementation)**

6 Pilots run in all 4 countries

Pilots were completed in all 4 countries during 2002. Second round pilots are underway in SA (covering 9 municipalities and around 5 million people) and Uganda (around half the country), with further refining of the approach, improving linkages to the local government system, and development of the upscaling methodology.

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

Uganda

Two annual rounds of community-based planning in Bushenyi District have been completed, the parish plans have been incorporated into higher local government plans, with the production of Sub county plans and the District Development Plan. Re-orientation workshops on the revised HPPG have been conducted by teams of national trainers in the 5 districts being supported by UNCDF under the District Development Project, Phase II. In the first CBP pilot district, Bushenyi, budget conferences were held at Sub-county level in January 2004 and refresher training was conducted for facilitators of the planning process at Parish and Sub-county levels. Bushenyi also sent 2 participants to the national Training of Trainers' event in March 2004 and hosted the practical segment of the ToT for national trainers.

South Africa

The first pilot was Mangaung Local Municipality with 43 wards. All wards were covered, the Municipality made available R50 000 (around £4500) per ward to support taking forward their plans (what are called process, as opposed to project, funds). Around 10 000 people participated actively in the planning, around 1.5% of the total population. The evaluation found significant impacts on wards as well as the municipality.

In 2003-4 9 municipalities covering over 5 million people are piloting CBP, as well as piloting the linkage process to the local government planning system. The ward planning component of this has been completed in 5 of the 8 municipalities. Mangaung, the initial pilot, is planning an ambitious programme to take forward CBP starting next quarter. Of particular interest is the application of CBP in eThekweni (Durban), the 3rd city of South Africa, which has brought some good institutional learnings. A major funding programme began in May 2003 with R6 million (around £550 000) of additional funding from DFIDSA, Netherlands Aid, Development Bank of Southern Africa, and GTZ, as well as participating municipalities. This is more than the funds provided by DFID for the whole 4 country research.

Ghana

Pilots were undertaken in the 2 districts of Adansi East and Asante Akim South in 2002-3 with plans completed for all Area Councils. Retraining was undertaken of 60 area council facilitators in 2003 and the area plans were completed in mid-2003.

Zimbabwe

The two focus districts in Zimbabwe were Chimanimani and Gwanda. Both the CBP Trainers of Trainers' Guide and the CBP Facilitator's Manual have been revised and adapted to suit the Zimbabwean context by the District Training Team. In Gwanda RDC two rounds of planning have been completed. Ward implementations plans were developed in the 23 wards. The communities are currently in the process of reviewing their ward plans so that they can be integrated to the national planning process, which will start in September 2004. As a result of sharing CBP experiences at Provincial level, some tools have been adapted to assist in the conducting of a Provincial Poverty Assessment survey for Matabeleland South.

In Chimanimani District the CBP process is now complete apart from two wards which were formerly commercial farms wards which have been excluded as there has been ongoing industrial action. The process started with training of 16 District Training Team members, which now has 6 members following high staff turnover in the district.

So pilots have been run in 1-2 districts in each country.

8 National policy adapted to incorporate CBP

Uganda

The national HPPG has incorporated many of the methodological elements of CBP. The HPPG has been revised and a facilitators manual and a draft trainers manual completed, the latter funded by EU Microprojects. Review of the urban planning guidelines has been finalized to link to the HPPG, but actual roll-out waits finalization of the new Town and Country Planning Act. The HPPG is also being linked with gender planning guidelines. The HPPG is being rolled out nationwide funded under the multidonor Local Government Development Programme (LGDP) Phase 2, and has been split into two guides, one for the Lower Local Governments (subcounties) and one for Parishes/Wards. These have now been illustrated. The Mid-term Review of the UNCDF-supported District Development Project commenced in August 2004. The project supported the dissemination of the revised HPPG to the six districts² in December 2003. The Mid-term review shall amongst other objectives seek to establish the impact of the HPPG on grassroots planning and budgeting processes.

SA

A national Steering Committee has met every two months since being formally established after the national workshop of November 2002, and this has been driving the upscaling process. The next phase of implementation of CBP has started with extension to 9 municipalities during 2003/4 (about 5 million people). A concept has now been developed for how to integrate CBP with the local government planning process and CBP has been showcased at a national Local Government Association conference in September 2004, with with massive interest.

Ghana

There has been a struggle to integrate the CBP process into the national planning process due to the top-down process of the Ghana Poverty Reduction Strategy (GPRS) guidelines, the short deadlines given to complete (two months) and the absence of a systematic planning calendar³. At a national workshop in June 2003 it was agreed to establish a national Steering Committee but this has not happened. A national programme supported by the World Bank (the Village Infrastructure Programme) is considering incorporating the CBP methodology into its work. It is now called the Community-Based Rural Development Programme (CBRDP) and has undergone significant changes in preparation for the second phase which takes off in September 2004. The CBRDP will be hosted by the Ministry of Local Government and Rural Development and a decision was taken to use the CBRDP to harmonize all the community participatory planning concepts in the country. CBP will be one of the concepts to be examined during the harmonization process.

Zimbabwe

The processes in Gwanda and Chimanimani have managed to create wider awareness on the importance of CBP from local to provincial level. The Matabeleland South Provincial Development Committee under the Ministry of Local Government, Public Works and National Housing has used the Gwanda District Training Team to train its Provincial Core Team in the use of Community Based Plan tools so that they can facilitate the Provincial Poverty Assessment survey. The Province is now in the process of coming up with strategies for poverty reduction and enhancing local economic development for sustainable livelihoods. The process is now reflected in the Matabeleland South Province Poverty Reduction Strategy

² The six project districts include Arua, Yumbe, Jinja, Mukono, Kayunga and Kabale.

³ The last time district plans were undertaken was in 1996. These were supposed to be revised in 2000, but this was the first revision. There is also no systematic annual process to roll the plans.

as an entry point activity. All the eight districts in the province will now be required to learn the process from the Gwanda district.

Clearly it is beyond the projects control to ensure that national policies are adapted. However this has happened in South Africa and Uganda, and there are still possibilities of this happening in Ghana and Zimbabwe.

4 Outputs

4.1 Progress against outputs

Table 1 summarises the original and extended outputs of the projects, the original indicator and actual progress reached. All the outputs have been reached and the project achieved way beyond the original project purpose.

Table 1 Summary of outputs and progress reached

Output	Indicator By June 2002 (note project later extended to Sept 2004):	Progress as at 30 September 2004
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 Madhya Pradesh and Bolivia selected as case studies 1.2 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 (Aug 01) 2.2 Generic CBP manual developed, and adapted version produced in all 4 countries (Sep 01). 2.3 Revised manual produced based on experience and results of evaluations (Nov 02). 2.4 Training of Trainers (ToT) manual developed (Jan 03) 2.5 ToT manual used for second round training in Zimbabwe and in SA 2.6 Revised HPPG used for national ToT in Uganda (Mar 04)
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 (July-Aug 01). 3.2 Visits to India and Bolivia completed and written up (Oct 01 and May 02). 3.3 Draft country reports produced documenting what happened in project and lessons learned (Aug 01) and early 2003. 3.4 All partner countries have written up experience for special edition of PLA Notes (March 2004)
4 Learnings amongst partners workshoped 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 and disseminated. 4.2 Reference groups have met regularly in Uganda, SA and Zimbabwe and are being incorporated into ongoing programmes. This is a formal Steering Committee in SA, which meets every 2 months. 4.3 Exchange visit happened for facilitators from SA to Uganda in April 2002, from Uganda to Zimbabwe and Ghana in September 2002.

Output	Indicator By June 2002 (note project later extended to Sept 2004):	Progress as at 30 September 2004
		4.4 Learnings from methodology workshopped at 3 partner meetings (Aug 01, July 02, Nov 02) 4.5 Second national workshops held in SA (Oct 02), Zimbabwe (Jan 03) and Ghana (July 03).
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 Implementation in pilots planned in all 4 countries 5.2 National rollout happening in Uganda and in SA (see output 8).
Unplanned outputs		
6 Pilots run and methodology adapted		6.1 Pilots run in one district in Uganda, and 2+ districts in SA, Zimbabwe and Ghana. 6.2 Methodologies adapted in all countries in 2001, 2002, 2003 and also 2004 in SA and Uganda.
7 Methodology applied in all of at least one local government area in each country		7.1 Full implementation in one city in SA (Mangaung/Bloemfontein), one rural district in Uganda (Bushenyi), two rural districts in each of Zimbabwe, and Ghana covering 2 million people 7.2 Rollout of HPPG in all districts of Uganda in 2003, and revised programme for 2004. 7.3 In SA programme rolling out to 8 municipalities and national guidelines. 7.4 In Zimbabwe a second planning round initiated in Gwanda.
8 National policy adapted to incorporate CBP		8.1 HPPG for Uganda incorporates CBP methodology and being rolled out nationally under LGDP 1 and 2 (including DFID funding). 8.2 KPIs for DPLG in South Africa include CBP – national Steering Committee leading on stage 2 which includes development of national guidelines 8.3 Zimbabwe pillar in decentralisation policy added to include CBP and Ministry committed to taking forward CBP.

4.2 Learnings against research questions

Table 4.2 Results of action-research against research questions

Research question	Answer developed
What sort of community-based planning organisation is established, and how should it link to local government and other government services	Legitimate structures must be used, ideally that can take funds. These cannot be at village level (as too resource intensive to cover all villages), but usually at the next level above eg parishes (Uganda), Area Councils (Ghana), wards (SA and Zimbabwe). These are formally linked into the local government system
What position (if any) should traditional authorities have on it	Where traditional authorities are important eg Ghana, they play a very important role. These often chaired the Area Council meeting in Ghana. In other countries, if appropriate, representatives need to be part of the process

Research question	Answer developed
What should be the CBP structure's terms of reference, ie roles and responsibilities	This structure (eg ward) needs to take the lead in the CBP process, with at least one member being trained to assist in facilitation of the process. The structure must also take responsibility for implementation of the plan where using own resources, as well as monitoring.
Once the role and functions are clear, how should this capacity be built?	A significant training process is needed for the CBP process to be both empowering and useful for higher level planning processes (in SA this was two weeks to include training and facilitating a live ward planning process). Additional training and support is needed for quality control, around implementation, and for M&E
What sort of planning process seems to be cost-effective	A 3-5 day process is needed for it to be both empowering, but affordable. The latter is ideal. This is in addition to preplanning and time for documentation. The process should build on strengths, and being based on preferred outcomes rather than problems makes it much more likely that the plan will be implemented. In very low capacity municipalities an integrated CBP and local government planning process may be more appropriate, using CBP tools to provide participatory information, and using an extended CBP planning as the basis for the local government planning process.
What should planning cover, projects of whatever type in the community, capital projects, local services, maintenance, etc	Planning should cover an integrated situation analysis built on livelihoods of different social groups, and plan for community action, as well as projects and activities to be supported by the local government and other agencies
How to deal with short vs long-term issues, eg over the environment	This is problematic. It is partially addressed and some of the tools specifically address this, particularly in the latest version of the SA Guide. More work can be done here.
What sort of community management is appropriate, and how should this be structured?	The legitimate structure needs to take responsibility, supported by the local government. More work is needed to refine the community-based management mechanisms.
Should there be locally held funds, or at least locally allocated funds? If so for what? How would this link to the district planning system?	The research has indicated that locally managed funds are critical, and that decision-making about these funds should be at community level if this is to be empowering. Experience in Mangaung (and also elsewhere in the world ⁴ is that these funds can be well managed). Some pilots are now exploring participatory budgeting around larger projects to supplement CBP.
What should be the link to civil society	Civil society is involved in different ways: in the representative structures (eg ward committees) but also as CBOs involved in implementing the plan. Promoting

⁴ Eg a range of World Bank funded community-driven development (CDD) projects in Indonesia, Brazil, Mexico.

Research question	Answer developed
	accountability of representative structures is critical, and more work is needed on implementation processes which include CBOs
What training is needed for the members of the CBP structure/others	A range of training mechanisms have been developed. However experience is that training must be experiential, and must involve doing a community-based plan and not just classroom work
What support role is needed and who should provide it?	The municipality would normally be the organisation to provide support, eg through community development workers, and a participation unit at municipal level. During the intensive planning process a fulltime CBP coordinator is needed, plus lead trainers to support the facilitators. This can reduce to part-time during implementation, and less once implementation has completed, and prior to the next planning cycle. In some cases with very low municipal capacity, NGOs may provide the support, possibly funded by higher level local governments (eg districts in SA and Uganda).

5 Contribution of Outputs towards DFID's developmental goals

5.1 Link to DFID Target Strategy Paper on making Governments Work for Poor People

Table 5.1 Link between TSP and CBP Outputs

Key capability from Target Strategy paper	Contribution CBP has made to this
To operate political systems which provide opportunities for all people, including the poor and disadvantaged, to influence government policy and practice;	CBP methods provide an opportunity for all community members to participate in planning and resource allocation decisions. Evaluations indicated a positive impact in these areas. Community-based plans have influenced local government plans, and the approach has influenced government policy and practice, notably in Uganda and South Africa, and to some extent in Zimbabwe, with possible impacts in Ghana.
To provide macroeconomic stability and to facilitate private sector investment and trade so as to promote the growth necessary to reduce poverty;	Not applicable
To implement pro-poor policy and to raise, allocate and account for public resources accordingly;	The community-based plans have allowed for the priorities of poor people to be incorporated in higher level planning processes. The evaluation in South Africa demonstrated that poor peoples' priorities had been incorporated in the plans derived using ward plans

Key capability from Target Strategy paper	Contribution CBP has made to this
To guarantee the equitable and universal provision of effective basic services;	CBP helps to present the demand for basic services. It has also demonstrated an ability to improve the quality of services (eg policing in Mangaung)
To ensure personal safety and security with access to justice for all;	See above. This is not an explicit aim but emerged as priority in certain areas, for example in South Africa, and was then incorporated in higher level plans.
To manage national security arrangements accountably and to resolve differences between communities before they develop into violent conflicts;	Not applicable
To develop honest and accountable government that can combat corruption.	CBP is being used as part of a process of empowering communities, including holding local government accountable for its implementation. This is still at an early stage but there is evidence that CBP can assist in building the links and accountability between communities and their local governments. In addition CBP has helped to create improved linkages between NGOs and government, notably in Uganda and Zimbabwe.

5.2 Promotion pathways to target institutions and beneficiaries

5.2.1 How outputs will be made available to intended users

Intended users are participants in the project and so have been part of the action-learning process.

5.2.2 How will further stages be carried out and paid for

The project is so designed that it will influence the on-going operations of partners. Partners have been selected (such as LGDP in Uganda) to be those supporting such type of activities anyway, so that additional funding is not essential for the results to be implemented. In Uganda and South Africa, where the project learnings and outputs have been upscaled, major additional resources have been made available to take this forward. These are part of on-going funding programmes. In South Africa's case, municipalities have made available very significant amounts for process funds to support implementation of community-based plans.

5.2.3 Dissemination mechanisms

Dissemination activities to date include:

Electronic

- The website at www.khanya-mrc.co.za/cbp with all the documents from the project;
- Edition of Khanya's electronic newsletter (Sustaining Livelihoods in Southern Africa) ;
- An entry on the project on Livelihoods Connect;
- Four editions of a regular CBP newsletter in SA.

Publications

- Articles have been produced on CBP in 3 publications in SA;
- An article on local governance in the EU's Courier Magazine;
- A special edition of PLA Notes on CBP completed in March 2004 – all of the participating countries have contributed an article. CBP project made a financial contribution.
- Article on CBP in SA Local Government Association's VOICE magazine

National programmes

- In Uganda the Harmonised Participatory Planning Guidelines have been disseminated to all local governments in the country;
- 2 national CBP workshops in Uganda, Zimbabwe, SA and Ghana;

Conferences/workshops

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

Video

- Finalisation of CBP video, distribution to CBP partners and DFID;

DFID

- Regular briefing of DFID country offices;
- seminar on decentralisation in DFID London in June 2002

Briefings/networking

- Information on the project has been sent to an OECD working group in decentralisation and to the World Bank's Community Driven Development Group;
- Meeting with LogoLink at IDS;
- Linking with World Bank's programme on upscaling community-driven development initiatives.
- In Zimbabwe, briefs during Full and Provincial Council meetings
- In SA, briefing of committee chairs of National Council of Provinces
- In SA presentation to Parliamentary Committee on Provincial and Local Government

Radio/television

- Radio interviews conducted with WREN Media for circulation in Africa and will also come out in print, national media coverage of the July workshop in Uganda, a range of press articles on CBP in Mangaung;

5.2.4 List of publications

A full list of publications is attached in Annex 1

5.2.5 Follow up action/research necessary to promote the findings of the work to achieve their development benefit? This should include plans for further dissemination, as appropriate.

The following is being undertaken at present using other resources:

- Testing of the methodology in more municipalities with a wide range of capacities in SA, including evaluation and revisions to Guides;
- Testing of the methodology for linkage to local authority plans in South Africa, with revisions as needed;
- Rollout of HPPG guides in Uganda with review of their effectiveness.

Additional resources would be useful for:

- in SA to develop an integrated CBP and district planning guide for municipalities with very low capacity. This would not address the community action objectives of CBP, but would address the improved plans and services objectives.
- Follow up evaluations;
- Process support in Ghana and Zimbabwe to assist with mainstreaming of the methodologies;
- Some support for on-going communication between partners, to continue the peer-learning, competition and support;
- How to deal with short vs long-term issues, eg over the environment;
- The community-based management mechanisms to support implementation.

5.2.6 How the outputs will be made available to intended users?

Products of the project are all freely available at www.khanya-mrc.co.za/cbp. In Uganda the HPPG guides are being printed to be available for municipalities. In the other countries the Guides are freely available for municipalities to use.

Annex 1 Publications

Overall

- CBP partners (2003): “Making The Link Between Micro And Meso – Learning From Experience On Community-Based Planning And Management, Natural Resource Perspectives No 88, October 2003, London, Overseas Development Institute.
- Goldman, I and J, Abbot (eds) (2004): Edition of PLA Notes 49 on “Decentralisation and community-based planning”, PLA Notes, April 2004, London, International Institute for Environment and Development.
- Goldman, I (2004): “Upscaling Community Driven Development: Learning From Experience On Community-Based Planning (CBP) In Uganda, South Africa, Zimbabwe And Ghana”, paper presented at World Bank Workshop on Upscaling Community Driven Development, Washington, June 2003.

Uganda

- Blomley, T P Kasule-Mukasa, F Nunan and C Kiberu (2004): “Experiences with CBP from Uganda”, in PLA Notes 49, see Goldman and Abbot (2004).
- Khanya (2002): “Report on Visit and Workshop in Uganda 30.6.02 to 11.7.02”, Bloemfontein, CBP Project.
- Androa, Royce Gloria (2002): “Evaluation of Community-Based Planning in Bushenyi District (Uganda)”, Kampala, for Ministry of Local Government.
- Bushenyi DLG (2002): “Manual for Parish Development Planning in Bushenyi District, 30 January 2002”, Bushenyi, Bushenyi District Local Government.
- MLG/PMA/CARE (2001): “Report on National Workshop On Community Based Planning, 12-13 June 2001”, Kampala, Ministry of Local Government/Programme for Modernisation of Agriculture/CARE
- Ministry of Local Government (Uganda) 2003: “Community Based Planning (CBP) In Uganda: The Community-Based Planning Project as at 31 January 2003”, Kampala, Ministry of Local Government.
- Ministry of Local Government (Uganda) 2003: “Harmonized Participatory Planning Guide for Lower Local Governments, August 2003”, Kampala, Ministry of Local Government.
- Ministry of Local Government (Uganda) 2004: “Community Based Planning (CBP) In Uganda: Final Report of the Community-Based Planning Project”, Kampala, Ministry of Local Government.

South Africa

- CDS (2002): “Evaluation of community-based planning in Mangaung”, Bloemfontein, Centre for Development Support, University of Free State.
- Chimbuya, S, C Ambert, M Feldman, T Maine and T Mea (2004): “Experiences of CBP in South Africa”, in PLA Notes 49, see Goldman (2004).
- DDP (2001): “The link between Micro and Meso: learning from experience on Community-Based Planning (CBP)”, in DDP Newsletter Vol 5,

- November 2001, Pretoria, Department of Provincial and Local Government
- Khanya (2001): “Workshop on Community-Based Planning in South Africa, June 2001”, Bloemfontein, Mangaung Local Municipality/dplg/Khanya-managing rural change.
- Khanya (2002): “Report of South African Community Based Planning workshop, Bloemfontein, 29-30 October 2002”, Bloemfontein, Mangaung Local Municipality/dplg/Khanya-managing rural change.
- Khanya (2003a): “Community-Based Planning in South Africa: the CBP project as at 31 March 2003”, Bloemfontein, CBP Steering Committee.
- Khanya (2003b): “CBP newsletter No 1, September 2003”, Bloemfontein, CBP Steering Committee.
- Khanya (2003c): “CBP newsletter No 2, November 2003”, Bloemfontein, CBP Steering Committee.
- Khanya (2004a): “CBP newsletter No 3, March 2004”, Bloemfontein, CBP Steering Committee.
- Khanya (2004b): “CBP newsletter No 4, September 2004”, Bloemfontein, CBP Steering Committee.
- Khanya (2004c): “Implications of CBP”, September 2003, Bloemfontein, CBP Steering Committee.
- Development Works/Khanya (2003): “IDP Managers Guide, September 2003”, Bloemfontein, CBP Steering Committee.
- Khanya/Development Works (2003): “CBP Facilitators Guide, September 2003”, Bloemfontein, CBP Steering Committee.
- Leshabane, J (2004): “Community-based planning: linking the village to local government”, in Voice April/May 2004, Pretoria, South African Local Government Association.

Zimbabwe

- ITDG (2001): “National Workshop on Community Based Planning in Zimbabwe: Moving Towards Common Principles, 6th and 7th June 2001”, Harare, MLGPWH/ITDG.
- Masendeke, A, A Mlalazi, A Ndhlovu and D Gumbo (2004): “Empowering Communities through CBP in Zimbabwe: experiences in Gwanda and Chimanimani”, in PLA Notes 49, see Goldman and Abbot (2004).
- MLGPWNH/ITDG (2001): “Country Review of Community Based Planning: The Case of Zimbabwe, August 2001”, Harare, MLGPWNH/ITDG.
- MLGPWNH/ITDG (2002): “Manual For Community-Based Planning, July 2002”, Harare, MLGPWH/ITDG.
- MLGPWNH/ITDG (2002): “Community-Based Planning in Zimbabwe: report of the CBP project, 10 October 2002”, Harare, MLGPWNH/ITDG.
- MLGPWNH/ITDG (2002): “Proceedings of NGO Consultative Forum on Community-Based Planning, 25 October 2002”, Harare, MLGPWNH/ITDG
- MLGPWNH/ITDG (2004): “Community Based Planning (CBP) in Zimbabwe: Final Report of the Community-Based Planning Project, October 2004”, Harare, MLGPWNH/ITDG.

Ghana

Awoosah, E t, J Cofie-Agamah, BJ oppong, S Kwarteng, F Owusu Ansah (2004): Planning with the Area Council: experience with CBP in Ghana”, in PLA Notes 49, see Goldman and Abbot (2004).

ISODEC (2001): “Community-Based Planning – Report on national workshop – Ghana, 9 – 10 June 2001”, Accra, ISODEC.

ISODEC (2001): “Community-Based Planning – Country Review report - Ghana, August 2001”, Accra, ISODEC.

ISODEC (2004): “Community-Based Planning – Final Country Review report - Ghana, September 2004”, Accra, Community-Based Planning Team – Ghana, Accra, ISODEC.

Khanya (2003): “Report on Visit and Workshop in Ghana June 2003”, Bloemfontein, Community-Based Planning Project.

Other

Khanya (2001): “Report on Visit to India re Community-based planning”, Bloemfontein, Khanya-managing rural change.

Khanya (2002): “Report on Study Visit to Bolivia and Sao Paolo”, Bloemfontein, Khanya-managing rural change.