

**Report of South African
Community Based
Planning workshop
Bloemfontein,
29-30 October 2002**

18 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 national workshop was organised by Mangaung Local Municipality and Khanya, with the support of SALGA, DPLG and the Free State Department of Local Government and Housing. Thanks to the participants who came from all over South Africa, and the hundreds of ward committee members who joined us on the first day. It was a pleasure to see some 400 or so people joining us for this event. Having the ward committee members was a small thank you for the efforts you have made in making the ward planning happen, and I hope you found it worthwhile. It was a privilege to hear the experiences of our partners in Uganda, Zimbabwe, and Ghana. Thanks to the Minister Sidney Mufamadi for the vain efforts he made to come, and the challenging speech that was delivered on his behalf. Also to MEC Lechesa Tsenoli, who showed his commitment by attending most of the workshop, chairing the last session, and volunteering to participate in the national Steering Committee which was agreed to take CBP forward. We hope that CBP will now take its appropriate place as a guiding methodology for making participatory planning a reality in South Africa, and we in Mangaung will endeavour to take this forward, pioneering the challenges of mainstreaming CBP into the IDP process.

Itumeleng Mokoena, Executive Mayor, Mangaung Local Municipality

This meeting was funded by Mangaung Local Municipality and DFID as part of the Community-Based Planning Project. 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 and www.bloemfontein.co.za

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.bfnccouncil.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	ii
Further information and contacts	iii
Glossary	v
1 Introduction	1
1.1 Background	1
1.2 Workshop Objectives	1
2 Opening speech by Executive Mayor, Cnr Itumeleng Mokoena	2
3 The government's approach to participation in local government	4
4 Background to community-based planning	9
4.1 Challenges and ways forward for public participation	9
4.2 UK's approach to local governance in SA	10
4.3 Introduction to community-based planning	11
5 Examples of CBP from the different partner countries	14
5.1 CBP in Mangaung Local Municipality	14
5.2 CBP – Uganda Experiences	16
5.3 Ghana's Experiences with Community-Based Planning	19
5.4 Lessons from Zimbabwe	20
6 Integration of CBP into the IDP and participatory management	22
7 Perceived strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats of CBP	26
7.1 Strengths and weaknesses of CBP	26
7.2 Opportunities and threats of CBP	28
8 Way forward for CBP	30
8.1 Suggestions for taking CBP forward in SA	30
8.2 Suggestions for taking CBP forward internationally	32
Annex 1 Programme	34
Annex 2 List of participants	43

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 OF SA COMMUNITY BASED-PLANNING WORKSHOP 29-30 OCTOBER 2002

1 Introduction

Decentralisation is being advocated as one of the answers to pro-poor service delivery. However one of the limiting factors is that work on strengthening local government and local management of services (meso level) has often not succeeded in strengthening the links with their citizens (micro level). The Community-Based Planning (CBP) project focuses on community involvement in the planning process and so their influence on the resource allocation system. The project is learning from best practice in the 4 participating countries (Uganda, Zimbabwe, South Africa and Ghana), and in 2 countries that have been visited (Madhya Pradesh in India, and Bolivia).. The project is funded by DFID, through the Rural Livelihood Department's Policy Research Programme. The **goal** of this project is that: ***“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.”*** This is the report of the second SA National Workshop on CBP, held 29-30 October in Bloemfontein.

The objectives of the workshop were for municipalities and other development practitioners involved in local governance to be aware of the experiences with community-based ward planning, how they could use it, and to have identified how to take this forward in South Africa.

2 Opening speech by the Executive Mayor of Mangaung Local Municipality, Clr Itumeleng Mokoena

Mangaung has taken on CBP as a way of improving democratic decentralisation. Through Ward Planning, Mangaung has adopted the activist approach for municipal planning processes and community meetings, which has brought close contact between the Municipality, Councillors, Ward Committees, and the community. This community-based planning has resulted in a changed direction for Mangaung in their Integrated Development Plan, and the release of tremendous latent community energy to address the priorities of their 43 wards.

3 The Government's approach to participation in local government – address by the honourable Minister Sydney Mufamadi, Minister for Provincial and Local Government

The Minister's speech was read on his behalf by Andrew Boraine, Ministerial Advisor. The Department of Provincial and Local Government (DPLG) is proud to be a partner on this learning project. For DPLG this initiative is seen as a response to the enabling legislative environment created in South Africa which challenges us to establish and improve the mechanisms and systems for community participation. The Minister highlighted some of the principles relating to participation in the system of local government, and that a Municipality is now defined as consisting of the political structures and administration of the municipality, **and the community of the municipality**. He highlighted the roles of ward committees and the use of IDP Representative Forums to bring together stakeholders. Government does not see communities as passive participants but as active agents of change and development. Participation processes should develop people to become more resourceful and ensure that service and infrastructure delivery is enhanced through community participation. Some of the key challenges include capacity-building of members of IDP Representative Forums, councillors and ward committee members, involving the private sector more and building sustainable partnerships between role players. The Minister also requested

proposals to PCC in relation to the role of ward councillors and ward committees, the enabling environment, promotion and replication of CBP, strengthening the linkages between CBP, IDPs, provincial and national programmes.

4 Background to CBP

MEC Lechesa Tsenoli of the Free State Department of Local Government and Housing highlighted the challenge to deepen democracy and establish a developmental state. He highlighted that participation could be weak or strong, and that the CBP approach predicated a commitment to strong participation, which needs clarification of the roles and responsibilities of different stakeholders. He also stressed that good governance is democratic governance, respecting human rights, having a say in decisions, holding decision-makers accountable, and that economic and social policies must aim at eradicating poverty and be responsive to people's needs and aspirations. There is need for a permanent struggle against bureaucratisation and we should put people at the centre of our developmental efforts.

Richard Thomas, DFID's Senior Governance Advisor, indicated that decentralisation has often become a device for further centralisation especially when the approach used is through deconcentration rather than devolution to lower level political authorities. It does not necessarily increase the level of 'voice' for poor people. The 'appropriate' level of government (given the resource base, the responsibilities of government and the managerial capacity) may be less government at all levels. Indirect approaches to local empowerment may often be more effective, i.e. developing civil society, use of a variety of media, development of systems such as Ombudsmen, etc as these increase civic competence and reduce the abuses of power at all levels.

Ian Goldman, the CBP Project Manager, from Khanya-managing rural change, discussed how the project had originated from dissatisfaction with approaches to planning and institutional reform which failed to link institutions to citizens. CBP was developed to make plans more relevant to local needs and conditions, to increase community involvement in provision of public services, and to increase people's control over their own lives and livelihoods. Partners came together from Uganda, SA, Zimbabwe and Ghana to see how such a planning system could be developed and implemented. A series of principles were developed to ensure that the system would be holistic, realistic and sustainable, and would address the needs of the poor. Each country has reviewed current experience on participatory planning, had a national workshop, piloted the methodology and Uganda, SA and Zimbabwe have gone to full implementation in one municipality. In total some 1.5-2 million people have been covered, and the methodology has been found to work well.

5 Examples of CBP in practice

Clr Zumane, the Speaker of Mangaung Local Municipality, presented the experience in Mangaung. Mangaung decided to adopt CBP to strengthen its planning process. It based its process around newly created ward committees, using a 4 day planning process, allocating R50 000 to each ward for spending on local priorities immediately after the plan was approved. The ward planning started in September 2001, and completed in March 2002, with 40 facilitators trained, 42 ward plans completed, and 41 receiving their R50 000. An independent evaluation has been conducted which showed that CBP was found to be very useful by councillors, ward committees and facilitators, the manual very helpful, the poor and disadvantaged were involved, there were impacts on service provision and there were high levels of ownership of the plan. However the support process could have been improved during the planning, and afterwards. CBP has helped to promote a high level of

voluntarism, many projects have been implemented afterwards, and has led to a changed strategic direction for the Municipality.

The presentation for Uganda was by Charles Kiberu of Bushenyi District and Martin Onyach-Olaa of the Local Government Development Programme. The structure of local government in Uganda is very different to South Africa, with district local governments undertaking all developmental services, no province, and a lower level local government called a subcounty rather like the old TRCs and TLCs. The level below the subcounty, the parish was chosen as the main level for CBP, typically having a population of 3-5000 people. The CBP process was carried out in March 2002, using a 2 day planning process. 170 parishes were covered in Bushenyi District, which were facilitated by subcounty staff, and CBP also influenced the subcounty and district planning process. Some of the challenges include limited capacity at subcounty level, ensuring the priorities of the poor emerge, and involvement of local CBOs and NGOs. The vision-based process was found to work, the livelihoods analysis strengthened participation of the poor, but mentoring and training needs to be strengthened in future. National government has also incorporated the CBP methodology into a national Harmonised Participatory Planning Guide (HPPG) which is being piloted at the moment.

Ghana's experience was presented by John Cofie-Agamah, Director of Fiscal Decentralisation in the Ghanaian Ministry of Local Government and Rural Development (MLGRD). Ghana conducted an initial review and workshop, which was piloted in Adansi East in Feb/March 2002 and in Asante Akim in April/May 2002. There was a training of facilitators of other Area Councils in September 2002. There has been action in the two area councils to take forward the plans. Unfortunately the roll out to all area councils in the two districts has been delayed due to Poverty Reduction Strategy processes where national government decided that participation would only be one workshop per region with opinion-leaders. The Ghanaian partners need to re-strategize to strengthen commitment at national level, to ensure expansion to cover the rest of the Area Councils in the Pilot Districts; and to adapt the facilitation manual.

In Zimbabwe village and ward committees were created in 1984, and recently village and ward assemblies have been created chaired by traditional leaders. In rural areas there are Rural District Councils (RDCs), and it was decided to pilot CBP using wards, as in South Africa. 19 of Gwanda RDC's 23 wards have been covered by CBP, and this was described by Ronnie Sibanda, the Chief Executive of the RDC. 5 wards have also been covered in Chimanimani RDC. A variety of lessons have emerged from Zimbabwe, including the use of District Training Teams, and the use of local facilitators.

6 Examples of participation in the IDPs

Groups looked at participation in the IDPs prior to CBP. Findings are reported according to the methodology, use of consultants, suggestions for maximising participation, ensuring representation, capacity-building, representative forum and stakeholder involvement, relation between projects in IDP and local priorities, feedback to communities, role of ward committees and data for planning.

7 Strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats (SWOT) of CBP

Groups did a SWOT on CBP based on the presentations and visits. A few of these are highlighted:

Strengths	Weaknesses
There is a tried and tested tool for vision and strengths-based planning	Need to strengthen representation process
People and ward committees have been empowered	Current plans don't balance short and long-term plans adequately
Vulnerable groups have been targetted	Limited buy-in by service providers
Links people to the IDP and resource allocation	Links with IDP inadequate at present
Opportunities	Threats
Existing legislation enshrines participation	Inadequate resources allocated to planning
Other potential partners can add value to CBP	Power struggles in wards
Strengthen coordination between local, provincial and national plans	Lack of budgetary allocation to support CBP
Potential for integrated planning	Manipulation of priorities possible

7 Way forward for CBP

It was agreed to move from a project to a national programme, and to establish a steering committee with the following composition: SALGA (Musa Soni), provincial LGH (Free State MEC LGH), DPLG (Yusuf Patel), civil society, Khanya, donors (GTZ/Finnish Aid), Mangaung (Speaker), Ethekwini Municipality, a district municipality (to be defined), Greater Tzaneen (Morongoa Ramphele). The Steering Committee will be responsible for crystallising recommendations from here and report back. The date of the first meeting was set as 20 November. Some key proposals for the way forward are:

Actions to take CBP forward	By who
Methodology	
Expand CBP methodology and guidelines to include community mobilisation and awareness of citizen rights	Khanya with support from DFID and other partners
Develop and package information sources to provide to WCs on government/NGO programmes to assist quality of planning	Provincial and national government
DPLG to develop new simplified guidelines on CBP	DPLG
Define the capacities and resources required for effective ward-based plans – including for less well resourced municipalities	Khanya
Strengthen linkage between ward plans and IDP and prov/national programmes including information	Khanya/ Municipality
Follow-up and feedback	
Clarify role of WCs and other community structures in implementation and review of IDPs	DPLG
Need for accountability of councillors, eg WCs seeing Council minutes, feedback meetings and need to simplify information	Municipality
Training	
Training needs assessment and training programme for municipal technical officers involved in CBP so can fulfil their role properly	HRD manager for Municipality
Feed experience into training of development planners	Universities/DPLG
Incentives	
Create incentives for ward participation (such as the R50 000)	Municipalities, Service Providers and WCs

Actions to take CBP forward	By who
Linking with budget	
Budget for CBP during IDP review and in business plans	Municipality (plus other levels). National (DPLG) and province
Commitment and advocacy	
Education for awareness and acceptance (of CBP). Target all stakeholders (councillors, officials, communities, business). Use range of methods (community meetings, adverts, workshops etc)	Municipality with partners, e.g NGOs. DPLG and provinces to direct and fund
Advocacy for the value of CBP with political leaders at highest level (municipal, provincial, national)	Mayor and MEC for Local Government and Housing
Establish Steering Committee to take forward CBP in South Africa	Various
DPLG national should establish a platform for learning for service delivery to communities	DPLG
Initiate/support pilot CBPs per province with an awareness programme, selection of sites and building on 4-country study	DPLG/ Participants at this workshop
Policy and legislation	
Revisit legislation re roles of ward committees to increase powers and functions so they can fulfill their role more effectively	DPLG/ Municipality
Lobby for inclusion of CBP approach into the IDP manual	MLM through MEC for Local Government
Harness senior government commitment to participation so IDP guidelines legislated, including CBP, role of constituency office and training of ward committees	DPLG
Establish how CBP can best be promoted/replicated	DPLG
Establish a network to coordinate methodologies – SALGA/DFID/Gov	This meeting
Report given to PCC on results of CBP	DPLG
Communication and networking	
Improve networking of different participatory methodologies (yearly forum, news letters, websites)	Local government and other stakeholders
Establish listserve/newsletter for CBP – so people can disseminate ideas eg DPLG establishing a system	DPLG
Internationally	
Adding additional countries, using other methods of networking and communication eg using videoconferencing, or through other networks such as Africities	
Take forward within NEPAD and SADC	

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

Decentralisation is being advocated as one of the answers to pro-poor service delivery. However one of the limiting factors is that work on strengthening local government and local management of services (meso level) has often not succeeded in strengthening the links with their citizens (micro level). If livelihoods of poor people are to improve, it is critical that these linkages improve.

The Community-Based Planning (CBP) project focuses on one aspect of this, community involvement in the planning process and so their influence on the resource allocation system. The project is learning from best practice in the 4 participating countries (Uganda, Zimbabwe, South Africa and Ghana), and in 2 countries that have been visited (Madhya Pradesh in India, and Bolivia).. The project is funded by DFID, through the Rural Livelihood Department's Policy Research Programme.

The **goal** of this project is that: *“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.”*

A vision-based methodology and manual have been developed, which has been adapted in the different countries. Successful pilots have been run in all 4 countries, and this has proceeded to full implementation in Bushenyi District in Uganda and Mangaung Local Municipality in South Africa, covering over 1.5 million people in total.

This is the second national workshop on CBP, while the first held in June 2001 explored current approaches to participatory planning in SA. Subsequent to that a CBP methodology was developed and implemented in the 4 countries, including Mangaung Local Municipality and parts of Limpopo Province. This workshop aimed to report back to the wider development community in SA, notably local government, on the methodologies developed and progress in their implementation.

1.2 Workshop Objectives

The objectives were that by the end of the workshop municipalities and other development practitioners involved in local governance are aware of the experiences with community-based ward planning, how they could use it, and ways this could be supported in South Africa have been identified.

Specifically participants should:

- understand the principles and methodology developed for CBP;
- understand how the community-based planning project has operated and what have been the results;
- understand the lessons from the different countries;
- have developed recommendations and strategies for taking forward CBP in South Africa.

2 OPENING SPEECH BY EXECUTIVE MAYOR, CLR ITUMELENG MOKOENA

Our Municipality has, like the rest of other local governments in the country, entered a new and challenging phase since the elections of December 2000. This period was marked by a creation of so-called “wall-to-wall” municipalities, which presented a sharp contrast to the previous form of local government. The previous system of local government promoted governance in urban areas to a much greater degree than rural areas. This created uneven and unsustainable development, which remains a legacy today. The new approach to local governance focuses on developmental institutions that address citizens on service delivery in an equitable and sustainable manner.

Previously the Municipality developed policies without consultation with ordinary citizens. This resulted in wastage of resources as strategies were sometimes unsustainable and unrealistic. Our Municipal Planning has been underpinned by officials doing planning without interaction with the community, and finding out their needs and priorities. The challenge facing both the politicians and the administration in this new system of local government is to ensure that the community is actively involved in the governance of the municipality. Concomitantly, the community are entitled to ensure that services are delivered adequately.

The MLM’s approach to innovation focused on revolutionising planning and delivery methods and practices. We have pioneered participatory approaches to Integrated Development Planning with a range of innovative initiatives aimed at improving democratic decentralisation.

Through Ward Planning, we have adopted the activist approach by Municipal planning processes and community meetings, which has brought close contact between the Municipality, Councillors, Ward Committees, and the community. We are pioneering a form of participatory planning called community-based planning, which has also been implemented in partner countries of Uganda, Zimbabwe, and Ghana, an example of NEPAD in action. This community-based planning has resulted in a changed direction for us in our Integrated Development Plan, and the release of tremendous latent community energy to address the priorities of their 43 wards. In all the partner-countries some 1.5 million people have been covered by this planning methodology. We will hear during the Conference how this process has already been incorporated into national policy in Uganda.

As Mangaung, we are excited to see delegates having travelled from all over the country to listen to our experiences on CBP. This is a sign that both officials and politicians from municipalities and in other spheres of government are keen to ensure that our communities are involved in local government planning, and that there is a strong relationship between our communities and local government.

Outline of the programme

We will hear during our 2-day Conference about how the CBP Project was conceived and implemented. After all the speeches on different views of community based planning from national, provincial and local level, we will be receiving practical experiences from all the participants of this projects, including from our partners in Uganda, Ghana and Zimbabwe, and also our funders, the UK’s Department for International Development (DFID).

Delegates will also have an opportunity to visit wards from Thaba Nchu, Botshabelo, Mangaung township and central Bloemfontein, seeing evidence of the energy and enthusiasm of black and white communities in the area. They will see examples of projects ranging from income-generation, crime reduction, HIV and cleaning up the environment.

As you know the objectives of this workshop are that municipalities and other development practitioners involved in local governance are aware of the experiences with community-based ward planning, how they could use it, and ways this could be supported in South Africa have been identified. Immediately following this workshop there will be a meeting of the CBP Partners from the 4 countries from 31st October to 1st November to plan how to take the project forward, and to expand the use of community-based planning in Africa, and I would like to wish them a successful planning meeting.

Finally, I would like to take this opportunity to thank the ward committee members and councillors for their tremendous efforts in undertaking this ward planning process, and in implementing projects afterwards. Most importantly, I thank our partners who were actively involved in the project in one way or the other, in a true spirit of cooperative governance.

I wish all the delegates a good two-day Conference and a wonderful stay in our city of Roses!

3 THE GOVERNMENT'S APPROACH TO PARTICIPATION IN LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Keynote address by the honourable Minister Sydney Mufamadi, Minister for Provincial and Local Government, read on his behalf by Andrew Boraine, Ministerial Advisor

Introduction

As you all know this is the year of Letsema during which communities and government are urged to rise to the President's call for volunteerism. This call for volunteerism is a catalyst for deepening local democracy and is backed by a new local government system that places communities at the centre of reconstruction and development. It is in light of this that this two-day workshop is so relevant. The organisers and participants of this community based planning project should be congratulated at the outset for this important initiative. The Department of Provincial and Local Government (DPLG) is proud to be a partner on this learning project. For us this initiative is seen as a response to the enabling legislative environment created in South Africa which challenges us to strive for establishing and improving mechanisms and systems for community participation.

The New Local Government System

As we grapple with enormous development challenges we must also celebrate some remarkable achievements since 1994. Over and above the fact that millions of South Africans today have access to basic services that was previously denied to them, we are a leading country in the world when it comes to charting a development path driven and owned by communities. Most of the delivery that has taken place in our country since 1994 has been done through models of community participation and models of government-community partnerships. Our constitution, together with various policies and legislation, is a benchmark for institutionalizing good local governance wherein community participation is featured as a central theme. Over time the implementation of new legislation will result in deepening local democracy in a sustainable way, thereby improving service delivery, speeding up and enhancing development.

I wish to highlight a few principles that underpin our new local government system:

- a) In terms of our constitution a municipality must "*structure and manage its administration and budgeting and planning processes to give priority to the basic needs of the community, and to promote the social and economic development of the community*".
- b) The White Paper on Local Government stipulates that municipalities must play a developmental role by committing themselves to "*working with citizens and groups within the community to find sustainable ways to meet their social, economic and material needs and improve the quality of their lives*".
- c) In terms of the Municipal Structures Act (1998) a municipality must develop mechanisms to consult the community in performing its functions and exercising its powers, and must annually review:
 - The needs of the community;
 - Its priorities to meet those needs;
 - Its processes for involving the community;
 - Its organisational and delivery mechanisms for meeting the needs of the community;

- Its overall performance in achieving the constitutional objectives.
- d) The Municipal Structures Act defines a municipality as consisting of the political structures and administration of the municipality, **and the community of the municipality**. It nevertheless has a separate legal personality which excludes liability on the part of its community. This new definition of a municipality has profound implications for the way municipalities function and work.
- e) In terms of the Municipal Systems Act (2000) the key instrument for developmental local government (or the new local government system) is Integrated Development Planning. IDPs are planning and strategic frameworks, for the short, medium and long term, to help municipalities to fulfill their *developmental* mandate. The IDP process must go through appropriate mechanisms, processes and procedures to allow for:
 - The local community to be regularly consulted in its development needs and priorities.
 - The local community to participate in the drafting, implementation, monitoring and review of the IDP.
 - Organs of state, including traditional authorities, and other role players to be identified and consulted on the drafting of the IDP, and to be part of the implementation process.
- f) An important and key feature of the new local government system is the ward committee system. According to the Municipal Structures Act:
 - The object of a ward committee is to enhance participatory democracy;
 - A ward committee consists of the Councilor representing the ward who must also chair the committee, and not more than 10 other persons;
 - Municipalities must make rules regulating the procedure to elect the members of the ward committee taking into account gender equity and diversity of interests;
 - Municipalities must make administrative arrangements for ward committees to function properly;
 - The functions and powers of ward committees includes:
 - Making recommendations on any matter affecting the ward to the ward councilor or through the ward councilor to the metro or local council, executive committee or executive mayor;
 - Any such duties and powers as the metro or local council may delegate to it.

The experience so far

One can see from this comprehensive framework that government is committed to building vibrant and sustainable communities. The success of the new system will rest though on the commitment of all groups to take advantage of the new legislative environment. In other words, we need to translate legislative theory into developmental practice.

In practice, the new local government system, given all the capacity constraints, is already working. Numerous communities are for the very first time making a structured and cohesive impact on local policy, priorities and projects. In the first round of IDPs in terms of the new legislation communities across the country have been involved in joint planning sessions with mayors, councillors, municipal officials, sector department officials, and professionals. Many municipalities have established IDP Representative Forums with the aim of discussing every stage of the plan with all stakeholders. These forums will continue their work in the implementation phase. They fulfill a

useful role taking into account the large geographic areas the IDP has to cover, the various interests affected, and the diversity of issues covered. In most cases the Forums were chaired by the Mayor or a senior councillor and participation on the forums typically included:

- NGOs operating in the area;
- Community based organizations;
- Business organizations to a lesser extent;
- Municipal representatives;
- Traditional authorities;
- Resource organizations;
- The chairpersons of ward committees;
- Relevant national and provincial sector representatives, and, in some cases, parastatals.

The IDP Representative Forums therefore provided the link between the municipalities and the ward committees. This link can be strengthened if the capacity of ward councillors and committees is improved and if ward committees are able to make more organized contributions to the IDP process. This type of organized input can be facilitated by ward-based plans.

Challenges

Government does not view community participation as an end in itself. Rather the purpose of participation is the very essence of a people-centred approach to development. In this context communities should not be viewed as passive participants but as active agents of change and development. Participation processes should develop people to become more resourceful themselves in as much as it should be aimed at ensuring that service and infrastructure delivery is enhanced through community participation. In order to promote this vision of community participation the following key issues to need to be addressed collectively as government and key stakeholders, both at a municipal level and a community or ward level:

- Capacity building of role players participating on the IDP Representative Forums so that they can effectively engage with the planning and implementation process;
- Capacity building for councillors to become agents for change in their communities, better communicators, and more effective representatives;
- Capacity building of ward committee members so that they are able to serve as local development champions and are able to effectively interact with and promote the broader community;
- Strengthening ward committees so that they can more effectively interact with the IDP as a municipal wide plan;
- Involving the private sector more effectively in the IDPs to enhance regional and local economic development strategies and develop the revenue and resource base of municipalities;
- Moving beyond consultation and participation towards building sustainable partnership building, by establishing ongoing networks and innovative collaborations with various role players;
- Establishing and promoting municipal-community partnerships around service delivery programmes.

Ward Committees and Ward Based Planning

Ward committees are seen as the vehicle for deepening local democracy and the instrument through which a vibrant and involved citizenry can be established. It is at the local level within wards that all development issues converge. Ward committees therefore have a crucial role to play as an interface between government and communities (not just local government). The ward planning process piloted in Mangaung is exemplary in this regard.

The Mangaung community-based planning process has had a marked impact on the development of new strategic priorities for the Municipality. It has also generated suggestions for new ways of achieving the priorities. It has provided a clear role for ward councilors and ward committees.

Most importantly, it has shifted the focus away from communities waiting patiently (or impatiently) for government to deliver, towards a set of actions that communities themselves can participate in, in partnership with the Municipality and other stakeholders. As such, it creates a cooperative governance framework where citizens, councillors and officials take collective responsibility for development at the local level.

One of the characteristics of our globalised world is the rise of the knowledge economy, where access to, and management of information plays a critical role. The Mangaung community-based planning process has not only been an opportunity for households and communities to contribute to the IDP; it has provided them with access to information. This is the first step towards re-skilling our people to participate in the knowledge economy. It can be argued therefore that the funds spent on the planning process, and the R2m contributed towards participative implementation of project, are in fact investments in the economy of the region.

The community-based planning process provides a link between municipal-level planning and delivery, and activities at ward level. The IDP is a municipal wide plan that must be finalised on the basis of a range of inputs: community/ward, technical/professional, wider political objectives, regional, national and even international considerations. As you have demonstrated, the IDP cannot be made up simply by an addition of ward priorities and plans. The ongoing inter-relationship between ward planning and delivery and the IDP should therefore be stressed.

One of the key tests of any project is the ability to replicate it elsewhere, under different conditions. The strength of the Mangaung community-based planning experience lies in the fact that the process has been extremely well-documented in an accessible format, together with the fact that it provides a set of comparative experiences from other countries in Africa. For example, the Mangaung process was featured as one of the four city innovations presented at the recent launch of the South African Cities Network. This will make it easier for the information to be transformed into knowledge that can be utilized by other municipalities, in South Africa and in other parts of the world.

Conclusions

I would like to highlight the importance with which the government is treating the community-based planning project. In December 2001, the Presidents Coordinating Council (PCC), a forum where the President meets with the 9 Premiers and SALGA endorsed a local government transformation action plan. One of the key objectives of local government transformation is deepening local democracy. The community-based planning project is included as an output under this objective.

In light of this, I wish to suggest that this workshop discuss proposals that should be brought forward to PCC with regard to:

- The role of ward councilors and ward committees generally;
- The enabling environment required to fulfill this role;
- How community-based planning can best be promoted and replicated;
- The capacity and resources required to undertake effective ward-based planning;
- The role of ward committees and other community structures in implementation of the IDP, including annual monitoring and review;
- Strengthening the linkage between ward-based planning and municipal IDPs; and
- Strengthening the linkage between ward-based planning and provincial and national programmes.

I wish you well for the rest of your deliberations and look forward to receiving your proposals.

4 BACKGROUND TO COMMUNITY-BASED PLANNING

4.1 Challenges and ways forward for public participation

MEC Lechesa Tsenoli

Challenge for deepening democracy

“Our Fundamental Challenge is to construct a truly developmental state. More than rules, we should be driven by a vision of creating a people-centred society with institutional ways of measuring progress.

Consistently our state system should be enterprising and innovative, fight a permanent struggle against bureaucratisation for the involvement of the people in determining their destiny, in keeping with our concept of people-driven processes of change.

According to our President, Thabo Mbeki **“Our provincial and local governments have a critical role to play towards the realization of these objectives, which must in practice become a defining feature of our democracy.”**

The RDP had 6 main pillars:

- Meeting Basic Needs;
- Democratizing the state and society;
- Building and restructuring the economy;
- Human Resource Development;
- Peace and Security;
- Nation Building.

To achieve this we need to do it in an Integrated, People Centered and People Driven manner

“For forms of government let fools contest, what is best administered, is best!” (according to Alexandra Pope) Bureaucracy, says the writer, sees to it that action, words and thoughts never meet. Action stays at the workplace, words in meetings, and thoughts on the pillow. The quotes above illustrate dramatically why the President calls for a permanent struggle against bureaucratisation and that we should put people at the centre of our developmental efforts.

Developmental Local Government is local government committed to working with citizens and groups within the community to find sustainable ways to meet their social, economic and material needs and improve the quality of their lives.

Challenges and ways forward

Some of the challenges and ways forward are:

- We need to cultivate an understanding of the big picture – representative and participatory democracy results in sustainable [political] development;
- There are different forms of participation – weak and strong, and we must be clear which we want to promote, and therefore what methods are appropriate;
- We need to deepen democracy and use local languages as a medium of interaction;

- We need to clarify the roles, expectations and responsibilities of different stakeholders;
- We need advanced infrastructures, such as Telecommunication ‘infrastructure’, even on farms;
- We need timely, regular and reliable information dissemination in a targeted way – around different issues, to all constituents, so promoting accountability;
- We need to budget appropriately and at the right levels;
- There needs to be regular training, workshopping and exposure for public representatives and bureaucrats;
- There also needs to be regular training and capacity building of members of the community and their organizations, including building and improving levels of literacy.

Above all we need to Think Globally and Act Locally .

Good governance – for what?

From the human development perspective, good governance is democratic governance. Democratic governance means that¹:

- People’s human rights and fundamental freedoms are respected, allowing them to live with dignity;
- People have a say in decisions that affect their lives;
- People can hold decision-makers accountable;
- Inclusive and fair rules, institutions and practices govern social interactions;
- Women are equal partners with men in private and public spheres of life and decision-making;
- People are free from discrimination based on race, ethnicity, class, gender or any other attribute;
- The needs of future generations are reflected in current policies;
- Economic and social policies are responsive to people’s needs and aspirations;
- Economic and social policies aim at eradicating poverty and expanding the choices that all people have in their lives.

4.2 UK’s approach to local governance in SA

Richard Thomas, Senior Governance Advisor, DFID

Local governance is a normative rather than an empirically based concept. Decentralisation in practice has often become a device for further centralisation especially when the approach used is through deconcentration rather than devolution to lower level political authorities.

Decentralisation will not work as a standalone solution particularly to capacity and policy problems at the centre and does not necessarily increase the level of ‘voice’ for poor people. CSO’s (if not captured) are often better at expressing those views. The ‘appropriate’ level of government (given the resource base, the responsibilities of government and the managerial capacity) may be less government at all levels.

¹ Drawn from UNDP’s Human Development Report 2002

The Western view of democracy, pluralism, patronage, ethnicity, culture, etc, may not help us understand local conditions and possibilities in Africa and Asia. Indirect approaches to local empowerment may often be more effective, i.e. developing civil society, use of a variety of media, development of systems such as Ombudsmen, etc as these increase civic competence and reduce the abuses of power at all levels.

Transforming the capacity and quality of government at the local level takes time. Change management and organisation development skills are as important as, for example, financial management techniques.

3.3 Introduction to community-based planning

Ian Goldman, Khanya-managing rural change²

Background to CBP

Decentralisation and public sector reform initiatives have often focused on the institutions, and not the links to their clients. This has resulted in inadequate impacts of these changes on local people, and the need to improve linkages between the meso level institutions and their clients. While NGOs have been promoting participation and empowerment, and have produced some interesting case study examples, they have struggled to have policy impacts and to work at scale.

Previous action-research by Khanya funded by DFID looked at Institutional Support for Sustainable Livelihoods in Southern Africa (Zimbabwe, Zambia and SA). This showed the incredible institutional complexity with formal/informal organisations and other institutions (rules of the game), different sectors and policies, a wide range of services, all operating at micro (community), meso (local government and service delivery levels) and macro (policy) levels. This work highlighted the importance of improving micro-meso-macro linkages. A set of key governance issues for promoting sustainable livelihoods were identified:

Micro level

- Are (poor) people active and involved in managing their own development (claiming their rights and exercising their responsibilities)?
- Is there a responsive, active and accessible network of local service providers (community-based, private sector or government)

Meso level

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

If we don't improve the micro-meso link - our attempts at poverty reduction are bound to fail, with poor people's voice lost, and they will remain excluded from services.

Planning process

Current decentralisation initiatives tend to emphasise local government, at most to sub-county/ward. Uganda is promoting sub-county and district planning, nominally village and parish but this is very limited. In SA, the IDP looks good – but the form of participation is not clear. The response to inadequate participation is either a once-off workshop (usually producing a shopping list of problems) or a thousand PRAs – which is very resource intensive, and usually sectoral. There is a

² Project Manager of the CBP project

need for a system that can be replicated within resources available, that links to the local government planning system and that is cross-sectoral and holistic.

Why community-based planning

There are 3 common motivations for undertaking participatory planning:

- To make plans more relevant to local needs and conditions;
- To increase community involvement in provision of public services;
- To increase people's control over their own lives and livelihoods.

Depending on which is chosen, there are important implications for the type of planning that is undertaken. In the CBP project the decision was taken that it must be all 3.

Developing the approach

Partners from 4 countries came together, from Uganda, Zimbabwe, Ghana and South Africa, all with some degree of decentralisation. In all cases there is the key partner from national level plus a facilitator-local government partnership - partners who are motivated and working on this or related topics already. The facilitator is usually an NGO.

An action—research approach was taken, with limited funds to be applied to the learning, sharing and methodology development. The project was deliberately not intended to be full-time, so learnings could be incorporated into people's normal operations and so influence policy and practice.

The principles that we developed for community-based planning are:

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

CBP so far

The steps involved have included:

- Review of experience in-country and national workshops (April-June 2001);
- sharing workshop - developed core methodology and later manual for vision-based planning, based around livelihoods (August) ;
- methodology and manual adapted for each country (Sep 2001 +);
- pilots run in SA, Uganda, Zimbabwe and Ghana (Sept 2001 +);
- full implementation in SA, Uganda and underway in Zimbabwe;
- exchange of facilitators - SA-Uganda (April 2002), Uganda-Ghana and Uganda-Zimbabwe (Sept 2002);
- visits to compare experience:
 - to India (Madhya Pradesh) Sept 2001;

- to Bolivia May 2002;
- to Uganda (Bushenyi) July 2002 ;
- writing up evaluations and country reports (Oct 2002) ;
- national workshops to feed back (Uganda, SA so far).

Tangible successes

SA

- Mangaung - 43 ward plans, covering 750 000 people, of which over 10 000 participated; guided the 5 year IDP – with action by community in many wards afterwards;
- experience has been used for national guidelines on community participation (DPLG);
- Limpopo, 31 villages have been covered in all 6 districts of the province;
- CBP is now one output for DPLG in reporting to PCC.

Uganda

- Bushenyi – covers 800 000 people, 170 parish plans produced and used for sub-county/district plans;
- used for national Guidelines for subdistrict planning (HPPG);

Zimbabwe - half way with Chimanimani/Gwanda Rural District Councils

Ghana - 2 pilots run so far in Adanse East and Asante Akim Districts

Next steps in SA

Mangaung is considering how to roll the ward plans, and how to ensure follow-up. Limpopo Province is also considering how to take CBP forward. We are now building national awareness, as through this workshop and a country report to be completed after this workshop

During this workshop we will be focusing on how to take forward this and related approaches in SA. There is a CBP partner meeting Thursday/Friday to think through longer cooperation issues

We also need to look at the micro-meso link in terms of service delivery and a new Action-Research project on Community-Based Workers (eg paravets, paralegals, home-based care workers) with SA, Lesotho, Uganda plus one other country will happen next year. We are busy finalising partners at present.

5 EXAMPLES OF CBP FROM THE DIFFERENT PARTNER COUNTRIES

5.1 CBP in Mangaung Local Municipality

Clr Zongezile Zumane, Speaker for Mangaung Local Municipality

Why did we implement CBP in Mangaung

Mangaung decided to take forward the CBP project, and to invest significant of its own resources, to ensure that decisions are based on:

- People's development priorities (ward planning);
- Knowledge of available and accessible resources (including opportunities and strengths);
- Proper information and a profound understanding of the dynamics and trends influencing the development in Mangaung Municipality;
- And to ensure proper preparation for, and involvement of stakeholders in the IDP process.

Mangaung already had the Kgatelopele project funded by USAID on ward committees and saw this as good opportunity to link with the CBP project.

Steps undertaken

- Review of SA experience conducted April - June 2001
- First SA workshop held in Umhlanga in June 2001 - participants from Free State included Mangaung Local Municipality, Department of Local Government and Housing, Motheo District Municipality, Economic Affairs, Social Development, as well as other participants from around SA;
- August, four country meeting held in Bloemfontein where we agreed the principles and approach;
- September, a generic manual was developed and then a Mangaung version;
- Implementation plan agreed by MLM, including R50 000 per ward to fund immediate implementation of less costly actions.

Public participation in CBP

The approach taken to public participation in CBP was to use existing community structures. Mangaung Local Municipality was the first municipality to establish ward committees during 2001. Public participation was structured in such a way as to provide sufficient room for diversity, i.e. different participation styles and cultures. Public participation encouraged the involvement of disadvantaged or marginalised groups and gender equity in accordance with the conditions and capacities in a ward.

The Mangaung manual chose the full 4 day contact time plus preparation and writing (shortened to 3 in some predominantly white wards). There was an allocation of R50 000 per ward to support immediate implementation of ward plans. The preparation for CBP required building political commitment in Mangaung, and the suggestion for a pilot was immediately transformed into full-scale implementation right across the municipal area.

Phases

The Ward planning started in September 2001 and completed in February 2002. A cascade training approach was used to build the skills of facilitators. Around 40 facilitators were trained including 30 municipal staff, plus staff from DLGH, Motheo, and Social Development. The manual was modified after the first and third ward planning sessions.

What does the ward plan look like

The plan has the following elements:

- Situation in the ward, overall and for different groups, including the most disadvantaged;
- vision and goals for the ward;
- projects and activities to achieve the goals (and what the community should do, what the municipality needs to do, what others need to do);
- proposals for spending R50 000 allocated by Municipality for spending this financial year;
- action plan for the ward.

What have been the results

43 ward plans have been produced (each ward having 10-18 000 people). We will visit 4 of these this afternoon. This has generated a new direction for Council, informing our strategic direction/plan (IDP), and will be followed up in our civic leadership hub for our strategic direction. The overall priorities were derived from wards, and these changed radically the direction of the Municipality over the next 5 years.

The results of the evaluation conducted on CBP in Mangaung indicate that:

- CBP was felt to be very useful by most wards (scoring it very useful-excellent);
- working with different groups was very helpful and there was widespread participation;
- facilitators were drawn from a wide variety of jobs in the Municipality and were very positive about the experience;
- the manuals were found to be very helpful;
- training and support to facilitators could have been improved;
- the poor and disadvantaged were involved in the planning, and their priorities are represented in the final plans;
- plans originating from wards had biggest focus on environment, jobs, HIV, safety and skills/education;
- there was evidence of services being improved as a result (even though this wasn't expected at this early stage);
- there were very high levels of ownership of the plan and process by the wards, with the R50 000 being important in motivating people to participate;
- for CBP to succeed it needs a good relationship between Ward Councillor and Committee.

Key lessons emerging from the evaluation

- the CBP process is people-driven – this is politically very powerful;
- the CBP process caters for the specific interests of vulnerable groups;
- we need to strengthen the links between CBP and Integrated Development Planning;
- we need to develop in MLM the capacity to manage, co-ordinate and support the implementation of CBP;
- there is need for better preparation and support during the planning process;

- we need to continue to ensure that the vision- and strengths-based approach continues, and that the needs/problem-based approach does not take over

Benefits of CBP for Mangaung

- Establishment of public participation and councillor support offices which have contributed to supporting the process;
- Availing resources to be utilised by ward committees;
- Capacity building for ward committees and councillors;
- Continued monitoring through workshops;
- Ongoing and programmed consultation on policy matters/issues;
- Improved living conditions by creating sustainable income generating projects in the wards;
- Promotion of a high level of voluntarism in the community;
- Improved awareness of critical social issues (e.g. HIV/AIDS, clean environment etc);
- Increased stakeholder participation in municipal affairs;
- Enhanced relationship and dialogue between the community and the municipality (councillors and officials);
- Increased access to and ownership of permanent dwellings with basic services (safe water, roads, sanitation, electricity) ;
- Participatory planning skills development of all stakeholders;
- Communities harness full control of their livelihood strategies.

5.2 CBP – Uganda Experiences

Charles Kiberu, Bushenyi District Local Government and Martin Onyach-Olaa, LGDP

Role of government in Uganda

Uganda has a national government and two levels of local government, district and sub-county. There are 56 districts, no regional government and local government has many devolved areas of responsibility. National government provides strategic direction.

District local government is responsible for implementation of **all developmental sectors** – it is closer to Local Municipality in size in the SA context, but has many more powers. It is referred to as LC5 (local council level 5). Sub-county/town council/divisions have about 25000 people and are the lower level local governments (LC3). They are much weaker and their capacity is being developed, but they have the legal mandate to plan and provide services. They are much bigger than the ward and have many more powers.

Below the subcounty is the Parish (LC2), a level of administration with about 3-5000 people, and this was the level used for CBP. Below the parish is the village (LC1) - about 500 people, with a village council made up of all adult members. Revenue is split between district/subcounty and below and the annual Indicative Planning Figure (IPF) defines the amount.

CBP Process in Uganda

- Development of the CBP Manual (Nov 2001);
- ToT at District & S/Cs level (Feb 2002);
- Training of Parish facilitators by S/Cs (April 2002);
- CBP Planning with mentoring of Parishes of S/Cs (March 2002);
- Review of the CBP process and Guide (Sep 2002);

- Refresher courses for ToT and facilitators (Oct 2002);
- Fitting CBP within national planning Guide to start now.

Achievements of the CBP project in Uganda

- Major contribution to a national Harmonised Participatory Planning Guide (HPPG);
- Development of a pool of trainers for Planning at District, Subcounty and Parish levels;
- All Parishes in Bushenyi District now have Development Plans;
- 75% - 80% of the Parish Development Plans have used the CBP manual;
- A steady improvement in the quality of parish plans;
- Increase in participation in planning, including of poor groups;
- Improvement in documentation of the plans;
- Shift from problem approach to vision-based planning;
- Increased demand for services;
- Production of integrated plans across sectors;
- Exchange of ideas, both internally and outside the country.

Challenges of CBP in Bushenyi

The main challenges from the experience in implementing CBP in Bushenyi are:

- Capacities at subcounties and parishes are limited;
- Resource constraints (human, time & financial);
- Sustainability of process, bearing in mind the resource constraints;
- Bringing on board the CBOs & NGOs;
- Issues of poor are sometimes getting lost during the prioritisation process;
- The harmonisation of actors at Parish level, notably Parish Development Committee and Parish Council.

Lessons learnt

The main lessons we have learned from the process are:

- The vision-based approach leads to a more realistic plan;
- CBP must fit within the LG's Planning & Budgeting cycle
- Mentoring/training should be comprehensive and needs to be strengthened in future;
- A simplified guide enhances participation;
- The livelihoods analysis process enhances participation, including of the poor and marginalised;
- The need for consideration of the community's daily & seasonal routine so that the planning is not too disruptive and people can participate;
- There are limits to voluntarism, and a need to strategise around incentives for people, especially if they are involved the whole day in planning;
- The need for political & technical commitment, notably at district level, if CBP is to succeed.

National involvement in CBP

In 1998 the District Development Programme funded by UNDP produced an Investment Planning Guide (IPG) for subcounties and lower level councils. In 1998 the Ministry of Local Government (MoLG) issued Parish & Village council PMs. The first national CBP workshop was in August 2001. Some of the concerns expressed at that event were that:

- From the NGOs – the IPG was not fully inclusive for participatory planning;
- From Government – the problem of the proliferation of planning methodologies.

The recommendation was made to revise the IPG and produce what is now called the HPPG. Since then, in:

- Nov/Dec 2001 – HPPG for sub-district was produced;
- Dec 2001 – Draft HPPG was presented at a national stakeholder workshop;
- Mar 2002 – HPPG was introduced to Districts through a training of trainers (ToT) process;
- June 2002 – the revised HPPG was presented to NGOs at a UPDNet meeting;
- Nov/Dec 2002 – there will be a ToT process on the HPPG for subcounties

The LGDP Approach

The Local Government development Programme (LGDP) provides a Development and Capacity-Building Grant facility. Access to the Development Grant is based on good governance criteria. All levels of LGs and Parishes are eligible, with an assessment every May/June. There is an incentives and sanctions mechanism, and those LGs passing are eligible for the Development Grant, and possibly even a bonus (which Bushenyi achieved this year). There is deliberate technical back-up support, and all LGs can access the capacity-building support. There are also Mentoring Guides, manuals, and the HPPG.

Difference between HPPG and IPG

In the new version of the HPPG there has been a shift from a needs-based to vision based approach. The emphasis is now on the village and parish, whereas previously it was on the sub-county. There is now an involvement of non-council stakeholders, the inclusion of new methodologies (livelihood analysis, SWOT etc). There is now a harmonisation of planning with the local government budget framework process (LGBFP).

Challenges

The key challenges which remain are:

- An integrated approach to planning not sector-based approach;
- Linking sector programmes to CBP/HPPG;
- Appraisal of interventions;
- Co-ordinating of methodologies by different stakeholders;
- Scaling-up nationally;
- Trade-offs in the effort on process vs the efforts to plan the actual projects/investments.

5.3 Ghana's Experiences with Community-Based Planning

John Cofie-Agama, Director, Fiscal Decentralisation, Ministry of Local Government and Rural Development, Ghana

Partners in CBP

The Project Team involved in the CBP project in Ghana include:

- Integrated Social Development Centre (ISODEC);
- Ministry of Local Government and Rural Development (MLGRD);
- National Development and Planning Commission (NDPC);
- Asante Akim South District Assembly;
- Adansi East District Assembly;

Major events so far

- Country Workshop - June 2001;
- Country Review - July/August 2001;
- Pilot in Adansi East - Feb/March 2002;
- Pilot in Asante Akim - April/May 2002;
- Training of Facilitators of other Area Councils - Sept 2002;
- Implementation delayed due to Poverty Reduction Strategy processes - national decided that participation would be one workshop per region with opinion-leaders;
- Final Country Report - October 2002;
- Advocacy at MLGRD, NDPC, RCC etc.

Results of our pilots

- Pilots in each of 2 district capitals;
- Plan distributed to all departments;
- Action started to implement these – such as roads, education, telecoms;
- Training of Area Council/government staff as facilitators in the 2 districts on a 7 day process;
- Involvement of NGOs, CBOs, and traditional leaders;
- Not yet moved to implementation as there have been problems in the process linked to Ghana's Poverty Reduction Strategy paper (PRSP).

Lessons Learnt

Project Management and Administration

- Partnership relationship should be formalized with supporting documentation .

Participation

- classification of vulnerability differs community to community;
- Greater participation could be achieved when:
 - the planning exercise is scheduled not to coincide with of economic activity period of the area;
 - Chief and elders are fully involved in the process;
 - Direct and representative participation approaches are adopted to suit the situation on the ground;

- Greater ownership when enough time is allowed during various stages of the planning process for the various livelihood representatives to meet respective groups, report proceedings and solicit their views.

Process and methodology

- The need to harmonize the CBP manual with others already in used in the country;
- Advocate for a review of community participation in the country's planning process.

Linkages - Without effective linkages at the national level CBP will remain a good standalone project.

Facilitation - There are good trainable people at the district and Town Council level for facilitating the development plan.

The way forward

The Ghanaian partners need to re-strategize to achieve:

- Commitment at the national level;
- Advocacy for review of community participation in the national planning process;
- Effective plan implementation and monitoring in the pilot districts;
- Expansion to cover the rest of the Area Councils in the Pilot Districts ;
- Harmonization of the training manual;
- Enhancement of relationships already established – within and outside the country.

5.4 Lessons from Zimbabwe

Ronnie Sibanda, Chief Executive, Gwanda Rural District Council

Political will for decentralization

In 1984 the Prime Minister's Directive (1984) created Village and Ward Committees. The Provincial Councils and Administration Act (1985) created Provincial Councils and Governors. Key other legislation is the Rural District Councils Act and the formulation of Thirteen Principles of Decentralization (1996). In 1999 the Traditional Leaders Act (1999) created Village and Ward Assemblies. A Rural District Capacity Building Programme operated during the late 1990s, developing the capacity of local government to plan and manage development.

Structures and roles of Government

Central Government is responsible for policy and strategy formulation. The Provincial Level is responsible for consolidation of district plans and providing a link for local governments to Central Government through the Provincial Development Committee (technical) and the Provincial Council (political). The Rural District Council is the planning and development authority at local level. Traditional leadership structures also have a bearing to the communities and these chair the Village and Ward Assemblies. There is also a Rural District Development Committee (RDDC) chaired by the District Administrator (DA) which is a committee of council, and includes all sector departments. The DA is the representative of national government at local level.

Sub-district structures

The Ward Assembly is the unit of planning which co-ordinates village plans and links them with the local government planning process. There is a Ward Development Committee (WADCO) which

includes technical departments and provides technical support to the Ward Assembly. The WADCO is chaired by the Councillor who sits in Council, while the Ward Assembly is chaired by a traditional leader. The Village Assembly is chaired by the Village Headman and is the level where plans are generated. There is a Village Development Committee (VIDCO) which provides technical support to plans at village level and has an elected Chairman.

CBP partners in Zimbabwe

The national partner is the Ministry of Local Government, Public Works and National Housing. District partners are Gwanda and Chimanimani Rural District Councils and the NGO, Intermediate Technology Development Group Southern Africa, a facilitator.

The CBP process

At National Level there was a national review of CBP lessons and a Country Learning Workshop in June 2001. At District Level the Councils passed a Council Resolution to participate, there has been training of facilitators, preplanning, the actual CBP Planning, and integration of ward plans into district plans. The pilots in Gwanda and Chimanimani took place in September 2001, using the ward as the local planning unit for CBP (23 in each district). A 5 day planning process in the ward was chosen. There have been delays due to political processes, but the training of facilitators happened in August 2002 and full-scale implementation started in the 2 districts in September 2002. 19 wards have been completed in Gwanda, but only 5 in Chimanimani.

CBP Lessons

- Strengthening involvement of local institutions, vulnerable and livelihood groups can increase community participation and ownership of the planning process;
- The internalisation of planning processes and methodologies by local stakeholders and facilitators strengthens CBP and replicability;
- Use of local Core Facilitation Team (CFT) members who have moral authority is vital for trust-building and it also localizes the plan as well as promotes planning based on local resources hence realistic ward plans;
- The process creates a framework for the LG to co-ordinate various initiatives;
- Incentives for local facilitation should be based on local practices and capacity-building opportunities;
- Timing for the CBP process should avoid clashing with other important happenings;
- As a holistic process, CBP tools generate a lot of useful background information from the diverse sectors and issues affecting the community;
- In the absence of local government grants, multiple resource leveraging can strengthen CBP processes if it is properly co-ordinated;
- Public sector involvement in planning is critical for involvement of other players;
- The need to ensure adequate capacity building at district and sub-district levels for effective CBP.

Next Steps

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

6 INTEGRATION OF CBP INTO THE IDP AND PARTICIPATORY MANAGEMENT

Groups were asked to analyse the current systems they used in participatory planning in their IDPs. The responses from the different groups have been reproduced faithfully (at least for the groups whose flip charts were available) and the responses have been amalgamated and grouped around themes.

Examples of participation used

Free State - Mangaung Municipality

- Use of ward committees;
- Budgetary process (communities were consulted at ward level);
- CBP process at ward level (participation of different social-economic groups in planning);
- IDP representative forum at local government level with stakeholders including districts and wards represented.

Kwa Zulu Natal

- Participation through involvement of community-based facilitators with the use of ward and sectoral based workshops as in Durban;
- Some key NGOs were included in later state after complaining;
- Using key informants from wards - kind of consultative process.
- Consultative workshop – through with minimal participation i.e of various interest groups – Pietermaritzburg;

Limpopo - Polokwane Municipality

- Questionnaires were used;
- Writing drafts (desktop work)
- Consultations with different stakeholders in IDP forums (Ward Committees, traditional leaders, NGOs etc) with no consultancies;
- Districts had different experiences – participation of stakeholders was not same in different places e.g some departments felt excluded

Northern Cape

- No participation in the Northern Cape case studies;

Other

- Committee based planning and budgeting seen as a solution to participative planning – eg for the Zimbabwean RDCs

Methodology/types of participation

- There has been a gradual improvement in municipal participation, facilitation and ownership. However the timing is largely a challenge, between date of elections, new structures and deadline for IDP.
- The IDP process is viewed as something outside responsibilities of council;
- This was the first time people have been involved, and it raised expectations – people flocked to the hall and there were big expectations of councillors

- Communities are over-researched /workshopped.
- Mass meetings – mobilisation, information sharing, feedback and conclusions
- Broad forums – targeting interest groups, eg. NGOs, CBOs
- Workshops – information sharing, brainstorming, determining objectives and SWOT, Facilitators – learning from best practices and experiences – resource for information
- The Guidelines/IDP manuals are good, but intimidating (over-big). Municipalities get nervous plus call in consultants to simplify and provide user-friendly tools /methods.
- National guidelines: should be comprehensive and include requirements to ensure all stakeholders are represented, draft inputs from wards. In assessment process by provincial government guidelines were not followed by municipalities on the whole;

Use of consultants

- Difficult to get councillors to own the process, so consultants have to fill the gap;
- Still often consultant/technical driven, especially the demographic analysis. The statistical information was only based on national sources so no community verification. Consultants don't have right orientation
- Consultants produced standard cut and paste IDP's – and they even sometimes forgot to change names/dates;

Suggestions for maximising participation

- Municipalities are not committed to participation – they just want to generate reports/plans and get the money;
- Ensure that discussions of all the IDP developmental fields takes place at the level of the communities/bottom level. Needs participation of wards and ward committees;
- Language barrier created problems for inclusive participation;
- Political groups/minority group not fully involved ;

Ensuring representation

- Type of participation process is very variable between areas as it is not prescribed in law. Lesson: the lower level at which the participation takes place the better (ideally street). Block committees are needed below ward committees to inform their thinking;
- No proper social profile of communities was undertaken – but it is important to understand social dynamics before doing planning;
- Communities are not homogenous – some social groups are excluded. The community should identify different groups and need good facilitation to ensure vulnerable special needs groups are included, with awareness of class, gender, race issues;
- Unequal participation – more attention to disadvantaged needed;
- Communities should be divided into manageable groups. In some cases Wards were divided into 3 sub-wards, which proved effective.
- Sector representation (women's Agric, etc.) coming to IDP forum attempted to cluster needs under one team.
- Councillors are responsible for the calling of residents to participate and also have to ensure adequate coordination of the whole process – transparency, information passed on to everyone (use churches and other community organisations
- Exclusion of some members of the community for some reason needs to be avoided .../political issues /chiefs, District, political, leadership and ward political
- No clarity on civic representations in terms of sectoral groups and interests;

Capacity-building

- Politicians are afraid to let go of power – thus capacity building must be inclusive of all i.e including politicians;
- Training is needed in how to manage and make use of consultants;

Representative forum/stakeholder involvement

- Lack of national, provincial and parastatal involvement – officials, especially senior officials, did not attend meetings and no reliable information was brought to the discussion from their side;
- Stakeholder/interest group mobilisation was not sufficient and line departments need to be more integrated in the process – DPLG is seen as responsible for IDPs but this needs to be across all sector departments;
- IDP forum is supposed to be composed of organised groups but how representative are the “representative forums”? Representatives to the Forum are not necessarily transmitting community priorities, etc. and they may be their own agenda ;
- Representative forums are the vehicle for community participation. Representative forums mainly end up representative of NGOs and CBOs rather than actual constituents (the people). Having multiple representative forums for the area helps logistically in getting increased participation;
- Link IDP “representative forums” with the councillors so that these ensure effective local feedback – listen to the people’s voice
- There is a problem of a lack of consistency and commitment in representatives to forum;
- IDP steering committee (mayor and task team reps) coordinated activities rely on civic society and government groups not individuals (individual represented by ward councillor);

Relation between projects in IDP and local priorities

- Projects in the IDP document do not necessarily represent priorities on the ground (element of top-down planning) but it is difficult to distinguish between community’s ideas and that of leaders because of empowerment issues;
- Prioritisation – it is difficult doing this as an institution, rather than on a sub-ward or individual basis;
- Understanding in community of IDP and its goals, financial constraints etc. - is this in place?
- Time frames too limited;

Feedback to communities

- Problem with feedback to wards (linked to councillor understanding);
- An important step is re-checking priorities with the community;
- Review process is becoming an opportunity to refine the IDP, as awareness of the IDP grows;
- Ward committee members and councillors feedback to constituents is often poor as there is not a mechanism for this, nor a requirement for the quality of it;
- Time frame was not sufficient for the representatives to consult members of communities;
- Accountability of councillors’ work/performance to be addressed by constituents;
- Reporting back from awareness meetings;

Role of ward committees

- Ward committees are required by law, but no resources are provided for their administrative costs – are they sustainable, especially in rural areas where logistics cost are high?
- Ward processes (meetings/consultations) can become a vehicle for political patronage as the degree of transparency is not prescribed;
- Community needs to be enthused/empowered to take control of the participative planning process, so it is not driven by council/councillors;

Data for planning

- Municipalities need support/training (good baseline data at household level) in monitoring and evaluating implementation – there is a trend towards using consultants again;
- Municipalities/facilitators need information so they are able to inform communities about opportunities/choices. Need to improve data collection /storage/information management and exchange;

7 PERCEIVED STRENGTHS, WEAKNESSES, OPPORTUNITIES AND THREATS OF CBP

Groups looked at how they saw the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats of CBP, based on the presentations, the visits and the discussions. These were reported back in plenary and combined and are presented below. A column has been added to show if any comments or actions that have been taken to address the weaknesses and threats.

7.1 Strengths and weaknesses of CBP

Strengths	Weaknesses	Comments on the weaknesses
There is a tool available to communities so voices can be heard	Manual and processes can exist but to ensure quality – capacity is required in communities	Ward committees are being trained as part of the process
Through this process people have been empowered and own the plan	Current plans don't balance short-term and long-term issues sufficiently	True – needs further discussion
Capacitation of ward committees	Baseline data old/not relevant – people collect?	Problem of old census data. Use livelihoods analysis?
Powerful tool to stimulate civic engagement and way IDP structured	Lack of linkages between ward planning and IDP	There are some – it has generated the priorities and influenced the programmes, but can be strengthened
People-driven, communities involved	Decisions influenced by MAYCO	Not really
Use of WC enhances participation	Lack of integration amongst service providers	Big problem and need way to improve participation
Proper CBP can influence other planning processes	Capacity of municipalities lacking to facilitate the process	30 people have been trained but this can improve
Process targetting vulnerable groups	Lack of commitment by ward leadership – some councillors and WC did not follow up	True in some cases
Takes stock of local organisations at ward level	Are those representatives really representative - needs other processes to strengthen representation – what about Rep Forums	Big problem as no representative structure below ward level. Policy issue.
No of community priorities addressed	Will these be implemented because of cost and timeframe?	Still to be seen
Will address some of constraints identified at national level	Depends on goodwill of citizens – unsustainable?	People must feel that the plans are implemented – in which case they will be motivated
Brings community closer to LG and confidence to plan for own process	Delinked from local government budget process – need to compare budgets before and after	True

Strengths	Weaknesses	Comments on the weaknesses
Communities have opportunity to influence resource allocation	Lack of proper monitoring mechanisms during facilitation	True – it was a major challenge just to do the plans
Development impact better through participatory processes such as CBP	Limited buy-in from prov/national depts – as haven't participated enough	True
Complementary to IDP	Process – political management is complex – who has the last say	The ward plan is owned by the ward. Council has the decision on what they will fund.
Ensures accountability	Sustainability of projects not clear	True and must improve
Shared strategic and pragmatic vision built on existing knowledge	R50k led to diversion to short-term expenditure	True but a measure of the success of a small amount of money immediately available
Can bring in traditional leaders and councillors	Needs of minorities often missed out	To some extent
Can create capacity in communities to drive own processes	Can create a dependency as needs facilitation skills to implement – so munic need to get skills – train councillors?	30 staff were trained plus others in the municipality. They could do it alone next time round.
Move from needs-based to vision-based planning	Inputs in rural settings weaker – lower participation?	Not really true
Holistic approach	1 week doesn't allow underlying messages to be addressed	The 4 days is a balance between sophisticated process and cost
	How does this relate to term of WCs – process may be longer	Plans are longer. Is an issue whether terms should be 3 years
	People only looked at R50k not wider	This varied, but if well facilitated this did not happen
	How deal with conflict between trad leaders/councillors – need conflict res skills	Need to add conflict resolution skills to training
	Wasn't involvement of youth	They were involved in most plans
	How much did ward leadership understand process?	They did not understand the whole process as it happened, but they did by the end
	Analysis – is it bringing up real needs	
	Feedback – not good enough to community	True
	Lack of involvement in white wards	It was limited but improved, and those who participated were enthusiastic
	Problem of using foreign language	Need to use facilitators who can use the main language. This improved as more facilitators were trained.

7.2 Opportunities and threats of CBP

Opportunity	Threat	Comments on threats
For CBP to be incorporated into IDP as a guideline – use constituency office	Political interference interferes as introduces lack of objectivity, gender issues etc	Job of facilitator to try and avoid this
Existing legal framework enshrines participation	Process might be hijacked by private consultants	Could be – that is why staff must be trained in municipality and service providers
Role of DPLG and support of key institutions	Change management in the civil service – too much bureaucracy – civil servants difficult to change	CBP is a good opportunity for culture change
Opportunity for developing skills in development planning for councillors and WCs	Use of external facilitators – unknown and not trusted by communities	Could be – in fact the wards gave the facilitators a high rating
Expands people's range of choices, creative and make better use of resources	Plan must not be seen as the end but the beginning of a process	Absolutely
We have case studies and possible service providers	Stress in possible lack of human and financial resources to undertake CBP	If staff are used including staff from departments this should be possible to address
Many more potential partners to add value to CBP eg GTZ, universities	CBP could tread on toes of other processes unless real partnerships established	Could do – need to link in
Provides skills to communities and possible employment	HIV/AIDS – will we have people to plan with?	
Linked to other policies like RDP	Consolidating all the plans is difficult if municipality large	True – and need to work more on methodologies for doing this
Encouraging collaboration and mobilisation of partners, eg private sector	Lack of clarity of role of WCs vs municipality	WC represents the community. No doubt further training would be helpful
Politics – consultation process deepened through politics	Politics – power struggles in ward committees	Definitely. CBP can also help by having a real job to do, but monitoring is needed and action if there are non-performing committees
Bring government closer to the people	Oversimplification of situation as different communities differ, but aggregated	Analysis is disaggregated so that differences are brought out. It is consolidated at the priorities stage.
If properly done then this can help with balancing local priorities with munic tech requirements and national priorities	If resources not available, ie other government authorities may sabotage by withholding support	CBP is worthwhile even just with municipal resources. It will be far more effective if other service providers participate
Strengthen coordination between local, provincial and national	Lack of preparedness of central and district authorities to cede power to ward level	Could well be an issue, but even a representational role is significant. Later as implementation happens

Opportunity	Threat	Comments on threats
		the role of WCs in managing development becomes more important
Builds capacity in planning facilitation and participatory methods --and reduce dependance on consultants	Lack of budgetary allocation for CBP	Up to municipality
Munic pass byelaws on participation esp re Systems Act so can fund WCs	WC based on volunteers – is it sustainable	Sustainable if the plans are implemented and people see it was worthwhile. It will not be if this does not happen
Involvement of marginal groups	National policies formulated and implemented without support from communities	CBP can at least provide feedback
Promotes integrated planning	National funding focused on physical infrastructure rather than social projects	Not necessarily true
Create financial incentives from other sources	Sectoral planning not nec linked to CBP	True and important to integrate sectoral planning into IDP and CBP
Process has an opportunity for LED Unit in Municipality to create an enabling environment for business development	Illiteracy	Makes more difficult but can still do the planning.
CBP complements IDP so likely to be acceptable	Manipulation of priorities during process	Possible and depends on facilitation skills
Potential for DPLG to build into guidelines	Low level of business involvement	There was some involvement but could be increased
If focus on elite can get funding to help things succeed	Voiceless may not be heard	The livelihoods analysis process with different social groups tries to ensure that the voiceless are met apart, and so their views brought into the process
Innovative partnerships between municipalities and communities	Negative attitude towards participation by communities	Possible, especially if plans are not seen to yield results. The R50k was very helpful here.
International linkages and experiences	High level of expectations	
	Commitment from WC members	Essential
	Capacity of service providers	Must be built through participation in CBP
	Involvement of people expecting financial gain	Will soon realise that not there
	If basic needs not linked into strategic plan	Depends on linkage between CBP and IDP
	Can be hijacked by local interest groups	Depends on facilitation skills

8 WAY FORWARD FOR CBP

8.1 Suggestions for taking CBP forward in SA

CBP has two objectives in one planning process:

- A self-organising instrument for organising wards for their own action;
- Must be able to influence resource allocation towards the ward (ie the IDP) through the Municipality, whether from government, donors, or the private sector.

We need to ask whether we want to take this donor-funded project forward and scale up into a structured programme? Overall there was commitment from the workshop to do so and a Steering Committee was appointed as a SA Steering Group for community-based planning with members comprising SALGA (Musa Soni), provincial LGH (Free State MEC LGH), DPLG (Yusuf Patel), civil society, Khanya, donors (GTZ/Finnish Aid), Mangaung (Speaker), Ethekewini Municipality, a district municipality (to be defined), Greater Tzaneen (Morongoa Ramphele). The Steering Committee will be responsible for crystallising recommendations from here and report back.

Groups were asked to identify steps forward that were needed and these were combined into one set of actions that are needed within SA. These were not vetted or agreed, but are listed as they were presented. Then in plenary additional issues were raised which have been added. They have also been organised by the different themes.

Actions to take CBP forward	By who
Methodology	
Circulate the generic CBP manual to all participants	Khanya-MRC
Expand CBP methodology and guidelines to include community mobilisation and awareness of citizen rights	Khanya with support from DFID and other partners
Develop and package information sources to provide to WCs on government and NGO programmes and projects	Provincial and national government
Must allow for equal participation of civil society	Municipality
DPLG to look at how to develop new guidelines out of this	DPLG
Establish inter-departmental forums at provincial and municipal levels to promote co-ordination in use of CBP and its follow-up (includes educational institutions and business)	City Manager HOD of LGH of province
Define the capacities and resources required for effective ward-based plans – including for less well resourced municipalities	Khanya
Strengthen linkage between ward plans and IDP and prov/national programmes (though munic?) including information	Khanya/ Municipality
Responsibility and capacity within the municipality for lesson learning on CBP practice nationally /internationally to keep CBP methods and guidance up-to-date	MEC LGH, Municipality, with support from Khanya
Process/mechanisms should be put in place to ensure area specific co-ordination	IDP Manager
Development of continuous monitoring system – refine methodology with quarterly progress reporting and participatory evaluation	Four-country project
Writing simplified versions of manuals and translate it into different	Local Government

Actions to take CBP forward	By who
languages	
Follow-up and feedback	
Clarify role of WCs and other community structures in implementation and review of IDPs	DPLG
Need for accountability of councillors, eg WCs seeing Council minutes, need to simplify information	Municipality
Training	
Assess training needs for participatory planning and design targeted training programmes	IDP Manager
Training needs assessment and training programme for municipal technical officers involved in CBP so can fulfil their role properly	HRD manager for Municipality
Feed experience into training of development planners	Universities/DPLG
Improve the transfer of skills from the consultants to government	Consultants and customer (e.g government)
Training of all stakeholders including community members, councillors, facilitators, WC members	SALGA, quality man't, NGOs (training), Councils (training and facilitation), DPLG (framework – policy guidelines)
Incentives	
Create incentives for ward participation	Munic, Service Providers and WCs
Linking with budget	
Budget for CBP during IDP review and in business plans	Municipality (plus other levels). National (DPLG) and province
Marketing of CBP projects for funding	?
Tap private sector for funding	Municipality
Improved feedback mechanisms between needs and budget – package information on programmes	All spheres
Commitment and advocacy	
Education for awareness and acceptance (of CBP). Target all stakeholders (councillors, officials, communities, business). Use range of methods (community meetings, adverts, workshops etc)	Municipality with partners, e.g NGOs. DPLG and provinces to direct and fund
Ensure all stakeholders on board before next round of CBP, marketing CBP to obtain buy-in at all levels	Municipality
Advocacy for the value of CBP with political leaders at highest level (municipal, provincial, national)	Mayor and MEC for Local Government and Housing
Establish Steering Committee to take forward CBP in South Africa	Various
Improved involvement of NGOs/CBOs	Municipality
Create linkages at ground level between service providers	Depts/Stakeholders
MoU with various stakeholders	Depts/SH/ Municipality
Community-based planning system must not only be owned by DPLG – also local bearing in mind the two different objectives.	
Developing a common platform for community-based planning in general. DPLG national should establish a platform for learning for	DPLG

Actions to take CBP forward	By who
service delivery to communities	
Initiate/support pilot CBPs per province. Awareness programme, Select sites. Initiate process building on lessons from 4-country study	DPLG/ Participants at this workshop
Policy and legislation	
Revisit legislation re part-time status and roles of ward committees to have remuneration, increase powers and functions so they can fulfill role more effectively	DPLG/ Municipality
Lobby for inclusion of CBP approach into the IDP manual	MLM through MEC for Local Government
Harness senior government commitment to participation so IDP guidelines legislated, including CBP, role of constituency office and training of ward committees	DPLG
Establish how CBP can best be promoted/replicated	DPLG
Establish a network to coordinate methodologies – SALGA/DFID/Gov	This meeting
SALGA critical for mainstreaming the approach	SALGA
Report given to PCC on results of CBP	DPLG
DPLG should encourage the appropriate environment for CBP to happen	DPLG
Communication and networking	
Improve networking of different participatory methodologies (yearly forum, news letters, websites)	Local government and other stakeholders
Establish a participatory/people centred planning practitioners forum to harmonise approaches of different organisations active in this field (i.e consultants, donors, business)	HOD of Local Government and Housing at the province initiates and practitioners operate
Innovative partnership between municipalities and communities and shared learning and networking	SALGA, DPLG, Councils
Establish listserve/newsletter for this – so people can disseminate ideas eg DPLG establishing a system	DPLG
Link to community-based radio stations to assist with dissemination in own language	
Lobby for CBP in IDP	

8.2 Suggestions for taking CBP forward internationally

We need to utilise what has emerged to recommend ways forward – in SA context, and also as an international partnership. The 4 country partnership is meeting after this workshop to look at how to take the project forward overall. Some suggestions were made here as to how to take the work forward internationally:

- Taking up at SADC
- Within NEPAD – building the administrative capacity of LG, accelerating service delivery, deepening democracy
- Develop relationships amongst municipalities, eg the CBP pilot municipalities

- Adding additional countries, and using other methods of networking and communication eg using videoconferencing, or through other networks such as Africities
- UN Habitat has created a database on good practice – CBP could be added
- Creating a Steering Group across the 4 countries?

Annex 1 Programme

Time	Session	Responsible
Tuesday 29th October		
9.30	<i>Registration and coffee</i>	
10.00	Opening Speech Workshop objectives and programme	Executive Mayor : Clr Itumeleng Mokoena
10.15	The position of Free State Department of Local Gov. and Housing re participation	MEC for Local Government and Housing: Lechesa Tsenoli
10.25	The Government's approach to participation in local government	Minister for Provincial and Local Gov. : Sydney Mufamadi.
10.40	Background to CBP	Ian Goldman, , CBP project
10.55	CBP in Mangaung	Speaker, Clr Zongizile Zumane
11.15	UK's approach to local governance in SA	Richard Thomas, DFIDSA
11.25	Plenary discussion with Minister, MEC, Mayor, DFID, Ian Goldman, Clr Zumane, Clr Bendile, Motheo DM	Chair: JJ Matlole
11.50	<i>Tea</i>	
12.20	Uganda	LGDP, Uganda
12.35	Ghana	Ministry of Local Gov, Ghana
12.55	Zimbabwe	Gwanda Rural District Council
13.10	Discussion	Martin Onyach-Olaa, LGDP
13.30	<i>Lunch</i>	
14.30-18.00	Visits to wards to discuss implementation of ward plans	
19.00	<i>African evening hosted by Executive Mayor, Mangaung Local Municipality</i>	
Wednesday 30th October		
8.30	Feedback from the visits	MLM Clr
8.45	Group work - integration of CBP into the IDP and participatory management	
10.00	<i>Tea</i>	
10.30	Report backs	Local Gov and Housing
11.30	Key enabling factors	Ian Goldman
11.40	Groups work on enabling factors	
13.00	<i>Lunch</i>	
14.00	Report backs	SALGA Representative
15.00	Way forward for CBP in SA	DPLG
15.25	Closing	Executive Mayor, MLM
15.30	<i>Tea and depart</i>	

Annex 2 List of participants (not including ward committee members)

Name	Organisation	Mobile	Email
1. M Bartels	DDP (Decentralised Development Planning)	083 326 4063	bartels@dplg.gov.za
2. M Feldman	DDP	082 882 7820	marcfeld@global.co.za
3. E Meyer	National Treasury	083 333 5541	Vanessa@kithenbrand@treasury.gov.za
4. F Perdigao	National Treasury	083 333 5541	Vanessa@kithenbrand@treasury.gov.za
5. R Botha	Development Bank of Southern Africa	082 480 0977	rudib@bdsa.org
6. NC Madzaka	Department of Agriculture, Limpopo	013-773 0833	
7. NB Tiert	Department of Agriculture, LPRDP	082 720 3574	Tiertobn@agricho.norprov.gov.za
8. S Mohlabi	Department of Agriculture, Limpopo	015-295 7028	mohlabims@agricho.norprov.gov.za
9. M BJ Mangena	Department of Agriculture, Limpopo	072 252 1890	mangenabj@agricho.norprov.gov.za
10. SE Malungane	Department of Agriculture, Limpopo	072 494 5911	Tiertobn@agricho.norprov.gov.za
11. P Aalto	Department of Agriculture, Limpopo	082 721 5047	paulina@agricho.norprov.gov.za
12. C Lambrechts	Ekangala Grassland Trust	083 658 2418	ekangala@ripplesoft.co.za
13. I Goldman	Khanya		goldman@khanya-mrc.co.za
14. J Carnegie	Khanya		James@khanya-mrc.co.za
15. Joe Marumo	Khanya		Moscow@khanya-mrc.co.za
16. T Dikibo	Khanya		tankiso@khanya-mrc.co.za
17. P Urquhart	Khanya		motswiri@iafrica.com
18. PP Ficarelli	GTZ Based project	083 450 3289	Base.gtz@pixie.co.za
19. MJ Ramaru	GTZ Based project	083 255 3068	ramarujm@agricho.norprov.gov.za
20. P Masina	Education & Training Unit	083 289 5096	edutrain@iafrica.com
21. A Molo	Education & Training Unit	082 651 4750	edutrain@iafrica.com
22. S Ngonini	Education & Training Unit	083 760 8583	edutrain@iafrica.com
23. C IW Kotsoane	Dept of Public Safety, Security Liaison	051-405 5238	
24. MP Du Plessis	WECLOGO	051-447 8911	weclogo@iafrica.com
25. A van Heerden	MLM		
26. M Kumalo	MLM		

Name	Organisation	Mobile	Email
27. D Schoeman	MLM		
28. S Sefika	MLM		
29. M van der Walt	MLM		
30. B Morobe	Dept Local Government & Housing	083 674 5634	qiloxm@d&h.ofs.gov.za
31. S Shadung	Polokwane Municipality	082 890 3361	davidcoetzer@polokwane.org.za
32. E Nchabeleng	Polokwane Municipality	082 825 7296	Jeanette.r@polokwane.org.za
33. EJ Khoele	Polokwane Municipality		
34. S Hugow	NGO Coalition		
35. M Semela	CARE		
36. A Benseler	HSRC	084 550 5500	abenseler@hsrc.ac.za
37. C Oelofse	Dept Tourism, Environmental & Economic Affairs	051-4033719	
38. T Nkwini	FAIR Share	082 364 3486	tnkwini@intekom.co.za
39. E Scott	Dept Local Gov & Housing		idp@majuba.ofs.gov.za
40. H Terblanche	Dept Local Gov & Housing	082 577 1916	dirdsp@majuba.ofs.gov.za
41. T Khaile	FAIR Share (UWC)	082 202 3142	tskhaile@uwc.ac.za
42. J Msiza	Dept of Water Affairs & Forestry	082 809 5127	msizaj@dwaf.gov.za
43. C Smuts	CBDP	083 650 0131	colin@cbdp.org.za
44. M Nyamane	Dept Local Gov & Housing	082 491 2556	mpnyamane@yahoo.com
45. T Mokoena	FAIR Share	082 591 0435	tskhaile@uwc.ac.za
46. C RC Swelindawo	FAIR Share	082 202 3346	tskhaile@uwc.ac.za
47. MW Machogo	Ninham Shand	051-447 8911	wilfred.machogo@shands.co.za
48. A Griffin	ASALAP	082 425 4922	angela@asalgp.co.za
49. H van Nieuwenhuyzen	FCR	083 771 5947	henlo@fcr.org.za
50. D Steenkamp	UOVS Urban & Regional Planning	051- 401 3210	steenkmg@sci.uovs.ac.za
51. MA Phaila	UOVS Urban & Regional Planning	051- 401 3210	
52. LN Melao	UOVS Urban & Regional Planning	051- 401 3210	

Name	Organisation	Mobile	Email
53. Y Khuduga	UOVS Urban & Regional Planning	051- 401 3210	
54. L Mapane	UOVS Urban & Regional Planning	051- 401 3210	
55. M Ndlovu	UOVS Urban & Regional Planning	051- 401 3210	
56. T Ramorapeli	UOVS Urban & Regional Planning	051- 401 3210	
57. S Hlungwani	UOVS Urban & Regional Planning	051- 401 3210	
58. A Mackay	UOVS Urban & Regional Planning	051- 401 3210	
59. Y Mashalaba	UOVS Urban & Regional Planning	051- 401 3210	
60. M Mogoe	UOVS Urban & Regional Planning	051- 401 3210	
61. R Tshabalala	UOVS Urban & Regional Planning	051- 401 3210	
62. I Nkoane	UOVS Urban & Regional Planning	051- 401 3210	
63. E Jaca	UOVS Urban & Regional Planning	051- 401 3210	
64. G Motlhalane	UOVS Urban & Regional Planning	051- 401 3210	
65. H Stapelberg	UOVS Urban & Regional Planning	051- 401 3210	
66. U Vosloo	Umzinyathi District Municipality	082 770 3563	devplan@umzinyathi.gov.za
67. M. P. L. Morabe	Provincial Strategic Planning	051-405 5507	italine@majuba.ofs.gov.za
68. A van Rensburg	PSP Monitoring & Evaluation	051-405 5507	italine@majuba.ofs.gov.za
69. S Landman	Zululand District Municipality	082 805 4014	ctp@zululand.org.za
70. C Madopi	DBSA	083 450 7139	charlesm@dbsa.org
71. M Roos	Broederlijk Delon	083 254 3143	mathilda@shisas.com
72. C Golino	DBSA	082 809 0018	christinaag@dbsa.org
73. M Roefs	HRSC	082 331 4436	mroefs@hrsc.ac.za
74. Da Pula	Lukhanji Municipality	082 450 4534	qtsec@eci.co.za
75. D van Wyk	Lukhanji Municipality	082 450 4544	qtsec@eci.co.za
76. L Garane	Kagiso Trust Consultancy	082 536 8632	lgarane@kagiso.co.za
77. B Taylor	Rhodes University	046-6038065	b.taylor@ru.ac.za
78. E Nel	Rhodes University	082 968 5875	e.nel@ru.ac.za
79. N Zwelinzima	Housing, Local Govt & Traditional Affairs	072 2405 767	mzamo@dhlgl.ecape.gov.za
80. M Ngwadi	Housing, Local Govt & Traditional Affairs	083 455 8661	mzamo@dhlgl.ecape.gov.za
81. H Hillmer	German Development Service	072 258 7337	Hen.hillmer@yahoo.com

Name	Organisation	Mobile	Email
82. V Jonas	Kopanong Municipality	082 786 5989	kopanmm@mweb.co.za
83. BJ Mthembu	Thabo Mafutsanyana Distict Municipality	083 630 5543	Victoria@efstatetourism.co.za
84. M Quali	EDA - Matatiele	039 737 3591	mosko@edamatat.org.za
85. N Ntombela	EDA - Matatiele	039 737 3591	zandile@edamatat.org.za
86. C Marè	Community Law Centre	021-959 2950	cmare@uwc.ac.za
87. V Hendricks	Community Law Centre	082 202 3115	vhendricks@uwc.ac.za
88. A Gray	Community Law Centre	072 510 1172	agray@uwc.ac.za
89. G Smith	Community Law Centre	072 375 5648	gsmith@uwc.ac.za
90. D Abrahams	MLM	083 234 1552	diane@civic.mangaung.co.za
91. LI Sonolo	Chris Hani District Municipality	082 923 8857	N/A
92. M Moeng	Matlhasedi Integrated Projects	082 322 6034	mompati@iafrica.com
93. R Kgeledi	International Republican Institute	082 775 1083	irikzn@iafrica.com
94. R Cairns	Oxfam GB	083 232 6710	tote@zi.co.za
95. AN Gcilitshana	Dept. Housing, L Govt or Traditional Affairs	073 233 2754 043-743-2983	tharnin@dhlgl.escape.gov.za Vivian 043-743-3370 (Fax)
96. KR Manzi	Dept. Housing, L Govt or Traditional Affairs	040-609 5441	kmanzi@dhlgl.escape.gov.za
97. J Cofie-Agama	Director, Decentralisation, MLGRD, Ghana		
98. C Kiberu	Deputy CAO, Bushenyi District, Uganda	09256 077 47037	cobsbush@africaonline.co.ug
99. J Carnegie	Khanya-managing rural change		james@khanya-mrc.co.za
100. M Soni	Policy Advisor, SALGA		msoni@salga.co.za
101. S Kwarteng			
102. D. J Moroka	Dept Public Works, Roads & Transport	051-4033331	
103. R. Chinner	Dept Public Works, Roads & Transport	083 455 1399	
104. A. Krone	Built Environment Support	082 853 7812	anton@besg.co.za
105. M. Sizwe	IDT	083 282 2138	sizwem@idt.org.za
106. S. Mini	Dept. Housing, L Govt or Traditional Affairs	083 455 8673	smini@dhlgl.escape.gov.za
107. N. S Mphumela	Public Works & Transport	072 151 6609	

Name	Organisation	Mobile	Email
108. WJ Barnes	Dept of Agriculture	082 375 0251	rowana@afrc.fs.gov.za
109. M Phatoe	Dept of Environmental, Tourism & Economic	072 297 3565	phatoem@majuba.ofs.gov.za
110. N Ndlovu	BESG	031-260 2267	bouwer1@nu.ac.za
111. M Kolisa	Palmer Development Group	082 659 8316	mthobeli@pdg.co.za
112. L Mbonambi	Ethekwini Municipality	083 271 2852	mbonambil@durban.gov.za
113. B O'Leary	Ethekwini Municipality	031-307 4920	
114. MB Khuzwayo	Ethekwini Municipality	084 322 5054	
115. B Mlangeni	Ethekwini Municipality	083 613 4649	
116. R Provis	Pricewaterhouse Coopers	083 280 8705	
117. Pillay	Equity Project /Dept of Health	083 260 3703	pillay@health.co.za
118. M Leeu	Maluti a Phofung Local Municipality	082 959 8495	mzangwa@ohs.dorea.co.za
119. J Ramokoase	SALGA FS	082 874 4721	freloga@freloga.co.za
120. MH Ntamo	SALGA FS	082 333 7522	freloga@freloga.co.za
121. M Moeng	Matlhasedi Integrated Projects	082 322 6034	
122. D Africa	MEC Dept LG & Housing NW		
123. A Kotane	MEC Dept LG & Housing Limpopo		
124. GI Masingi	MEC Dept LG & Housing Limpopo		
125. C Maleki	Ukhahlamba District Mun	0829285658	pimiss@ukhahlamba.co.za
126. T.C. Chabe	Xhariep District Mun	082 552 9478	chobe@xhariep.co.za
127. T. Gxaba	Dept of Agriculture	082-909-2281	tgxaba@worldline.co.za
128. P Shabalala	Maphumaulo Municipality	082 924 4776 /032 481 2047	
129. Z. W. Ndinisa	Eastern Cape – Dept of Housing and LG	040 - 6095436	ndinisaz@dhlgl.ecape.gov.za
130. D. Lesotho	WRDM	011-411 5004	dlesotho@wrdm.gov.za
131. M Magwetyana	Dept of LG, NW	018-387 3599	mmagwetyana@nwpg.org.za
132. C Ranoka	West Rand (Gauteng)	011-411 5004	
133. M Matlole	Mangaung Local Municipality	051-405 8101	cmanager@civic.mangaung.co.za
134. R. Sibanda	Gwanda Rural District Council (Zimbabwe)	09263	gwandardc@iafricaonline.co.zw

Name	Organisation	Mobile	Email
		8422571	
135. L. Verwoerd	Mangaung Local Municipality	051-405 8378	Metro2@civic.mangaungcity.co.za
136. L Tsenoli	FS Local Government	051-405 5322	
137. C. Jackson	IDS Sossex UWC	0944 1273678265	c.jackson@ids.ac.uk
138. J. Mathe	ALDA	082 896 7006	mathe@mda.org.za
139. F.E. Netshirembe	Dept of Agric	01-812 3402	netshirembeef@agricho.norprov.co.za
140. A masendeke	ITDG (Zimbabwe)	09263 4750880/2	absolomm@itdg.org.zw
141. G. Jacobs	Consultant (Private)	082 452 2376	pestro@netactive.co.za
142. S Motlhale	Economic Affairs	051-405 4357	
143. G. Mohlakoana	Mangaung Local Municipality	051-405 8203	george@civic.mangaungcity.co.za
144. R Mosepedi	Mangaung Local Municipality	084 67893	
145. L. D. Tsotetsi	DLG &H	051-405 3417	id@majuba.ofs.gov.za
146. M. Ndlovu	UFS	082 693 9085	
147. M. Ramphele	Tzaneen Municipality	082 805 2414	morongoer@tzaneen.gov.za
148. G. F. Heyns	Mangaung Local Municipality		
149. A.Z. Zenich	Mangaung Local Municipality	082 784 1182	
150. A. Lotriet	Mangaung Local Municipality	082 801 7013	
151. S.A Khonzela	Mangaung Local Municipality	082 822 4316	
152. J. C. Erasmus	Mangaung Local Municipality	082 850 8396	rassie@civic.fs172.co.za
153. S. S. Nakedi	Mangaung Local Municipality	083 331 2061	
154. F. van der Merwe	Mangaung Local Municipality	082 921 5891	
155. J. van der Merwe	Mangaung Local Municipality	082 828 7956	
156. K van Rhyn	Mangaung Local Municipality	051-436 2981	

Name	Organisation	Mobile	Email
157. J. Hefer	Mangaung Local Municipality	082 653 5353	
158. V. Rani	Mangaung Local Municipality	082 333 6534	
159. M. Fikizolo	Mangaung Local Municipality	082 574 1878	fikizolo@civic.fs172.co.za
160. M. Sealedi	Mangaung Local Municipality	083 279 3483	
161. M.G. Melan	Mangaung Local Municipality Mangaung Local Municipality	083686 5902	
162. J. J. Motlallane	Mangaung Local Municipality	082 561 8268	
163. B. Tsoai	Mangaung Local Municipality	083 360 6076	
164. A. Maloi-Thibeletsa	Mangaung Local Municipality	083 274 1851	
165. A. Koch	Mangaung Local Municipality	083 253 7582	interna@intekon.co.za
166. Z. Zumane	Mangaung Local Municipality	051-405 8643	
167. L. Masoetsa	Mangaung Local Municipality	051-405 3620	losala@civic.fs172.co.za
168. N. Mokotjo	Mangaung Local Municipality	082 339 9184	
169. T. A. Jacobs	Mangaung Local Municipality		
170. S. N. Soebhele	Mangaung Local Municipality	082 447 4533	
172. M T. Bendile	Mangaung Local Municipality	051-432 7222	
173. M B Mbang	Mangaung Local Municipality	082 821 9305	
174. S. M Khutlane	Mangaung Local Municipality	082 338 8758	
175. P. J. J. van Biljon	Mangaung Local Municipality	083 262 3931	
176. J. V. du Plessis	Mangaung Local Municipality	082 449 9488	
178. D.J. Rosssouw	Mangaung Local Municipality	082 920 3899	
179. J. A Ditlhakwe	Mangaung Local Municipality	082 339 9668	
180. P. E. Motlhabi	Mangaung Local Municipality	082 822 4354	
181. I. J. Kegakilwe	Mangaung Local Municipality	082 828 9586	
182. M.R. Mompoti	Mangaung Local Municipality	082 447 4535	
183. S. P. Chere	Mangaung Local Municipality	072 236 7711	
184. M. S. Moilwa	Mangaung Local Municipality	083 256 9505	

Name	Organisation	Mobile	Email

Annex 2 List of participants