

APPENDICES

**with the Advice on
Strategic District Planning in
Zambia by SNV**

(appendices 1 to 4)

APPENDIX 1A

Terms of Reference Support Mission, Commission EIA

Terms of Reference Support Mission DGIS-MER / SNV-BBA

1. Background

Towards the end of 1997, SNV-Zambia developed the intention to upgrade a number of existing district programme development plans (DPDP's) for its main areas of intervention and to draft DPDP's for a number of new areas. The basic idea was, initially, to:

1. establish an interactive development of the sub-programmes in the selected intervention areas and the SNV programme in Zambia as a whole;
2. develop the sub-programmes in a strategic manner; and
3. seek an integration of environmental, economic and socio-institutional aspects in the proposed plans.

This programming exercise was to be implemented by a simultaneous implementation of a socio-institutional analysis, an environmental analysis and an economic analysis in each so-called *concentration district* of SNV-Zambia. Since analytical tools for the first two were readily available, an effort was made to develop a tool for local economic analysis.

In the process of developing this tool, the idea to merge the three analytical tools in one, gained ground. Gradually a tool for integrated analysis of district development emerged. It was decided to test the first outline of this analytical tool in initially five, in a later stage only three districts. It was thought that through a real-life application valuable lessons could be learned in order to upgrade and fine-tune the tool.

During its implementation the emphasis on a SNV programme plan shifted towards a district plan. Hence, aspects like local ownership (through the District Development Co-ordinating Committee), community participation (through village consultations and representation) and stakeholder involvement (of government, non-government and private sectors) gained importance. This shift in focus has improved the approach but at the same time created some confusion amongst the various actors.

2. Methodology

In order to implement the Strategic Planning process a manual has been elaborated describing the five main steps of the proposal. Furthermore, District Teams have been established in the various districts, consisting of two SNV personnel and two non-SNV district persons (either government, non-government or private organisations). The co-ordination of the implementation is entrusted to a National Team, consisting of one gender specialist, one development economist and one rural development planner (the latter being the co-ordinator). The exercise started in May 1998 through a national workshop in which five district teams participated in a two-day team-building exercise and a three-day discussion of the proposed Strategic Planning exercise. As stated above, at the moment the SP exercise is an ongoing process in three districts; Mwinilunga in North-Western Province, and Nchelenge and Samfya in Luapula Province.

3. *Backstopping*

The aim of the Support Mission by DGIS-MER / SNV-BBA is to make an appraisal of :

- Methodology:** To assess the strengths and weaknesses of the SP-exercise as an integrated tool for sustainable economic development at district level.
- Process:** To assess the approach followed in stakeholder involvement and community participation in relation to medium-term district development planning.
- Approach:** To assess the pro's and con's of using district teams in which SNV plays a facilitating role.

4. *Time table*

	Kolhoff / Wind	Meindertsma
Saturday 05-12	Arrival Lusaka Briefing by Jan Vloet	--
Sunday 06-12	Travel to Mwinilunga	--
Monday 07-12	Orientation District institutions Briefing on progress	--
Tuesday 08-12	1 st Stakeholder Meeting	--
Wednesday 09-12	Return to Lusaka (Ibis Garden)	Arrival Lusaka Briefing by Jan Vloet Departure for Ibis Garden
Thursday 10-12	National Review Workshop Assessment experiences so-far	National Review Workshop Assessment experiences so-far
Friday 11-12	National Review Workshop Actions ahead Return to Lusaka (Holiday Inn)	National Review Workshop Actions ahead Return to Lusaka (Holiday Inn)
Saturday 12-12	Departure for the Netherlands	Departure for the Netherlands

APPENDIX 1B

Aanvullende TOR voor Missie naar Zambia van de Commissie voor de MER

1. Heeft het ontwikkelde instrument voldoende potentieel om uit te groeien tot een algemeen bruikbaar instrument binnen CNV en wellicht daarbuiten? Welke aanpassingen zijn daarvoor eventueel wenselijk?
2. Welke plaats zou het kunnen innemen in een geïntegreerde, duurzame ontwikkelingsanalyse van streken? M.a.w. geeft het een basis voor een dergelijke analyse of betreft het vooral een basis voor een analyse van de economische dimensie in het kader van een duurzame ontwikkelingsbenadering waarin ook de SEAn en een analyse vanuit de sociale en institutionele invalshoek elk hun gelijkwaardige bijdrage leveren?
3. Op welke wijze en vooral in welke mate wordt de SEAn methodologie toegepast en wie zijn daarvoor verantwoordelijk? Is daarbij voldoende expertise beschikbaar? Hoewel er gezegd wordt in de beschrijving dat er een instrument voor milieu-analyse bestaat wordt die niet als zodanig gebruikt. Wat is de reden zich tot enkele, voor de economische invalshoek relevant geachte, onderdelen te beperken en dus een analyse vanuit (juist in marginale gebieden zo belangrijke) milieu-invalshoek achterwege te laten?
4. Welke contacten heeft het Nationale Team om het ownership van de operatie ook boven het districtsniveau te verzekeren?
5. Wat is de formele en institutionele inbedding van de operatie binnen Zambia?
6. Op welke wijze worden de ervaringen met het gebruik van het instrument vastgelegd en voor de verdere ontwikkeling beschikbaar gemaakt?
7. Wat is de follow-up die Zambia zich voorstelt met betrekking tot de ontwikkeling van het instrument, nadat de analyses en de districtplanning hebben plaats gehad?
8. Wordt er voldoende onderscheid gemaakt tussen de analytische en de planningsfase en de betrokkenen bij elke fase?
9. Zijn de districtsprofielen voldoende analytisch van aard en niet te beschrijvend?
10. Is het de bedoeling de districtsprofielen als een breed beschikbaar document te publiceren? Hoe denkt men dan te voorkomen dat het een te statisch element wordt?
11. Wat voorziet men aan monitoring-activiteiten?

Het beste en tot horens. Groeten,

Albert Heringa

APPENDIX 2

Programme field visit 5-13 December 1998

- Saturday 5 December: 14.00; Arrival in Lusaka of the team members Mrs. M.Wind (SNV/BBA) and Mr. A. Kolhoff (Commission for EIA);
19.00; Meeting with Jan Vloet (Coordinator Strategic planning, SNV-Lusaka).
- Sunday 6 December: 07.00 - 18.00; Travel from Lusaka to Mwinilunga in Mwinilunga district.
- Monday 7 December: 09.00 - 12.00; Meeting with Rotan Kamena (Agricultural advisor of SNV and project leader of the district team in Mwinilunga) and Chiel de Wit (District planning advisor for SNV in Mwinilunga and member of the district team) on the approach followed by the district team in the strategic planning exercise.
12.00 - 14.00; Meeting with John Kajuka (Chairman of the Mwinilunga district development organisation) and visiting of community projects funded by the micro project programme of the EU/WB.
15.00 - 18.00; Continuation of the first meeting with Chiel de Wit.
20.00 - 21.00; Meeting with Christien (member of the district team in Mwinilunga).
- Tuesday 8 December: 09.00 - 18.00; Field visit with Mozes (Agricultural extension worker) to chitamene and dambo farming system and beekeepers in the northern part of Mwinilunga district.
- Wednesday 9 December: 07.30 - 17.00; Travel from Mwinilunga to Ibis Garden.
13.00; Arrival in Lusaka of team member Mr. J.D. Meindertsma (Commission for EIA)
20.00; Start of the National Workshop on Strategic planning at district level in Ibis Garden.
- Thursday 10 December: 08.30; Introduction of the workshop.
09.00; Presentation of the results of the district teams.
12.00; Presentation of the National Team.
12.30; Presentation of the Commission for EIA and SNV/BBA.
14.00; Working groups on solutions and alternatives to development issues.
16.00; Plenary presentation of results of working groups.
20.00; Presentation on poverty assessment and livelihood indicators.
- Friday 11 December: 08.30; Introduction.
09.00; Presentation of the case study: detailed analysis.
09.30; Panel discussion on the case study.
12.00; Working groups on methodological aspects of the detailed analysis.
14.30; Presentation of results of working groups.
16.00; Action plans; issues and questions raised to be incorporated in the action plans of the National team and District Teams.

Saturday 12 December: 17.00; Evaluation of the workshop.
08.30 - 09.30; Debriefing at the head office of SNV in Lusaka with:
Jan Vloet, Imke van der Honing (Programme officer -Solwesi) and
Piet van Ommeren (Director SNV-Lusaka).
11.00; Departure of Mrs. M.Wind and Mr. J.D. Meindertsma.
Sunday 13 December 14.30; Departure of Mr. A.Kolhoff.

APPENDIX 3

Recommendations for rewriting of the guideline

In this appendix specific remarks with respect to the guideline are made. It is strongly recommended only to make use of this recommendations if the guideline is rewritten integral. Improvement of separate steps or more attention for a certain discipline e.g. environment, gives no guarantees for an integrated approach and an output of the planning process which contributes to a sustainable development.

1. Presentation

The district teams said that they hardly use the guideline because it is not accessible. The present guideline is aiming to assist the district teams with the guiding of the process and it contains guidelines for the information to be gathered and analysed. To make the guideline accessible it is recommended to:

- split the manual in two parts in order to make the manual better accessible for the different purposes, not necessarily in two volumes. One part should provide guidelines for the management of the process and the second part should provide guidelines for the information to be gathered and analysed;
- the guidelines should be defined as instructions;
- structure the chapters more systematically e.g. aim, methodology, additional information, methods and techniques, input/output;
- look for a balance between the instructions, presentation of cases and examples of agendas;
- write the guideline in such a way that the document can be used without the assistance of the writers;
- use the terminology in a consistent way;
- keep the flow chart, it is clear and instructive;
- make more use of visualisations of concepts etc.

Nowhere in the guideline are references to the original methods. This should be done, moreover it offers interested users the opportunity to study specific methods more in depth.

Monitoring is not foreseen yet and this should be addressed, because a community-based planning approach calls for continuity and the opportunity for adaptations. So far, the SP-exercise should be completed by June 1998 (work planning presented at the National Workshop in December 1998). This decision may be taken due to lack of (commitment of) funds and partly to an evolving vision of SNV-Zambia. The SP-exercise was initially set-up as a one-time exercise (and still is).

The planning process does not have a pre-set timetable. This is not considered to be a problem. The national team and district teams prepare regularly a timetable for their activities (work plans). Taking into account that most district teams consist not of professional planners and that the members are part-time involved, there should not be too much pressure to meet deadlines.

2 Specific comments for the chapters/steps

2.1 Introduction

The introductory chapter consists of a list of concepts, principles and approaches. The justification for this selection and the coherence is lacking.

Recommendations:

- It is recommended to prepare a clear introduction consisting of a short description of the present problems, the aims (long term and short term) starting points and the approach of the planning process. Long term aim: Sustainable development of the people in the district. Short term aim: Preparation of a strategic district plan including concrete action plans.
- It is recommended to link the section - towards strategic sustainable economic developments - to the other sections in this chapter. The choices made are not justified e.g. by taking rural resource management as the focus of economic investigation, ecological and socio-institutional dimensions are taken aboard of the strategic planning at district level, no further information.
- It is recommended to work out the relation with existing district planning activities like the district situational analysis and the district development plan.

2.2 Stage 1: Initiating strategic planning at district level

- This chapter is still to be rewritten in the what should you-do-as district-team-style, which is to be changed as the emphasis is changed towards community-based planning (in Chapter 3, which is rewritten, community planning is described, this should be brought forward). In fact the first stage is meant to get an impression of the ideas/perception of all relevant stakeholders in the district.
- The three steps under 1.2. are not really steps.
- Can you ask less empowered groups in the community what there mission statements are?
- In step 4 (First Stakeholder Meeting) the aim is to obtain commitment from the key actors to the process of strategic planning. It should be explained what kind of commitment is aimed at.
- Especially in this chapter guidelines for the set up and guiding of the process are mixed with guidelines concerning the contents of the planning exercise. These should be separated. General instructions with respect to the process could be presented in one chapter.
- The present situation will be described on basis of available information and knowledge of the actors and team members/facilitators. Expert judgement is not foreseen in this stage.

2.3 Stage 2: Taking stock

- The chapter title and structure are unclear, section 2.1. “using analytical tools” is non-informative, no tools are presented (zoning is stressed, how should this be done is not said), neither it is explained what kind of analysis is to be done in Step 2, and; Tricky because suddenly in 2,3 a very important output is required, a District Profile. Quote: “Results arising from the analytical tools would yield very important information, which would need to be synthesised and put in a district profile.”
- The aim of this stage is to describe the present situation (natural situation/socio-economic situation) and future trends in the broad sense in the district. This profile will generate information on major problems but a proper analysis of these problems is lacking.
- The district is object of study but the regional or national setting of the district is not requested to be elaborated. The economic setting concerns the national situation with respect to e.g. price and subsidy policy but also flow of remittances. The downstream area of the watershed which is located outside the district is part of the environmental setting and should be studied in case potential impacts will affect areas outside the district. The social setting is looking into the cultural aspects such as the value system which influences the behaviour of people.
- The setting of the seven areas to be investigated is not taken into consideration.
- The section infrastructure and social services is a good issue that is quite often not studied.
- Sections 2.2.7 on experiences with other development activities in the district are included. Experience with relevant activities in other districts/comparable agro-ecological zones should also be included.
- The most important risk in this stage is the lack of an integrated analysis and synthesis of the seven different areas/issues/subjects in the district profile. The presented outline of the district profile is a classical sector/thematic oriented approach of describing the different issues in a region. An analysis of the most important problems and their underlying causes are not elaborated in the profile.
- In the description of the contents, section on natural resources it is stated that the profile should present recommendations on steps to prevent depletion of natural resources. Apart from an description of the present situation and trends solutions are requested for and as far as understood this was not the aim of the profile.
- Section 2.1.3 livelihood systems should partly be linked to section 2.2.4 natural resource endowments and management. Because important dimensions of the livelihood systems, which are primarily based on agriculture are directly linked to use and management of the natural resources (production functions). Different levels of management of the natural resources should be described: household/intra-household level, community level, clan level. Management of natural resources by other stakeholders e.g. government and private sector (logging companies) should also be described. In section 2.2.4 the ecological processes (e.g. recovery of soil fertility and attention for irreversible processes) and regulation functions should be addressed.

- Furthermore, it is important to determine the exploitation level. This should be elaborated. Trends, historical as well as future trends should be described.

2.4 Stage 3: Identification and prioritisation of key development issues

- This chapter appears to be one meeting, although the agenda is long, and the tasks are enormous and many steps have to be followed: it is questionable to do this all in one meeting. Methods of prioritising and reconciling different priorities by different stakeholders are to be included (discussed during the workshop).
- The aim of this stage is to identify and prioritise main development issues, by stakeholders on basis of the district profile.
- Section 3.0 is not clear and a mix of instructions, background information etc.
- The sequence of steps is logical.
- Is the issue of conflicting interests sufficiently addressed? Which stakeholders are present?
- Is the last step 6 (preliminary analysis of the selected issues) achievable within three days? Is a workshop the right setting to elaborate this analysis?
- It is recommended to distinguish the most important environmental problems. Who is taking care of the needs of the future generations?
- Is the input of (environmental) experts sufficiently guaranteed? Experts are able to judge the severity of e.g. environmental problems, which are presently in the first stage of degradation.

2.5 Stage 4: Detailed analysis of priority development issues

- The title does not cover the content. It is disappointing to read that these and those aspects have to be assessed, without indicating how this can be done: much more should be done here to give the district teams real support; much can be learned from the planning instrument Strategic Environmental Analysis.
- The aim of this stage is defining intervention strategies for selected topics on basis of a detailed analysis; output - report on alternative strategies.
- The focus in this stage is on rural resource management (RRM) whilst the priority development issues have not been selected yet. The links between RRM and these issues should become clear.
- It is suggested not to do a detailed analysis as this may lead to sub-sector and sub-issue studies (like the one presented during the work shop) but in-depth analysis;
- With respect to the ten steps in this stage the second group of steps all have to do with assessment.

- Step 8: an opportunity for growth; 6 lines and a box with 10 questions are all there is on economic analysis. It is focussing on quantitative growth whilst investments for long term growth and equity is not dealt with. The underlying causes of (potential) environmental problems should be elaborated. Identification of environmental opportunities should be an explicit part of the opportunity analysis. This step should be expanded.
- The first 9 defined steps are presented as sequential, while they could be done to a large extent simultaneously; the use of the word step is anyhow confusing: Each Chapter is called a step, within each chapter there are a number of steps; and then within the latter step there are some time steps as well (see 4.2). The methodology should be changed and things be made more transparent.
- Step 10, is not part of Phase 5, but part of the following Chapter. This step is in fact the opportunity analysis resulting in strategies and an assessment of these strategies. Is an assessment of the strategies part of the process/approach?
- The strategies should be reviewed on basis of the sustainability framework.

2.6 Stage 5: Finding ways forward

- Strategy outline and reporting (last step of Chapter 4) should be placed in this chapter.
- The intended separation of programmes and projects from the strategic planning should be carried out. The output should be a strategic district development plan and action plans.
- The aim of this stage is to select the intervention strategies by stakeholders. This means that the stakeholders have an important role of choice at an important decisions on making stage in the planning process. According to the guideline selection will be done on basis of the individual assessment of the relative feasibility and appropriateness. This approach must result in a lot of noise because informed decision making by the stakeholders is not guaranteed and the criteria for selection are not yet identified.
- Information on definition of an intervention strategy should be replaced to chapter 4.
- Development scenario's and proposed project activities should be reviewed on basis of sustainability in all aspects, socially, economically and ecologically.

APPENDIX 4

Operationalizing the concept of sustainable development, an example^{1]}

WHAT SHOULD OR COULD BE ASSESSED?

Economic sustainability:

- Is the economic productivity of degraded land improving; and are economic activities building on natural resource potentials?
- Are input/output ratios, and subsidies for external inputs, decreasing?
- Are production, processing and storage losses being minimised?
- Is the local economy diversifying?

Ecological sustainability:

- Is natural resource production combined with conservation (of soil, water, and wild-/domesticated biological diversity), to ensure resilience?
- Are harvests constant or increasing, but not at the expense of conservation?
- Is the use of ecological processes optimised (e.g. biological nitrogen fixation, waste assimilation, and recycling of water and nutrients)?
- Is pollution minimised, both on-farm and off-farm?
- Are environmentally damaging practices being phased out?
- Are natural resource limits and potentials becoming better understood, and regularly monitored?

Social sustainability:

- Are natural resource use systems increasing people's control over their own lives, and the range of choices open to them; are they compatible with local values (e.g. of taste and taboo) and systems of decision-making?
- Are costs and benefits of natural resource rehabilitation and use equitably distributed - so more people have access to resources for shelter, energy, materials and food, or so that they have incomes to pay for these basics; are special efforts made to redress imbalances, notably those disfavouring women?
- Is there a growing body of commonly-held knowledge on natural resource limits and opportunities, and is local innovation in natural resource use increasing?
- Is there a growth in local (para)professional capacity, capable of conducting natural resource research and planning?
- Is the farmer playing a leading role in rehabilitation and natural resource systems?
- Are people who used to rely upon unsustainable activities for their livelihood being supported in their transition to sustainable activities?

¹ This example is based on experience with community based assessment of local resources in three districts in Pakistan. In: National Sustainable Development Strategies: Experiences and Dilemmas by the IIED; October 1994; p.p. 18-19.

- Is there a tendency towards full employment, with suitable off-farm employment to take the pressure off the land?

Institutional sustainability:

- Is local environmental rehabilitation taking place against a background of supportive, stable policy? i.e.
 - internal institution (community rules and norm on resource allocation, multiple use, cost and benefit sharing, conflict resolution, and pursuing other collective natural resource values)
 - external institutions (government land tenure, revenue policy, social support systems, natural resource technical support systems, and infrastructure)
- Are communities developing a diverse institutional support network in environmental rehabilitation, including Government and private sector - or are they over-reliant on one project?

CHOICE OF INDICATORS

One option for assessing progress on these elements of sustainability is to focus on a few indicators - each of which covers the interaction of economic, ecological, social and institutional dimensions. These indicators will be fully developed during the community planning process, since they must be consistent with local strategy aim:

1. *Changes in Productivity* (yields, resource conservation measures, costs);
2. *Changes in Resource Quality* (extent of resource-conserving practices; use of ecosystems functions; extent of resource-degrading practices; extent of local contribution to conservation technology development);
3. *Changes in Local Resilience and Vulnerability* (agricultural and wild product managed and farmed, access to credit, impacts of drought on livelihood, human health);
4. *Changes in Self-Dependence of Groups and Communities* (extent of participation, local skills and capacities, effectiveness of local resource management/rehabilitation groups, dependence on external resources);
5. *Replication of Strategy Successes to Non-Strategy Sites* (replication rates by neighbours, federation of groups to tackle broader-scale issues); and
6. *Changes in Operations of Support Institutions* (new roles for professionals, enabling policies, increasing links with other agencies, local commitment to increasing capacity),