



Technical Centre for Agricultural & Rural Development



German Technical
Cooperation
Sector Network Rural
Development (SNRD), Africa

The Struggle for Pro-poor Growth: Linking national programmes to local priorities and overcoming process overload

Proceedings of the 7th African Forum

8 to 13 June 2003
Pretoria, South Africa

E. Benson-von der Ohe
Désirée Dietvorst
Johann Hesse

**The Struggle for Pro-poor Growth:
Linking national programmes to local priorities
and overcoming process overload**

Proceedings of the 7th African Forum

8 to 13 June 2003
Pretoria, South Africa

In Memory of
Werner D. von der Ohe
(1945 – 2003)

who was Speaker of the SNRD Working Group “Sector Reform in Rural Development” until he was murdered in early February. He and his team carried out many of the preparations for this year’s Forum, which had been scheduled for late February but was postponed until June as a result of this tragedy.

It is a tribute, both to him and to the relevance of these Fora to participants, that almost everyone who had originally registered for the Forum managed to come, despite two abrupt last-minute changes – the shift in dates from February to June and later, due to terrorism threats in East Africa, the shift in venue from Nairobi to Pretoria. Apparently these annual Fora continue to meet a real need among African implementers and planners of sector programmes. Werner would have been pleased!

Acknowledgments

Special thanks are in order to:

Klaus Pilgram and the Pretoria team, who miraculously put in place local arrangements at the new venue of Pretoria, doing in a few weeks what normally takes many months;

Johann Hesse, who quickly stepped into the role of Speaker of the Working Group and assumed the leadership of the Forum;

Reimund Hoffmann, who replaced Johann as Deputy Speaker and also provided the leadership that Werner’s GTZ-supported project in Nairobi needed to carry on their work;

Gesa Wesseler of CTA, for her continued belief in the Forum’s worth and for managing to shift the budgeted funding beyond the planned fiscal year;

Désirée Dietvorst for her ability to structure conference programmes that integrate new themes without losing continuity with what has gone on before;

Ruth Njau, Heike Hoeffler and the entire Kenya local arrangements team;

Albert Engel, one of the “fathers” of SNRD and of this Working Group, who came despite other obligations to help keep the Forum alive;

Nathaniel Mjema for his skillful moderation and his ability to create the illusion that things had been better planned than was actually the case;

Elizabeth Benson - von der Ohe for her enthusiasm and commitment to this Forum, in spite of her devastating loss;

and to all the *resource persons* and *participants* who shifted their personal and work obligations in February and again in June, in order to come together once again.

Abbreviations

ACF	Zambia's Agricultural Consultative Forum, a stakeholder group	DIE	Deutsches Institut für Entwicklungspolitik (German Development Institute - GDI)
ACP	the African, Caribbean and Pacific group of states that entered into the Lomé Convention and later the Cotonou Agreement with the European Union member states	DTS	Development Transfer System, within Uganda's decentralisation strategy
ADB	African Development Bank	EAC	East Africa Community
AGOA	African Growth and Opportunities Act	EBA	the Everything But Arms initiative that grants least developed countries access to EU markets, for the most part without restrictive tariffs
ASIP	Agricultural Sector Investment Programme	EC	European Community
ASSP	ASIP Support Southern Province, a project in Zambia	EPA	Economic Partnership Agreement, dealing with trade between nations
BMZ	Germany's Federal Ministry of Economic Cooperation and Development	EPZ	Export Processing Zone
CAPE	Centre of Aid and Public Expenditure, part of the Overseas Development Institute in London	EU	European Union
CAADP	Comprehensive African Agriculture Development Programme of NEPAD	FARA	Forum for Agricultural Research in Africa
CBO	community-based organisation	FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
CIDA	Canadian International Development Agency	FASDEP	Ghana's food and agriculture sector development framework
COMESA	Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa	FDS	Fiscal Decentralisation Strategy
CSO	civil society organisation	FTA	Free Trade Agreement
CSR	Zambian Civil Society for Poverty Reduction	GATT	General Agreement in Tariff and Trade, the predecessor to the WTO
CTA	Technical Centre for Agricultural & Rural Cooperation	GDI	German Development Institute (Deutsches Institut für Entwicklungspolitik = DIE)
DAC	Zambia's District Agricultural Committees	GPRS	Ghana Poverty Reduction Strategy
DADS	Zambia's District Agricultural Development Strategy	GTZ	German Technical Cooperation Agency (Deutsche Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit (GTZ) GmbH)
DANIDA	Danish International Development Agency	HIPC	Heavily Indebted Poor Countries
DC	development cooperation, also developing countries	HLG	higher local governments (within Uganda's layers of local government)
DDCC	Zambia's District Development Coordination Committees	IDA	International Development Agency
DfID	Department for International Development (United Kingdom)	IDP	Integrated Development Project, the municipal development framework used in South Africa
		IFAD	International Fund for Agricultural Development

Abbreviations

IGAD	Integrated Governmental Authority on Development, which coordinates development in the Horn of Africa	NEPAD	New Partnership for Africa's Development, a project of the African Union (AU)
IGR	inter-governmental relations	NGO	non-governmental organisation
IMF	International Monetary Fund	NPPA	National Priority Programme Areas
IMS	Integrated Management Strategy	NTB	Non-Tariff Barriers to trade
INGO	international non-governmental organisation	O&M	Operations and Maintenance, in contrast to the personnel costs (wages) within a budget
I-PRSP	Interim Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper	ODA	Official Development Assistance
ISNAR	International Service for National Agricultural Research	ODI	Overseas Development Institute in London
ITC	International Trade Centre of the United Nations	OECD	Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development
KDDP	Kenya's Kilifi District Development Programme	Oxfam	a British international NGO
KfW	German financial cooperation agency (Kreditanstalt für Wiederaufbau)	PAC	Zambia's Provincial Agricultural Committees
KePIM	Kenya Participatory Impact Monitoring project	PAF	Uganda's Poverty Action Fund
KIPPRA	Kenya Institute for Public Policy Research & Analysis	PAPSCA	Uganda's Programme for the Alleviation of Poverty and Social Costs of Adjustment
LDC	Least Developed Countries	PBA	Programme Based Approach
LG	Local Government	PDPRS	Zambia's Provincial Development Poverty Reduction Strategy
LGDP	Uganda's Local Government Development Plan	PEAP	Uganda's Poverty Eradication Action Plan, equivalent to a PRSP
MAFF	Zambia's Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Fisheries	PEM	Public Expenditure Management
M&E	monitoring and evaluation	PID	Project Information Document of the World Bank; also: Participatory Integrated Development, an approach used by the KDDP project, Kenya
MDG	Millennium Development Goal of the United Nations	PMA	Uganda's Plan for Modernisation of Agriculture
MOF	Ministry of Finance	PPA	Participatory Poverty Assessment
MOFA	Ghana's Ministry of Food and Agriculture	PRS	Poverty Reduction Strategy
MOP	Ministry of Planning	PRSC	Uganda's Poverty Reduction Support Credit
MTCS	Medium Term Competitiveness Strategy	PRSP	Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper
MTDP	Medium Term Development Plan	PSD	Private Sector Development
MTEF	Medium Term Expenditure Framework	PSFU	Private Sector Foundation Uganda
MTR	Medium Term Review	REC	Regional Economic Communities, such as SADC or COMESA
NAADS	Uganda's National Agriculture Advisory Services		

Abbreviations

RTA	Regional Trade Agreement, a term that covers both FTAs and customs unions
RTS	Recurrent Transfer System, within Uganda's decentralisation strategy
SADC	Southern Africa Development Community
SAR	Staff Appraisal Report of the World Bank
SIDA	Swedish International Development Agency
SIP	sector investment programme
SP	sector programme
SPAS	Social Policy Advisory Services, a project in Kenya
SNRD	Sector Network for Rural Development, Africa
SWAp,	sector wide approach
TC	technical cooperation, a form of development assistance focusing on providing expertise
ToR	Terms of Reference
TRIPS	WTO Agreement on Trade Related Intellectual Property Rights
UDN	Uganda Debt Network, an NGO
UPPAP	Uganda Participatory Poverty Assessment Project
WB	World Bank
WFP	World Food Programme
WG	working group
WTO	World Trade Organisation

Contents

Acknowledgments
Abbreviations
Contents
Preface

Internal opening

Presiding: Dr. Klemens Hubert, GTZ Country Director, South Africa

TRIBUTES TO WERNER VON DER OHE	1
<i>Christoph Beier, GTZ Headquarters, Germany</i>	
<i>Josef Grimm, SNRD Chairman, South Africa</i>	
<i>Johann Hesse, Speaker of SNRD Working Group, Ghana</i>	
<i>Julius Nduati, Ministry of Agriculture, Kenya</i>	

Opening of the Forum

Presiding: Dr. Klemens Hubert, GTZ Country Director, South Africa

0.1 OPENING ADDRESS BY HER EXCELLENCY THE GERMAN AMBASSADOR TO SOUTH AFRICA	2
<i>Mrs. A. Peters</i>	
0.2 OPENING ADDRESS BY THE DIRECTOR GENERAL, MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE, SOUTH AFRICA	2
<i>Bongiwe Njobe</i>	
0.3 THE PLACE OF SECTOR PROGRAMMES IN EUROPEAN COMMUNITY POLICY, BY THE AMBASSADOR AND HEAD OF DELEGATION OF THE EC DELEGATION, SOUTH AFRICA	3
<i>Michael Lake</i>	
0.4 CTA'S APPROACH TO SECTOR PROGRAMMES AND PRO-POOR GROWTH, CTA, THE NETHERLANDS	3
<i>Gesa Wesseler</i>	
0.5 POVERTY REDUCTION APPROACH OF THE GERMAN FEDERAL MINISTRY FOR ECONOMIC COOPERATION AND DEVELOPMENT (BMZ), GERMANY	4
<i>Eberhard Hauser</i>	
0.6 INTRODUCTION TO THE FORUM PROGRAMME	5
<i>Johann Hesse</i>	

Top down or bottom up? Linking national policies to local priorities

1. INTRODUCTION: MAKING SWAPS WORK FOR THE POOR	6
<i>Chaired by Jerry Tschoba, Ministry of Agriculture, South Africa</i>	
1.1 MAKING SWAPS WORK FOR THE POOR: A BILATERAL DONOR'S PERSPECTIVE	6
<i>Christoph Beier, Department of Planning and Development, GTZ, Germany</i>	
1.2 MAKING SWAPS WORK FOR THE POOR: THE VIEW FROM THE GROUND	7
<i>Anthony Mwanaumo, Agricultural Consultative Forum, Zambia</i>	
<i>Plenary discussions</i>	9

CONTENTS

2. TOP DOWN OR BOTTOM UP?	10
<i>Chaired by Peter Ngobese, Ministry of Agriculture, South Africa</i>	
2.1 BOTTOM-UP DISTRICT PLANNING: LINKING LOCAL LEVEL NEEDS TO NATIONAL PROGRAMMES IN KENYA	10
<i>Kenda Mwenja, Kilifi District Development Project, Kenya</i>	
2.2 INTEGRATING LOCAL PRIORITIES INTO NATIONAL POLICY FRAMEWORKS IN SOUTH AFRICA	11
<i>Marc Feldman, Consultant, Development Works, South Africa</i>	
2.3 PLANNING THE PRSP FROM BELOW: THE UGANDAN POVERTY PARTICIPATORY ASSESSMENT	12
<i>Daisy Owomugasho, Makerere University, Uganda</i>	
<i>Working groups</i>	<i>12</i>
<i>Plenary discussions</i>	<i>15</i>
<hr/> <i>Poverty and participation: Implementation at decentralised levels</i> <hr/>	
3. GETTING LOCAL ACTORS TO COOPERATE IN THE FIGHT AGAINST POVERTY	16
<i>Chaired by Collins Nkatiko, Ministry of Agriculture, Zambia</i>	
3.1 ADDRESSING RURAL POVERTY IN SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA: INSTITUTIONAL AND ORGANISATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES	16
<i>Uwe Otzen, Institute for Development Studies, Germany</i>	
3.2 THE ROLE OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT IN ADDRESSING RURAL POVERTY: THE CASE OF UGANDA	17
<i>Martin Oloo, Ministry of Local Government, Uganda</i>	
3.3 PARTICIPATION AND DISTRICT LEVEL PLANNING IN GHANA	17
<i>Kofi Atta-Agyepong, Ministry of Agriculture, and Frank Obeng Dapaah, Regional Coordinating Council, Ghana</i>	
<i>Working groups</i>	<i>18</i>
<i>Plenary discussions</i>	<i>22</i>
4. BUILDING BRIDGES: EXPERIENCES WITH CROSS-SECTOR COOPERATION	23
<i>Chaired by Lena Otoo, Ministry of Agriculture, Ghana</i>	
4.1 MAKING CROSS-SECTOR COOPERATION WORK AT THE PROVINCIAL AND DISTRICT LEVEL: EXPERIENCES FROM THE SOUTHERN PROVINCE IN ZAMBIA	23
<i>Collins Nkatiko, Provincial Agricultural Coordinator, and Fewdays Yenga, Provincial Local Government Officer</i>	
4.2 INTEGRATED DEVELOPMENT PLANNING: WHAT WE CAN LEARN FROM SOUTH AFRICA	24
<i>Danso Agymang, Integrated Development Planning, South Africa</i>	
4.3 COMMUNITY DRIVEN DEVELOPMENT: LESSONS FROM KENYA	25
<i>Walter Salzer, Kilifi District Development Project, Kenya</i>	
<i>Working groups</i>	<i>26</i>
<i>Plenary discussions</i>	<i>29</i>

External challenges: The case of international trade

5.	INTERNATIONAL TRADE AGREEMENTS: WHICH ONES ARE IMPORTANT AND WHY?	30
5.1	OPPORTUNITIES AND LIMITATIONS OF LINKING INTERNATIONAL TRADE AGREEMENTS TO NATIONAL PROGRAMMES	30
	<i>Alexander Werth, International Centre for Trade and Sustainable Development, Geneva</i>	
5.2	A REVIEW OF TRADE RELATED ISSUES IN PRSPs AND AGRICULTURE SWAPS FOR EIGHT SELECTED COUNTRIES IN AFRICA	31
	<i>Helmut Albert, GTZ, Germany</i>	
5.3	TRADE AGREEMENTS UNDER THE EUROPEAN UNION AND HOW DEVELOPING COUNTRIES CAN TAKE ACCOUNT OF THEM	33
	<i>Jürgen Lovasz, Delegation of the European Union, South Africa</i>	
5.4	THE IMPORTANCE OF INTERNATIONAL TRADE AGREEMENTS FOR KENYA	33
	<i>Agayo Ogambi, Trade Point Representative, Kenya</i>	
5.5	THE NEPAD INITIATIVE: A REPORT FROM THE SECRETARIAT	34
	<i>Edwin Ijeoma, NEPAD Secretariat, South Africa</i>	
	<i>Plenary discussions</i>	35

Money matters: Resource flows to local levels

6.	POVERTY AND BUDGETING	38
	<i>Chaired by Anthony Mwanaumo, Agricultural Consultative Forum, Zambia</i>	
6.1	THE ROLE OF TRUST FUNDS IN ENSURING THAT RESOURCES REACH INTENDED BENEFICIARIES	38
	<i>Sehoai Santho, Regional African Leadership Development Programme, University of Pretoria, South Africa</i>	
6.2	HOW, WHEN AND WHY DOES POVERTY GET BUDGET PRIORITY: A BRIEF SYNTHESIS OF AND INTRODUCTION TO COUNTRY EXPERIENCES	39
	<i>A study by CAPE/ODI, London, presented by Désirée Dietvorst, Consultant, Namibia</i>	
6.3	HOW, WHEN AND WHY DOES POVERTY GET BUDGET PRIORITY: THE CASE FOR GHANA	39
	<i>Douglas Zormelo, Consultant, National Development and Planning Commission, Ghana</i>	
	<i>Working groups</i>	41
	<i>Plenary discussions</i>	44
7.	CHANNELLING RESOURCES TO THE FIELD	45
	<i>Chaired by Ian Kumwenda, Ministry of Agriculture, Malawi</i>	
7.1	THE ROLE OF LOCAL AUTHORITIES AND TRADITIONAL LEADERS IN EMERGENCY RELIEF OPERATIONS WITH PARTICULAR REFERENCE TO THE CURRENT FOOD CRISIS IN MALAWI	45
	<i>Owens Chirambo, Border Zone Development Project, Malawi</i>	
7.2	KENYA POVERTY IMPACT MONITORING: FIRST EMPIRICAL RESULTS INCLUDING A CONSIDERATION OF HIV/AIDS	45
	<i>Leonard Obidha, Ministry of Finance, Kenya</i>	

CONTENTS

7.3 PARTICIPATORY COMMUNITY-BASED BUDGET PERFORMANCE MONITORING IN UGANDA	46
<i>Daisy Owomugasho, Makere University, Uganda</i>	
<i>Working groups</i>	<i>47</i>
<i>Plenary discussions</i>	<i>50</i>

Conclusions and way forward

8. WHERE WE ARE AND WHERE WE'RE HEADING	51
8.1 WHAT WE HAVE SEEN, HEARD AND TALKED ABOUT: A BRIEF OVERVIEW OF THE FORUM'S FINDINGS	51
<i>Johann Hesse, GTZ-Ministry of Agriculture, Ghana</i>	
8.2 SPINNING THE WHEELS: HOW TO GET MOST MILEAGE OUT OF OUR 'REGIONAL SWAP NETWORK'	54
<i>Albert Engel, GTZ, Namibia</i>	
<i>Country working groups: The road ahead</i>	<i>55</i>
<i>Plenary discussions</i>	<i>60</i>
<i>Evaluation and closing</i>	<i>60</i>

Annexes

<i>Annex A.</i>	<i>Workshop Programme</i>
<i>Annex B.</i>	<i>List of Participants</i>

Presentations by major topic (on the CD-Rom):

<i>Annex C.</i>	<i>Tributes to Werner von der Ohe</i>
<i>Annex D.</i>	<i>Opening and Introduction to the Forum</i>
<i>Annex E.</i>	<i>Top down or bottom up?</i>
<i>Annex F.</i>	<i>Getting local actors to cooperate in the fight against poverty</i>
<i>Annex G.</i>	<i>Building bridges: Experiences with cross-sector cooperation</i>
<i>Annex H.</i>	<i>International Trade Agreements: Which ones are important and why?</i>
<i>Annex I.</i>	<i>Poverty and budgeting</i>
<i>Annex J.</i>	<i>Channelling resources to the field</i>
<i>Annex K.</i>	<i>Where we are and where we're heading</i>

Preface

Sector wide approaches (SWAp's) have brought about important advances. Sector wide policies and budgets have improved the dialogue and coordination between national governments and development partners and have contributed to the harmonisation of support initiatives. Sector wide reforms helped to redefine and re-divide the roles between the government and non-state actors – a process that has happened not only in agriculture, but also in state-dominated sectors such as health and education.

Yet, after almost a decade of SWAp implementation, people at the local level in many countries are often not even aware that SWAps exist or how these are meant to change their lives. In hindsight, we can say that the change from scattered field-based projects to coordinated sector-wide programmes was necessary but that, at the same time, it has proven extremely difficult to connect these national programmes with local-level priorities for development.

How can we ensure that SWAps indeed reflect local-level priorities, and that the intended target groups – e.g., the rural poor – benefit? This year's African Forum brought the local level back into focus.

Pro-Poor Growth Requires Multi-Level Linkages

The challenge for sector wide approaches is how to effectively link the national level with the local level, such that

- national policy and budgets reflect regional and local priorities
- resource flows from national to regional and local levels are ensured and transparency and accountability provided
- regional and local actors are strengthened to plan, manage and deliver the services needed for pro-poor growth at the grassroots

Each level, national, regional and local, needs to contribute to the goal of pro-poor growth. Implementation strategies also need to take account of international conditions, especially those that affect African export markets and import prices, and that may undermine national poverty-reduction efforts.

Overcoming Process Overload

SWAps don't operate in isolation. The implementing institutions of sector programmes are usually also involved with poverty reduction strategies, civil service reforms and financial management reforms. Added to this are new capacity demands originating from the WTO development round, the EU partnership negotiations, or others. This multitude of complex reform initiatives and heavy capacity-demands creates the danger of "process overload" for national institutions. The meeting will focus on the linkages and strategies to minimise this danger.

Participants

The forum was aimed at implementers of sector programmes from local, regional and national levels, as well as PRSP implementers, planners & coordinators, civil society organisations, and practitioners from development organisations.

In the past, many forum participants have been sponsored, not only by GTZ but also by other partners in the donor community, including IFAD, DANIDA, World Bank, FAO, DFID, SIDA, CIDA, the Netherlands and others. This year was no exception.

Organisers

The forum was organised by the Sector Network Rural Development (SNRD), an initiative of German Technical Cooperation (GTZ), in partnership with the Technical Centre for Agricultural & Rural Cooperation (CTA).

This was the 7th workshop on sector wide approaches initiated by SNRD's Working Group on Sector Reforms in Rural Development. Since 1997, SNRD has organised various events in sub-Saharan Africa that brought together decision makers on sector wide approaches in order to:

- provide a platform for the exchange of experiences between practitioners
- enable a structured discussion and analysis of key areas of constraint as identified by participants
- compile relevant information for dissemination to practitioners
- provide an African perspective as a counterweight to other, more donor-dominated, international debates on sector reform
- develop a network of active information exchange among African implementers of rural development initiatives

There were 68 participants, representing 11 African countries – Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Ethiopia, Ghana, Kenya, Malawi, Mozambique, Namibia, South Africa, Uganda and Zambia – as well as four European countries.

This volume summarizes the content of what was presented and discussed. We hope it will prove useful to the participants and also to others involved in making sector wide approaches successful tools for development and poverty reduction in their countries.

Johann Hesse

Speaker of the conference organizers, the working group “Sector Reform in Rural Development” of the GTZ Sector Network Rural Development (SNRD)

Internal opening

Presiding: Dr. Klemens Hubert, GTZ Country Director, South Africa

The evening before the formal opening of the Forum, participants gathered to meet one another and to remember a fallen colleague. Following a warm welcome to Pretoria from Dr. Hubert of the GTZ-South Africa Office, everyone briefly introduced him or herself. But the main agenda was to commemorate a man who had been instrumental in the life of the African Forum series.

Tributes to Werner von der Ohe

Christoph Beier, GTZ Headquarters, Germany

Josef Grimm, SNRD Chairman, South Africa

Johann Hesse, Speaker of SNRD Working Group, Ghana

Julius Nduati, Ministry of Agriculture, Kenya

Formal tributes from the above participants (some of which are reprinted in Annex C) were followed by informal reminiscences by others who had known the late Werner von der Ohe, who – until his death in February – was Speaker of the “Sector Reforms in Rural Development” Working Group of SNRD, the group that calls together the African Forum every year.

Many expressed shock at how senseless and unnecessary his death was, shot by would-be robbers for no apparent reason.

As senior advisor to the Kenyan Ministry of Agriculture in Nairobi, he was remembered as an example of how to orient high-level policy work to the needs and problems of the rural poor, with the aim of direct impact for the actual beneficiaries. The focus of the African Forum series is this very same challenge, hence his dedication to its success.

Also mentioned as another piece of outstanding work was his analysis of 30 years of GTZ’s rural development support to Kenya, where he and his Kenyan colleagues took stock of what has (and what has not) proved sustainable after all these years.

He was recalled as someone able to work well with high ranking partner-country government officials, German government representatives and other donor agency staff, but also with local farmers and people of all stations in life. And perhaps most of all, he was remembered for his character, as expressed eloquently by colleague Johann Hesse: “... in every organisation there are people you respect more than others, people you trust more than others and people you look up to more than others. For myself I can confidently say, that Werner was such a person to me. He is a great loss to us.”

Opening of the Forum

Presiding: Dr. Klemens Hubert, GTZ Country Director, South Africa

0.1 Opening address by Her Excellency the German Ambassador to South Africa

Mrs. A. Peters

Ambassador Peters opened with a reference to the late Werner von der Ohe, a man of “Good True Zeal” (GTZ) for the cause he worked for. The cause that this Forum will deal with is the fight against poverty. She urged the participants not only to approach this cause with good true zeal, but also dared them to be of *simple* zeal. Fundamental things need not be presented in a complicated manner that only experts can understand. The fight against poverty is too important to be left only to experts. She challenged the participants to find together the best, the most caring and the most effective way to pursue these goals. [For the entire text of her address, see Annex D-1.]

0.2 Opening address by the Director General, Ministry of Agriculture, South Africa

Bongiwe Njobe

Ms. Njobe shared experiences and lessons learnt from implementation of a sector plan in agriculture in South Africa. Four core strategies were formulated. One aim was to strive for a united and prosperous sector, not divided by race. “Sector strategy agreements” were made with the two dominant farmers’ organisations, representing large predominantly white and small predominantly black farm enterprises, respectively.

Among the lessons learnt, she mentioned the following:

- It is much more appropriate to *plan around a commodity approach*. e.g., goats. Then the various issues – for example, what can you do with a goat, value adding after the production phase, finding ways to increase job opportunities and increase remuneration, etc. – come together as applied to goats. It helps to keep a sense of focus.
- At another level, fragmentation must be avoided. The *quality of follow-up and feedback* is crucial here.
- The leadership really needs to be *within the country*.
- Partnership equity contributions: If there are unequal partners, the weaker one may not put anything onto the table. One needs to *continually evaluate the extent to which all partners put things on table*.
- It’s essential to *streamline information flows*.
- *Conceptually, be very clear about what the problem is and what the indicators are*. The way the problem is conceptually defined helps greatly to identify which indicators to use. In South Africa, they defined the problem and hence the goals in terms of wealth creation and prosperity, not in terms of pro-poor dialogue. So one looks at different indicators, such as income, to measure progress. [More information is available on their webpage.]

0.3 The place of sector programmes in European Community policy, by the Ambassador and Head of Delegation of the EC Delegation, South Africa

Michael Lake

The Policy of the European Community for Development Co-operation, adopted in November 2000 not only for the European Commission itself but also for its Member States, provides the basis for reforming the management of external aid in order to promote “*increased recourse to sectoral support and to direct budgetary aid....*”. The Commission is therefore following a policy of supporting Sector Programs where appropriate.

Sector Programmes are led by key principles on which there is a wide agreement in the international donor community. Firstly, they should be *led by partner governments*. Secondly, they have the common goal of *improving the efficiency and effectiveness with which internal and external resources are utilised*. The concern is to improve the results of government and donor spending, both by focussing resources on the priorities stated in national poverty reduction strategies or similar documents, and by improving the quality of spending.

In striving to attain this goal, sector approaches share three common objectives:

- To broaden *ownership* by partner governments over decision-making with respect to sectoral policy, sectoral strategy and sectoral spending.
- To increase the *coherence* among sectoral policy, budgeting and actual results through greater transparency, through a wide participation of all levels of the society and through ensuring a comprehensive view of the sector.
- To *minimise the transaction costs* associated with the provision of external financing, either by the direct adoption of government procedures or through progressive harmonisation of individual donor procedures.

Mr. Lake previewed the topics of the coming week. Of great importance are the discussions on who shall participate in formulating national policies, strategies and activities and how this process shall be organized. The next question is how the implementation has to take place at decentralized levels. In this context, budgeting issues and the flows of finances to local levels will be considered. Finally, there are certain international influences that national and local levels dealing with poverty reduction need to take into account.

He expressed the wish that the our deliberations on reducing poverty through application of Sector Wide Approaches in developing countries would yield concrete answers and tangible results – results that would concretely impact on the working of governments at different levels, civil societies and donors in our countries that are committed to Poverty Reduction. [See Annex D-2 for the key points of his talk.]

0.4 CTA’s approach to sector programmes and pro-poor growth, CTA, The Netherlands

Gesa Wessler

CTA and the struggle for pro-poor growth

This year’s Forum was co-organised by CTA, the Technical Centre for Agriculture and Rural Cooperation. CTA was established in 1983 under the Lomé Convention between the African, Caribbean and Pacific Group of States (the ACP group) and the European Union Member States. Since the year 2000 it has operated within the framework of what is known as the ACP-EC Cotonou Agreement, the successor agreement to the Lomé Convention. CTA has defined its niche in the area of information and communication management for agriculture and rural development. CTA's tasks are to develop and provide services that improve *access* to information for agricultural and rural

OPENING ADDRESSES

development, and to strengthen the *capacity* of ACP countries to produce, acquire, exchange and utilise information in this area

Sector wide approaches are one way in which donors and client countries can interact. Since CTA is not a donor but rather a specialized support agency, the problem of whether or not to spend its money in a sector wide approach (SWAp) has never arisen and will most probably not arise in the future. There are, however, many ways in which CTA can assist the various stakeholders in these processes. In this area, maybe even more than in the traditional fields of development finance, the availability of relevant, accurate, adequate and timely information is key, as are functioning information flows among the various stakeholders.

CTA can therefore offer all its information products and services in the context of SWAps – as a topic in its publications, by providing platforms for information exchange, and in the context of its training programme.

For CTA, the main questions that arise are,

- Is there a need to change or adapt current activities when dealing with a SWAp?
- Are there specific information needs that need to be taken into account, outside of the themes traditionally covered by CTA?
- Are there new groups of stakeholders emerging who would need information services and skills?
- Are there new types of capacities needed to facilitate information flows between the different actors?

Some of the key challenges that CTA faces in relation to SWAps are:

- To assess the information needs and improve information flows between the grassroots and national planning offices (and anybody in between these levels).
- To strengthen the capacities of the rural poor to participate in the design, planning and implementation of SWAps.
- To make relevant information and experiences from other places available to countries just embarking on the process.
- To raise awareness of the mechanisms and implications of SWAps and related issues (such as agricultural trade) among the various stakeholders, in order to improve ownership and participation.

[For her PowerPoint presentation, see Annex D-3.]

0.5 Poverty Reduction Approach of the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ), Germany

Eberhard Hauser

The growth of agricultural productivity works as a key to poverty reduction. Rural education and health, agricultural innovation and investment and rural infrastructures are the most important components for a sustained pro-poor-growth policy. But this only works where agricultural policy provides for three basic preconditions:

- First, a *land tenure system* that allows for a balanced distribution of land rent and offers security for farm management.
- Second, an *agricultural price and market policy* that allows for sufficient innovation and investment incentives, and
- Third, an *innovation policy* that transmits the results of applied agricultural research into broad social practice.

The challenges have grown in the last ten years. Most developing countries have largely liberalized their tariff regimes, mostly within the framework of structural adjustment programmes, while

OPENING ADDRESSES

industrial countries have made only limited progress in reducing tariffs for sensitive products and removing subsidies for their agriculture.

Thus world markets remain distorted; heavily dumped world-market prices meet free import conditions in developing countries and withdraw large segments of urban food demand from domestic producers. Products like low quality rice or maize arrive on African markets at very competitive prices. African producers find themselves today on the playing fields of global competition. Within Africa, big efficient producers in some countries dominate over the small subsistence farmers, another challenge for a pro-poor-growth strategy.

The German Government has taken up the challenge. In the Programme of Action 2015, a broad and comprehensive approach is outlined. The programme describes ten areas of priority. These include:

- improving the economic opportunities for the poor,
- strengthening their political participation, and
- fostering social protection.

Our partner countries are supported in implementing indispensable reforms and structural changes, which are their responsibilities. We support low- and middle-income countries to draw up and implement national participatory Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs) including Sector Wide Approaches (SWAs) and commit ourselves to use these as guidance for our bilateral co-operation programmes.

[For the entire text of his address, see Annex D-4.]

0.6 Introduction to the Forum programme

Johann Hesse

The opening session concluded with an introduction to the programme by WG Speaker Johann Hesse, who welcomed participants on behalf of Forum Co-organiser GTZ and its Sector Network for Rural Development (SNRD). He clarified that, although GTZ supports many partner ministries who deal with sector-wide approaches, it does not support many SWAs directly. A special welcome was extended to representatives of donor organisations, including CIDA and DfID.

He put this 7th African Forum in the context of the Fora that have been held so far (“where do we come from?”) and summarized some trends over time. (For more on these, see Section 8.2 where the same themes were revisited in somewhat more detail.) He then explained the major topics of the programme for the coming week:

- Introduction
- Implementation: top down or bottom up?
- Participation: implementation at decentralised levels
- Building bridges: experiences with cross-sector cooperation
- External challenges, e.g. trade, NEPAD
- Money matters: resource flow to local levels (budgeting and monitoring)
- Conclusions and way forward

In closing, Dr. Hesse introduced the approach to be used in the working group discussions, so that by the end of the week “Everybody has talked and listened to everybody else at the workshop”. The basic discussion questions are always:

What messages have YOU heard?
What experience can YOU add?
What lessons have YOU learnt for YOUR work?

[For his complete presentation, see Annex D-5.]

Top down or bottom up?

Linking national policies to local priorities

1. Introduction: Making SWAps work for the poor

Chaired by Jerry Tschoba, Ministry of Agriculture, South Africa

1.1 Making SWAps work for the poor: A bilateral donor's perspective

Christoph Beier, Department of Planning and Development, GTZ, Germany

Co-authored by Kathrin Lauckner

Current Trends in the International Debate on Program-based Approaches

Programme Based Approaches (PBAs) are currently being discussed and debated at different levels of the development cooperation system and in various fora. In the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD/DAC), the debate is highly political, influenced by competition among donors. At the level of development agencies and of practitioners in the field, staff are (sometimes) struggling with implementing these policies. Practitioners in the field may sometimes discuss how to survive yet another “fashion trend”.

Dr. Beier pointed out some issues, successes and shortcomings in three areas: accountability and risk management, programme and stakeholder alignment, and the role of non-state actors.

In terms of Accountability and Risk Management, there is increased awareness that accountability has different dimensions. There is accountability between different actors, such as donors, recipient governments, line ministries, providers of technical cooperation (TC) and civil society in both donor and recipient countries. Accountability is not only financial but also political and technical.

Progress: PBAs do help to streamline efforts toward financial accountability and to streamline monitoring and evaluation. They stress the need for increased capacity building in accounting procedures at all administrative levels.

Shortfalls: Setting up systems for increased Financial Accountability is time consuming and expensive. Donor harmonisation thus often concentrates very much on financial management systems, and less on results-oriented sector management. There is insufficient awareness of the need for conflict resolution mechanisms when increased transparency makes lack of accountability (or capacity) visible.

1. INTRODUCTION: MAKING SWAPS WORK FOR THE POOR

In terms of Program and Stakeholder Alignment, different programme approaches (PRSP, SWAp, SIP, Regional Programmes) exist side by side without much coordination. There are undefined interfaces or overlaps of programs and responsibilities and the lack of clear-cut roles and responsibilities in planning, implementation and monitoring for all the different players. PRSPs claim to provide a comprehensive development framework but are often weak with regard to sound sector strategies.

Progress: PRSPs can (at least potentially) build on strategies developed by Sector Programs. Unlike most Sector Programmes, PRSPs have built on broad-based consultation processes. In some countries, the importance of the private and the non-profit sector (especially in the delivery of basic social services) is increasingly being recognised.

Shortfalls: Centrally planned programs often fail to reach the regional and local levels of the system and to respond to locally identified needs and priorities. Sector programs may even counteract other reform processes like decentralisation. SWAps tend to concentrate a lot of (external) funds in the sector, leading in a distortion of power relations between Central Government and Line (Sector) Ministries.

With respect to the Role of Non-state Actors, Private Sector (profit and non-profit) and Civil Society have to be regarded as two different arenas. There is a multitude of potential roles for such actors: contributors to policy discussion and formulation; advocates and lobbyists; service deliverers (operators); monitors or watchdogs of human rights; innovators; mobilisers and financiers. And there might be potential conflicts between different roles (e.g., inclusion in policy dialogue might lead to exclusion from implementation).

Progress: Whereas first-generation SWAps focused on improving the effectiveness of governments, second-generation SWAps have moved towards a redefinition of the role of the state (enabler function). In some countries, SWAps have triggered a systematic involvement of the Private Sector in Sector Management meetings and a contractual approach to service delivery. PBAs and parallel reforms such as Decentralisation have in some countries contributed to a more inclusive and participatory planning approach at the local level.

Shortfalls: Although the role of the private sector is increasingly recognised, there are still reservations on both sides, especially in social sectors. This is also true for Civil Society Organisations vis-à-vis government. In many countries, the legal framework for efficient and effective private (profit and non-profit) sector participation is still not fully in place. Finally, support to private sector and civil society involvement is often donor driven.

What is the role of the German Agency for Technical Cooperation (GTZ), with its expertise-providing Technical Cooperation (TC) mandate, in Programme Based Approaches? TC has a role to play in supporting Good Governance and sound sector policy. GTZ works on different levels of the system (macro, meso, micro) and can thus contribute to coordination and increased communication of different stakeholders. It has good knowledge of local conditions and obstacles to implementation at all levels, which may assist to monitor progress. Finally, GTZ is in a position to link up with and support change agents. But TC alone is not enough. A “best mix” of TC and financing, projects and programmes – based on country assessment – is required. [See Annex D-6 for the complete presentation.]

1.2 Making SWAps work for the poor: The view from the ground

Anthony Mwanaumo, Agricultural Consultative Forum, Zambia

From the ground-truthed perspective, there is too much emphasis on the government as the main recipient and manager of development funds and the national treasury as the primary preferred mechanism of funds flow. There is, however, a new phenomenon of recognizing the importance of non-state actors in programme planning, implementation and financial management. In addition, there

1. INTRODUCTION: MAKING SWAPS WORK FOR THE POOR

are emerging private-public partnerships in programme management. These include the trust model and the stakeholder association for consultation, advisory and networking, such as the ACF in Zambia.

There is also improved accountability through one sector-wide budget that is transparent and accessible to all, but this is difficult to maintain partly due to donor demands. We see an emphasis on ownership and its associated efforts of capacity building. However, such support is often difficult because of sustainability problems and donor control. Consequently there are challenges of donor harmonisation, sector management and financial issues that remain. Donors' requirements to trace funds can lead to complex accounting systems with no relation to the existing capacity of implementers, especially at lower levels. This 'flag problem' should not necessitate complex financial management processes; instead, it can be addressed through simple methods such as limiting the number of donors that can support a programme or a sub-programme, pooling donors funds at sub-programme levels and promoting donor-through-donor financing.

Programme alignment, while important, remains surprisingly poor between and within different sector programmes and sub-programmes. While PRSPs tend to mention sector programmes as the 'pillars' of implementation, few if any sector programmes refer to 'their' overarching PRSP. In addition, the PRSP and its predecessors tend to be ignored, e.g. Mozambique, Ghana and Tanzania.

With respect to stakeholder alignment, SWAPs have brought increased awareness regarding the different roles of stakeholders. However, actual implementation of the policy along complementary responsibilities remains an area of conflict long after policies have been formulated and accepted. Nevertheless, stakeholder consultation has intensified and possibly become better structured under the recent PRSPs planning processes.

Whether centrally planned programs reach the decentralised levels is a function of who does most of the planning. When the planning is dominated by a line ministry, then such programmes tend not to reach the decentralized levels. However, the same is not true when a strong ministry of finance and planning does actually help the process of pro-poor budgeting.

It is also worth noting that there are interesting trends among donors, from implementation to facilitation and away from the field to the national level. This needs to be reversed. Donors should instead offer advice and be facilitators at every level; otherwise they risk missing the target group.

Lastly, the role of non-state actors is clearer in productive sectors (e.g. agriculture, infrastructure) than in social sectors (e.g. health and education). But even in sectors such as agriculture, there is still an historical syndrome of mutual mistrust. Inadequate legal frameworks continue to be a stumbling block. Thus there is need to amend some legislation to pave the way to non-state participation. However, changing the legal framework can be too lengthy and bureaucratic. This is worsened by the reluctance and hesitance among decision makers in government to actually formally hand over responsibilities/powers to non-state actors. Where formal enabling legislation is not in place, we need to use innovative interim solutions such as public/private partnerships through Memorandums of Understanding, statement of intent and agreed code of practice. By and large, a 'half-way house' between the public and the private sectors is less threatening to the government, whilst acceptable to donors as an alternative mechanism. [For his presentation, see Annex D-7.]

Plenary discussions

Session 1: Introduction

Presentations 1.1 Making SWApS work for the poor: a donor's perspective; and 1.2 Making SWApS work for the poor: The view from the ground

Harmonisation of donor proceedings has two important components:

- Harmonisation of procedures: financial management, accountability, M&E, reporting, etc.
 - It is necessary and important to reduce the transaction costs of aid.
 - Efforts by donors and partner countries exist.
 - SWApS can be appropriate instruments to bring this process forward.
- Harmonisation of policies and approaches:
 - Only partly possible and desirable.
 - Donors have different experiences, ideas and perceptions; in the interest of development, we shouldn't dilute this diversity but offer different options.
 - Our fast changing environments and policy contexts need quick and adequate responses, which can only be given if there is no blueprint policy (see the diversity of 'action and reaction' within policy frameworks in Europe).
 - Projects properly embedded in existing national policy frameworks can still be an appropriate form of supporting change processes.

Accountability

- There exist different types of accountability (financial, technical and political).
- Each of these forms has different 'addressees' or groups of people to whom accountability is owed. Partner countries have to be accountable to the ultimate beneficiaries as well as to their financiers. Similarly, donor countries have to be accountable to their taxpayers, as well as to the partners in developing countries (in our case, especially the poor).
- Related to these different forms are different procedures and mechanisms of accountability.
- Capacity constraints related to accountability exist and are recognized.
- Although these constraints occur at national level, they are just as prevalent at lower, closer-to-implementation levels.
- This makes a case for continued TC (or TA) at implementation (or grassroots) levels and provides some justification for continued support in the form of projects (as a complement to programme based support).

Equal partnerships between partner countries and donors

- There is a (justified) fear of the 'dominant donor'. An example is PRSPs, which are a clear pre-condition to qualifying for debt-relief as well as for receiving development loans (WB and EU).
- Some donors advocate a simple dropping of money in a basket; at the other end of the spectrum are donors who follow a dominant dictation of conditionalities.
- The German donor feels itself to be in the middle, preferring a process of negotiation where both partners bring forward their perceptions (e.g. South Africa). Thus, the German side offers different forms of cooperation, i.e. technical as well as financial cooperation.
- The question: what kind of a partnership is wanted: how strong should the partner country be?
- Relationship between donor and partner countries is not in danger: the German donor is working towards long-term commitments and intensified relations between advisors and their counterparts in partner countries.

Dialogue between different stakeholders or actors within partner countries

- Should the partner government be in the driver's seat? Not entirely. There is a need for cooperation and dialogue between different actors.

1. INTRODUCTION: MAKING SWAPS WORK FOR THE POOR

- A strong partner to donors is one who allows different opinions among stakeholders and facilitates dialogue between them.
- Participation of civil society is needed, but they are not always well organized.
- Conflicting interests and views are not something to be avoided, but something to benefit from – as long as different actors are given the opportunity to express them.

National versus local (or implementation) level

- The change from implementation-oriented to policy-oriented support has led to donor TA being pulled out from the field and (partly) been relocated at national level (as policy advisors).
- However, support is needed ‘where the action is’, e.g. at the levels where the policy is implemented.
- Often well-articulated policies exist, but the real challenge lies in how to put them into practice.
- In fact, the complement of PBAs has contributed to creating tension between actors at local levels, in particular between sector (or line) ministry offices and those of local government.
- Advisors are needed at that local level to help resolve some of these tensions and promote a dialogue.

2. Top down or bottom up?

Chaired by Peter Ngobese, Ministry of Agriculture, South Africa

2.1 Bottom-up district planning: Linking local level needs to national programmes in Kenya

Kenda Mwenja, Kilifi District Development Project, Kenya

The Kilifi District Planning Concept

Kilifi District Development Programme is a multi-sectoral project based in Kilifi District, Kenya, financed and supported by the Governments of Germany and Kenya. The project supports community driven development by mobilising communities to vision and design plans as well as to implement them while being supported by funds and capacity building services. Since its inception in 1997, KDDP has mobilised more than a hundred villages and assisted in the implementation of more than 650 community projects (of which 250 reached completion and more than 400 are still in various stages). The project endeavours to link the local programmes to national programmes by contributing to the improvement of policies that ultimately shall institutionalise community driven development.

The bottom-up district planning concept was jointly developed by KDDP and Ministry of Planning in 2000 to meet the mutual desire of both the project (KDDP) to link better the local plans (Community Action Plans) to National plans and the Ministry’s interest to test a bottom-up planning process. This was necessary, considering that the former plans (of previous years) were inappropriate to reflect needs of communities.

However, although this concept was partially adopted by the ministry in the 2001 district / national planning round, at the moment it remains a concept that is not (yet) accepted or tested on a larger scale.

In Kenya some of the existing traditional planning processes for rural development include the preparation of National and District Development Plans. The PRSP consultative process, which was a one-time event, was done in 2000 in all Districts of Kenya. After the finalization of the PRSP, a new budgetary process, the Medium Term Framework MTEF, was introduced. It, however, did not appropriately address the grassroots needs if compared with what emerged from the PRSP consultations. Recently, after the change of government after elections, a new paper (the Economic Recovery Strategy Paper, a merger of PRSP and party Manifesto) has been developed, which is still being discussed.

2. TOP DOWN OR BOTTOM UP?

The Bottom-up Planning Concept

The bottom-up planning process foresees an institutionalised process, which stimulates consultations, leading to general consensus at village, zone and the district levels on the overall long-term development priorities. From the long-term priorities, short and medium development priorities are then derived.

Once the district plan has been developed, it forms the basis for M&E and information management. The plan is also used to inform the national level / district authorities about local priorities and funding requirements.

The key features of bottom-up district planning are that it must be participatory and inclusive, with the entry being at the lowest cohesive development unit (village / sublocation). The plan is based on comprehensive situation analysis and long-term visions at the various levels. The plan is strategic and area specific.

The expected effects of this planning are that communities have a large say in determining their development priorities, real participation takes place, development is owned by the people, political empowerment (democratisation) is secured, and there is increased fiscal transparency and accountability.

Conditions for Implementing the Bottom-up:

- Strong political commitment to ensure decision making process actually shifts from the top (national level) to the bottom (district and communities) alongside a well-designed decentralisation approach.
- Secured minimum funding of community / zonal / district projects, e.g. through unconditional block funds. Plans made with unsecured anticipated budgets raise unnecessary expectations.
- Consultations at all levels (community, zone, district) and feed-back loops to promote ownership and confidence in the planning process.

[His complete presentation can be found in Annex E-1.]

2.2 Integrating local priorities into national policy frameworks in South Africa

Marc Feldman, Consultant, Development Works, South Africa

The presentation proceeds from the new concepts and legislation guiding South Africa's new system of government for development and in particular local government municipalities. The allocation of powers and functions and the relevant planning instruments are critiqued in the light of the drive in policy for greater decentralisation. This is then assessed against the financial mechanisms and the distribution of nationally generated revenue across the three spheres of government to consider how far South Africa has moved in meeting the decentralisation drive.

To deepen the understanding of how the integration of local priorities into national policy frameworks occurs, he discussed the special programmes created to address the crisis in rural and urban areas, the role of various spatial instruments and the institutional arrangements established. The approach to aligning the planning, budgeting and implementation between the spheres and sectors of government is also discussed, to demonstrate the challenge faced at a local level within the limited and uneven state of decentralisation in SA

Finally an assessment of some key observations affecting the integration of local and national priorities and the emerging results are discussed. The current situation as presented, is then juxtaposed against the relevant features being considered in a new draft bill on intergovernmental relations to outline the possible future scenario for integrating local and national priorities that may emerge over time. [His complete presentation can be found in Annex E-2.]

2.3 Planning the PRSP from below:

The **Ugandan** Poverty Participatory Assessment

Daisy Owomugasho, Makerere University, Uganda

Although Uganda has experienced a steady macro-economic growth in the last decade, it remains one of the world's poorest countries. As such, poverty eradication remains a fundamental objective of Uganda's development strategy for the next two decades and the Government is determined to reduce the proportion of the population living in absolute poverty to 10% and in relative poverty to 30% by the year 2017.

Although Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers have recently become a common feature in development assistance, Uganda's process started much earlier, following a period of relatively high growth with correspondingly high levels of poverty and poor Human Development Indicators. This led to the design of the Poverty Eradication Action Plan in 1997, which was revised after the 1st PPA in 2000 to constitute Uganda's PRSP. It is to be revised after every 3-5 years.

The Participatory Poverty Assessment (PPA) Project aimed at bringing the voices and perspectives of the poor into formulation, planning and implementation as well as strengthening and complementing quantitative poverty monitoring. Two phases of the PPA have been undertaken so far, covering a total of 21 districts out of 56.

The UPPAP findings and recommendations have been widely disseminated and utilised at sub-county, district and national levels in different areas. Key areas include better understanding of poverty and its multidimensional nature, inclusion of poor people's views in policy formulation and implementation and a shift in public expenditure towards social sectors and infrastructure. This has led to reduced poverty levels in some sectors / groups of the population, although it has increased for others. A Poverty Monitoring Unit has been constituted responsible for measuring and developing poverty indicators among others. Some challenges remain in terms of, for example, linking macro policy to micro policy, providing safety nets during adjustment and reforms, and reviewing particular regulations. Another challenge identified was in the partnership process, where different partners had different and often conflicting agendas – an area where Uganda would wish to learn from other implementers.

Notwithstanding, the UPPAP remains an important tool in identifying poor people's focus areas, to feed them into the PRSP in order to realise the poverty reduction objective. Planning for the 3rd Phase is also underway. [Her complete presentation can be found in Annex E-3.]

Working groups

WG 2.1 Bottom-up district planning in Kenya (Kwenda)

Discussion Starter: Kofi Atta-Agyepong, Ghana
Rapporteur & write-up: Heike Hoeffler, Kenya

What messages have you heard?

- Communities are able to plan in a participatory manner – if adequately facilitated and encouraged.
- To start on the lowest level is important for poverty reduction.
- Methods and approaches for participatory planning are available and tested but they are complex, time consuming and require many steps.

What experiences can you add?

- Controversy: What is the appropriate lowest level for intervention – household or community? What is the respective adequate level for development committees?

2. TOP DOWN OR BOTTOM UP?

- Is it very important to take decentral governmental staff of line ministries into account – where do they come into play with district development plans? Link them up!
- For such bottom up processes, political will is vital, as well as a legal framework that enables such approaches.
- It is important to establish linkages between levels (coordinating committees).

What lessons have you learnt for your work?

- There is need for anti-poverty outputs at each level, from the household to the district.
- There are pre-conditions to develop such approaches.
- Local plan to be harmonized with national plan.
- Bottom up planning useful and serves purpose when linked to national budget.
- Controversy: Bottom up planning are expensive – is it cost-efficient?

Challenges

- How do local plans match national resource flows – who counterchecks needs and resources available? Who ensures the resources?
- The role of a national “meso-level” (such as the provincial level) remains unclear. Could the Provinces act as “moderators” between the local and the national level?
- The missing link: From community priority to sector policy.

WG 2.2 Integrating local priorities into national policy frameworks in South Africa (Feldman)

Discussion Starter: *Anthony Mwanaumo, Zambia*
Rapporteur: *Jonathan Arnold, Ghana*

What messages have you heard?

- Not top down or bottom up, but the keys are:
- Allocate responsibility & resources to what level?
- Manage how the levels interact with each other. When there are overlapping competences, integration becomes complex. There’s a lack of coherent structure for integrating local voices and views into plans.
- Concentrating resources for optimal impact.
- There is no action without money at various levels.
- Local priorities are driven by whoever has the funding.
- Difficulty of mobilizing resources of institutionalising mechanisms, especially long term, for organizing political decision taking.
- Not only institutionalising the mechanisms, but making them binding.
- The answer lies in the inter-governmental relations bill.
- Political will is necessary.

What experiences can you add?

- Public debate is fundamental to political decision-making.
- National questions have to be calculated into the discussion. Some issues are pan-territorial.
- Worldwide experience is that there will always be struggle, particularly in federal states.
- Stable institutions will create mechanisms to resolve these issues.
- A shared distribution of powers requires shared revenue control.
- One level of government cannot commit the funds of another.
- Overlapping decision-making: all levels are at the same level, but without the same power. One level can easily overstep its bounds.
- Simplified systems for local government management: transparent, simple, effective.
- In Namibia, systems exist and function well. But poverty, subsistence agriculture and unemployment remain.

2. TOP DOWN OR BOTTOM UP?

- We still need to question whether local voices are being heard, especially from those with low education and literacy.
- People often afraid of honest talk to government officials.

What lessons have you learnt for your work?

- Need clear definitions of roles & responsibilities. What about unfounded roles & responsibilities?
- Decentralisation is required. Decentralisation needs to be accompanied by capacity building. This includes building capacity of local people to interact with higher levels: political, technical financial. A broader perspective of capacity building is needed.
- Even responses to crises need to consider participatory local processes.
- Democracy must have built-in checks and balances.

WG 2.3 Poverty Participatory Assessment in Uganda (Owomugasho)

Discussion Starter: Ian Kumwenda, Malawi

Rapporteur: Agayo Stanley Ogambi, Kenya

Messages heard

- The case of Uganda shows that “it works”. PRSP works to reduce poverty. The bottom-up approach works. Development can also originate from lower levels (bottom up).
- The bottom up approach:
 - leads to enhanced understanding and ownership, thus furthering and ensuring possible successful undertaking,
 - leads to the creation of own indicators/measures,
 - creates tension between Government, Donor and Community, especially if the roles and responsibilities are not well defined,
 - creates expectations which, if not met, lead to frustrations and disillusion,
 - causes shifts in direction of power, i.e. management & administration,
 - requires political will for the approach to be successful.
- About poverty:
 - Involvement of local communities is vital in addressing poverty.
 - Poverty assessment is important in the design and implementation of the PRSP.
 - There are divergent states and definitions of poverty (different understandings of poverty) from one community to another.

Experiences and lessons learnt

- It is important to focus on the needs. There are varied needs/interest/priorities at various levels, i.e. at community level, district/provincial level, government and donor levels.
- Bottom up approach:
 - enhances ownership/ participation /understanding, leading to acceptance of programmes and involvement in the activities,
 - creates anxiety and raises expectations that all known problems will be solved,
 - exerts pressure on Government and donors,
 - leads to budgetary constraints (more demands on limited resources).
- The capacity of the community to implement the bottom up approach is limited,
- ...it exists in the planning, but in a number of instances this reverts to ‘top down’ in the implementation, financial administration and management.
- It is important for all the stakeholders (Community, Government and Donor) to play complimentary roles and not competitive roles.
- At the community level:
 - there is often limited capacity to comprehend complex and new ideologies that may be important to them,
 - involving the community in prioritising and implementation eases frustration.
- PRSP:
 - is a policy document that requires action programmes/activities,

2. TOP DOWN OR BOTTOM UP?

- was a conditionality (World Bank) for debt relief in a number of countries,
 - requires defined supportive structures for its successful implementation,
 - in successful undertakings, the implementation is discharged by technical persons,
 - requires thorough analysis of impacts of PRSP. In addition, it is important to institute safety nets for any eventualities,
 - calls for gradual implementation to capture and include all sectors' needs.
- As structures, World Bank documents and PRSP were found not to be flexible. For successful implementation, PRSP need to be flexible (incorporate local situation, challenges and difficulties) for it to be applicable: "Think globally, act locally".

Further input / Queries from the floor:

- Top-Down, Bottom-Up: it depends on where you are standing.
- Political will?
- Harmonisation of local and national plans: What kind of governance?
- There are local issues which do not require national resources.
- Only those issues that cannot be decided on local level go to national level.
- Know what poverty means to you, so that you can develop interventions to combat it.

Plenary discussions

Session 2: Top down or bottom up?

Presentations 2.1 Bottom-up district planning in Kenya; 2.2. Integrating local priorities in national frameworks in South Africa; and 2.3 Planning the PRSP from below in Uganda

Bottom up or top down?

- ...depends on where you are standing.

Harmonisation of various plans

- Naturally, harmonisation within one policy framework is important.
- But, the term *harmonisation* has to be qualified and understood.
- Roles and responsibilities are different at different levels.
- According to the principle of subsidiarity, only those issues that cannot be dealt with at a lower level should be moved upward to a higher level.
- This means that the national and the local plan are two different things.
- But the national level (or central government) has to ensure that local plans and activities adhere to certain norms and standards ('the responsibility for quality control'), (e.g. in Germany, a lack of harmonisation on the quality of education led to unacceptable differences).

Understanding poverty

- The determinants of poverty are context and location specific.
- In one country (e.g. Uganda), lack of access to services may be a clear determinant of poverty.
- However, in other countries or other areas within countries, facilities may be there, but people are still regarded as poor (e.g. the Himba of Namibia have access to a school and clean water, own over 400 head of cattle and are still half-naked).
- Also, the perception of what constitutes poverty depends on people themselves; the Himba with 400 cattle does not regard himself as poor, but he does not send his children to school.
- The people at grassroots should identify (1) what is poverty and (2) who is poor (both in).
- It is then up to the national government to ensure that these data are aggregated and that clear determinants and indicators are identified.
- These should be the basis of the Poverty Reduction Strategies.
- However, these poverty assessments have to continue during program implementation.

Poverty and participation: Implementation at decentralised levels

3. Getting local actors to cooperate in the fight against poverty

Chaired by Collins Nkatiko, Ministry of Agriculture, Zambia

3.1 Addressing rural poverty in sub-Saharan Africa: Institutional and organisational opportunities

Uwe Otzen, Institute for Development Studies, Germany

Development of local government – a key to poverty reduction in rural Africa

In sub-Saharan Africa some 80% of the poor live in rural areas and derive most of their incomes, whether in kind or in cash, from agriculture. Economic development that is based on agriculture and benefits the mass of the population and also the building of development-oriented local government structures providing a wide range of services are therefore essential if poverty is to be reduced.

Both aspects have been repeatedly overlooked because of erroneous assessments of the employment, economic linkage and value-added potential of peasant farming and because of the disdain in which the development-promoting significance of rural communities is held. Since the 1980s international development cooperation has, moreover, increasingly shifted its emphasis in support to physical and social infrastructure and to the service sectors, principally toward the industrial and urban sphere.

At the same time, there has been a growing realization that, if rural and agricultural development is to proceed sustainably and have the effect of reducing poverty, this will become a complex national cross-section task that can no longer be performed with conventional approaches to development based on project aid. This is equally true of all globally designed action programmes that influence sustainable agricultural and rural development, such as the implementation of Agenda 21, the plan of action to implement the Desertification Convention, the World Food Summit Plan of Action and the implementation of the poverty reduction strategies to achieve the Millennium Development Goals.

From these facts, omissions and findings it must be concluded that poverty reduction in all Africa's agricultural countries should be achieved primarily through agriculturally based development, in which local government must play a role in promoting the economy, coordinating the various activities and bridging the service gap. This can be achieved only by means of gradual political, institutional and fiscal decentralisation.

As the rural communities will have to bear the main administrative burden of poverty-reducing development in the future, they must be sustainably strengthened with national and international support. A beneficial agricultural policy environment, realignment of international development

3. GETTING LOCAL ACTORS TO COOPERATE

cooperation and jointly financed and democratically controlled local government development funds are prerequisites for broad-based, poverty-oriented rural development.

[The complete paper plus an overhead chart can be found in Annex F-1.]

3.2 The role of local government in addressing rural poverty: The case of **Uganda**

Martin Oloo, Ministry of Local Government, Uganda

The Government of Uganda's development strategy is to create a modern, integrated and self-sustaining economy, which is export oriented and private sector led. However, key economic indicators show that the country is still far from achieving this development objective. The Medium Term development strategy of Government has therefore been to reduce poverty in line with the United Nations Millennium Development Goal (MDG). Major Government reforms over the years have been geared towards addressing poverty at household level. These development strategies are being implemented under a decentralized policy framework where the Local Governments (LGs) have a very important role to play in poverty reduction. The LGDP, PMA, NAADS, and the Deregulation Project, the focus of this article, are some of the major reforms initiated by the Uganda Government and are being implemented by LGs for poverty reduction. Despite these initiatives and policy commitment, the LGs are facing a number of challenges to fulfil their decentralized service delivery mandates and contribute to poverty reduction. Although central government is aware about some of the challenges and efforts are being made to address them, the country seems still to have a long way to go in eradicating poverty from the majority of its masses.

[See Annex F-2 for his talk, both as a paper and in PowerPoint form.]

3.3 Participation and district level planning in **Ghana**

Kofi Atta-Agyepong, Ministry of Agriculture, and Frank Obeng Dapaah, Regional Coordinating Council, Ghana

Agricultural Sector Development Planning: Experiences at the Regional and District Levels of Brong Ahafo Region of Ghana with GTZ support – Linking National Policies to Local Initiatives

Development initiatives and processes for poverty reduction and growth tend to be driven by policies and programmes aimed at exploring the condition, potentials and relationships necessary for people to work together for a common goal within specific timeframes.

Often times, these “drivers” are not structured systematically for policy / programme coherence, coordinated planning and priority setting. There is also the challenge of linking national policies to local initiatives to ensure consistency, harmony and fostering of common vision for national development. This linkage process is effective on the assumption that there is a national programme that defines intervention areas at the national, regional, district and community levels in a collaborative manner. The effects of an uncoordinated policy / programme environment are isolated decision making processes at same / different levels, scattered development initiatives and inefficient utilisation of resources.

Experiences in Ghana with GTZ support, in the agricultural sector, have shown that strategic planning is a powerful instrument for charting new road maps, during which new insights are gained and issues clarified to find the best alignment and fit between national policies and local priorities for poverty reduction and growth.

This paper attempts to demonstrate how strategic planning can be used to help sector departments (as the case of department of Food and Agriculture in the Brong Ahafo Region of Ghana) to define and develop its organisational mission, identify priority and focus areas for poverty reduction, make effective use of resources by maximising the use of existing opportunities, chart new communication

3. GETTING LOCAL ACTORS TO COOPERATE

patterns with stakeholders in the agricultural sector for better targeting and to overcome process overload.

The paper, however, admits that effective strategic planning requires a balance of technical skills, a high degree of flexibility on the part of facilitator and implementers to adapt to the changing circumstances and a genuine enthusiasm and commitment to bring out the best in people for pro-poor growth. This is huge challenge and shall continue to remain so.

[The full presentation can be found in Annex F-3.]

Working groups

WG 3.1 Addressing rural poverty (Otzen)

Discussion Starter: Daisy Omomugasho, Uganda
Rapporteur: Fewdays Yenga, Zambia

What messages have you heard?

- Decentralisation depends on size, area and economic performance.
- Poverty reduction should be multi-sectoral, multi-level.
- There must be clear roles and responsibilities for each level.
- Fund flow determines and influences organizational setting.
- Need to create stronger local governments, e.g. capacity.
- Need to empower communities with capacity to prioritise needs, to negotiate, etc.

What experiences can you add?

- Effective Local Government systems may reduce process overload.
- Access to assets is critical to pro-poor growth.
- Collaboration between local governments could help share experiences in pro-poor struggle strategies.

What lessons have you learnt for your work?

- Development organs at all levels should be supported.
- Be bold, learn from mistakes and go forward (but the setting has to be right).
- There is need to transfer capacity from the centre to local areas.
- Create lean central governments to maintain level payroll.
- Checks and balances necessary.
- Need for development budget programmes managed by local governments.

Open issues and questions

- The link between governance, Local Government and pro-poor growth is too fast.
- Private sector involvement in poverty reduction is necessary.
- One way communities can participate is by empowerment through local parliaments.

3. GETTING LOCAL ACTORS TO COOPERATE

WG 3.2 Local government in addressing rural poverty in **Uganda** (Olaa)

Discussion Starter: Lena Otoo, Ghana

Rapporteur: Emmanuel Doricles Eledi, Ghana

What messages have you heard?

- Decentralisation so far only functions through projects.
- There was a forum for stakeholders to decide their destiny on service delivery.
- Clear structure to enable Local Government to play its role in Poverty Reduction Programme.
- Accept to learn from mistakes; there is no perfect state. Go the process way!
- Increased investment in decentralisation will help to reduce process overload.
- Institutionalisation of a Decentralisation Policy/Process is possible.
- Beware of national sector institutions and financial autonomy.
- Staff at district level are direct employees of district councils.
- Broad-based development, need for decentralisation, strong role for agriculture, integration and cooperation are vital.
- Accountability of service providers to beneficiaries.
- Decentralisation success due to bottom-up approach.
- Capacity building should include Local Government and private sector for success.
- Local Government restructuring was necessary before new roles.

What experiences can you add?

- Capacity building.
- Develop governmental capacity sector-wide but in the private sector as well.
- Decentralisation requires capacity support.
- Limited capacity and vision inhibit successful undertaking of decentralised service delivery.
- Resources (finance & budget).
- Budget support & project support are not necessarily mutually exclusive, but an optimum mix should aim at reducing transaction costs and process overload.
- Decentralisation of power & authority must go together with adequate finances.
- Deconcentrated budgets and offices are accountable to the top, not the bottom.
- Strong central government is necessary to distribute resources to Local Governments equitably.
- Legal issues (rules, regulations).
- There is need for a legal framework before you commence.
- District tender committees are tampered with by elected representatives.
- Donor Experiences: CIDA Ghana: MDBs (macro), SWAp (sector), DWAP (local). All receive budget support.
- Overcoming starting inertia: Unless you experiment on new ideas, you never start!
- Conflicts and their resolutions:
 - Conflicts between democratically elected representatives and traditional leaders in leading lower-level initiatives.
 - Tension between local government and sectors is based on resource allocation.
 - Resistance by central government to give up authority constrains decentralisation.
- Commitment by stakeholders.
- There was political goodwill and commitment on decentralisation and to tackle PRSP through Local Government.
- Commitment by all stakeholders is critical to bring all concerned on board.

3. GETTING LOCAL ACTORS TO COOPERATE

- Countries with democracies have basic structures already.
- Carrying out development agendas more completely will reduce the confusion and overload.

What lessons have you learnt for your work?

- Need for a legal framework.
- There is no one definition of poverty.
- Need to enshrine the policy shift in the constitution and acts of parliament. Institutions are legalised. Constitution recognises local structures.
- Incentives may be provided to Local Governments who adhere to rules, objectives and set goals.
- Scaling up.
- Prerequisites: successful donor coordination, strong country ownership, clear structures.
- Establishing of partnership principles accommodating all funding modalities (project/programme).
- Decentralisation must progress through many phases to become effective and efficient.
- Aim at incremental achievements.
- Despite widespread consultations, conflicts of interests may still arise during implementation on bottom-up / decentralisation process.
- Support for Decentralisation.
- Decentralisation is worth the struggle.
- A strong Local Government can handle PRSP's programmes more effectively.
- Power (in all forms) at the local governmental level, perhaps through adult suffrage, can mitigate re-centralisation.
- Government has to make bold decisions to move decentralised development forward.
- Political will is crucial for decentralisation to be successful.

Open issues and questions

- Linkages between stakeholders.
- How are traditional authorities integrated into local government?
- Are development partners responding adequately?
- The sector line ministries are rigid – resisting change! How do you overcome this?
- What is the role of development partners?
- Is structural adjustment coming back?
- Does decentralisation work in all political arrangements: one party versus multiparty?
- How were civil district staff in the districts integrated in the council's establishments?
- Local Government's Revenue Generation.
- Clear strategies for resource mobilisation with respect to councils that have a poor resource base.
- How can Local Government revenue be increased?
- Capacity Building.
- With varying competences at each level, what capacity building programmes are needed?
- Private sector weak or absent! How to develop the private sector?
- Local Government and sanctions: Who suffers when a Local Government is sanctioned?
- What is the future of Local Government?
- What does the final state of decentralisation look like?
- Does decentralisation enhance centralisation?
- Will decentralisation lead to a creation of independent "states" in the future?

3. GETTING LOCAL ACTORS TO COOPERATE

BOTTOM LINE of Messages heard:

- Although decentralisation is a complex and expensive process, it can reduce transaction costs and process overload with adequate investment.
- It is essential however that clear structures are outlined, accountability to beneficiaries ensured and capacity building done for both Local Government and private sector.

WG 3.3 Participation and district level planning in Ghana (Atta-Agyepong & Dappah)

Discussion Starter: *Danso Agyemang, South Africa*
Rapporteur: *Daniel Ohemeng-Boateng, Ghana*

What messages have you heard?

- Planning process creates demand in other areas/regions.
- Be conscious of overload.
- Good planning that is all-inclusive is important.
- Sub-strategies (e.g. fiscal decentralisation, Local Government revenue enhancement, etc.) are important.

What experiences can you add?

- A good plan is not enough. Follow-up needs to be institutionalised!
- Restructuring of line-ministries to implement the decentralisation plan meets resistance.
- Basket funding reduces process overload.
- Requires a Memorandum of Understanding with the individual donors and donor coordination for donor reports.
- For donor reports: government working group, consultative meetings, external auditing.
- Transparency is important.
- Conflict management mechanisms are necessary at all levels.

What lessons have you learnt for your work?

- Stakeholders to be included from the beginning and during the whole process!
- Direct funding of regions rather than through line-ministries.
- Budget funding and not project funding.
- Budget funding and project funding can be complementary.
- Expenditure tracking at implementation level is important for some donors and institutions.

Open issues and questions

- Representation of stakeholders in the forum of dialogue.
- Institutionalising of process (strategy formulation).
- How are national indicators internalised at district/local level?
- Formulation of indicators: National indicators based on lower level indicators or the other way around?

Plenary discussions

Session 3: Getting local actors to cooperate in the fight against poverty

Presentations 3.1 Addressing rural poverty in sub-Saharan Africa: institutional and organisational opportunities; 3.2 The role of local government in addressing rural poverty, the case of Uganda; and 3.3 Participation and district level planning in Ghana

Real institutionalisation versus ‘islands of success’

- The Ugandan experience demonstrates that decentralisation policy can be institutionalised.
- However, attempts in other countries seem to be (1) localized and (2) heavily dependent on donor support (e.g. in Ghana and Zambia).
- The government of Uganda has shown what governments can achieve if they dare to make bold decisions.
- When the political will is lacking, then ‘islands of success’ are difficult to institutionalise. Uganda has a clear political will, but this is lacking in other countries.
- It took Uganda almost 11 years from the first formulation of the decentralisation policy to the endorsement of the Local Government Act.
- The private sector should do what it is best placed to do: Once the government moves out of areas better served by the private sector, its (limited) resources can be used more effectively to address ‘real or core’ public sector duties.
- Learning process: Mistakes should be seen as opportunities for improvement. Uganda decided to learn from mistakes and has followed its decentralisation policy consistently over many years.

Tension between local government and sector or line ministries

- There was a long consultation process between local government and sector ministries in Uganda prior to the Local Government Act; however at present sector ministries are trying to regain power they feel they lost; This threatens to undermine the ongoing decentralisation process.
- In other countries too, tensions between local government and sector (or line) ministries are rife.

Is there a blueprint?

- The figure that Uwe Otzen presented, he feels applies to all governments, be they in developing or developed countries as it gives an overview of all the elements that are needed.
- However, it cannot tell what the appropriate entry point is (for any given country) or the sequencing of the process (which steps to take first). Similarly, priorities will differ depending on the relative strength of actors (e.g. public, private) in a given country.
- In addition, we can only support a real decentralised system if we challenge the centre sufficiently: Just adding a parallel decentralized structure will only result in ‘process overload’.
- Under a decentralized system the central government has to be lean (in most countries this means it has to be restructured to slim down: Uganda’s Min of Local Gov went from over 1000 to less than 100 people at national level).

Avoiding process overload

- The complexities of financial management under a decentralized system are often a cause of ‘process overload’.
- Decentralisation processes are funded both by internal (government) funding and external (donor) funding. In order to reduce transaction costs and overcome process overload the following can help:
 - Under internal funding: A fund flow from national to district levels whereby the district has considerable autonomy over the use of these funds is preferred to the government funding individual projects (e.g. schools, water-wells in Uganda)
 - Under external funding: donors can put their money into the ‘basket’ (i.e. through the treasury at national level) for it to be channelled to the district directly. However, this can only work where there are decentralized structures in place and a clear political will to support them.
- Uganda demonstrates that a proper investment in decentralisation and getting tasks and responsibilities right is the best thing you can do to avoid process overload.

3. GETTING LOCAL ACTORS TO COOPERATE

Issues put forward after the Group Work

- Is the assumption true that a decentralized service delivery system contributes directly to poverty reduction?
- How to solve the problem of ‘the Flag’ in cases where donors put their money in a common basket which is not allocated to specific activities / regions?
- At which level is the basket??

4. Building bridges: Experiences with cross-sector cooperation

Chaired by Lena Otoo, Ministry of Agriculture, Ghana

4.1 Making cross-sector cooperation work at the provincial and district level: experiences from the Southern Province in **Zambia**

Collins Nkatiko, Provincial Agricultural Coordinator, and Fewdays Yenga, Provincial Local Government Officer

Experiences from the GTZ/GRZ projects ASSP & ddp

District Agricultural Committees (DAC) were established in 1996 to determine the agricultural destiny of their districts in consultation with MAFF and other key players in the sector. Their Terms of Reference (ToR) were revised in 1997 and included two main responsibilities: a) broad coordination of the Agricultural Sector Investment Programme and b) the Rural Investment Fund implementation.

The DAC suffered from political interference, lack of financial and capacity building support as well as lack of appreciation within the Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Fisheries (MAFF) and large parts of the donor community, as shown by the dissolution of the National Agricultural Steering Committee that formed an apex body for the DAC and the lack of support for formation of the Provincial Agricultural Committee (PAC). This and the fact that various other institutions, like the Agricultural Sub-Committee of the District Development Coordination Committee (DDCC) and the Stakeholder Forum, existed and competed on the same level undermined the vertical and horizontal institutional frame of the DAC.

The final ASIP evaluation cited among the successes the institutional reform and strengthening of the MAFF. The main weakness was that there was no positive impact on the livelihoods of the rural poor.

In order to enhance their participation in planning and implementation of development programmes it is proposed that the DAC's ToR, composition and responsibilities are broadened and their institutional frame is clarified. Furthermore, it is proposed to establish a vertical channel via the PAC to the Agricultural Consultative Forum (policy formulation) and a horizontal link through the DDCC as the Agricultural Sub-Committee to the district council (participation in local decision making). Their output on the district level will be formulation of a District Agricultural Development Strategy (DADS) and the coordination of its implementation. The DADS feeds into the District Development Poverty Reduction Strategy (DDPRS), which relates to the Poverty Reduction Strategy Programme (PRSP) through the Provincial DPRS (PDPRS). The Agricultural Commercialisation Programme and the Transitional National Development Programme are guiding documents for the DADS and DDPRS / PDPRS, respectively. The DDCC is the coordinating committee at district level, which links to the Provincial Development Coordination Committee at provincial level. It is proposed to revise the composition, authority and responsibility of all the committees in line with the national decentralisation policy.

4. BUILDING BRIDGES: CROSS-SECTOR COOPERATION

To ensure efficient cross-sectoral coordination at the district level, it is proposed that the DPU will be equipped with a full time professional whose main responsibilities are:

- A) Maintenance of all relevant district databases and;
- B) Provision of the secretariat of the DDCC itself and of its key sub-committees.

[This presentation can be found in Annex G-1.]

4.2 Integrated Development Planning: What we can learn from **South Africa**

Danso Agyemang, Integrated Development Planning, South Africa

The previous condition of Local Government in South Africa was described in terms of the lack of public participation, communication among sectors, racial integration, etc. Starting in 1993, the Local Government Transition began a process which ended in the establishment of a national consistent model of local government with provincial and district committees and councils.

Once this structure was in place and various aspects of the legal framework amended accordingly, *Integrated Development Planning* (IDP) could begin. IDP was variously described as a device to clarify the notion of developmental local government work, a mechanism for alignment and coordination between and within spheres of government, a participatory planning process aimed at integrating sector strategies, and as a municipal process through which a strategic development plan is prepared for a five-year period.

The IDP process has several distinct phases:

- *Analysis* of problems, people's priority needs, available and potential resources and the dynamics of development of a particular municipality.
- *Strategic debate*, a phase where there is broad inter-sectoral debate about the best ways and means of addressing priority issues (decisions about choices, time, cost, innovations), leading to such strategy elements as a vision statement, development objectives, development strategies, and initial projects identification with tentative financial estimates.
- *Projects* are then further specified, with inputs from task teams of professionals who provide proposals with tentative target figures, technical standards, locations, time horizon and cost estimates, indicators for development objectives, etc.
- *Integration* is the phase where project proposals are checked for compliance with agreed objectives and where a coordination and harmonization process in terms of timing and space occurs. Outputs include revised strategies for projects and five-year financial, capital investment and municipal action plans with a consolidated monitoring/performance management system. References to sector plans (e.g., for transport, water, environment, etc.) are included.
- *Approval* occurs when, following comments from the public and stakeholders, the plan is approved and adopted by Council.
- The end result of this process is an amended and approved Integrated Development Plan that has the support of all stakeholders, including the relevant agencies that are responsible for implementation.

A number of the achievements so far were described, as were many of the lessons learnt. Of particular interest for this Forum were the tools for overcoming 'process overload', which included the provision of a clearly defined policy and legislative framework, establishment of a nationally oriented resource-sharing support mechanism (PIMSS), the use of a website to disseminate information, conditional grants being clearly defined and gazetted, the structuring and institutionalization of participation, and targeted training with appropriate manuals for relevant stakeholders.

[This presentation can be found in Annex G-2.]

4.3 Community driven development: Lessons from **Kenya**

Walter Salzer, Kilifi District Development Project, Kenya

Community driven development comes into the focus of an increasing number of development organisations. This contribution summarizes the experience of the Kilifi District Development Programme, a district-based, multi-sectoral rural development programme situated at the North Coast of Kenya. It is supporting 100 communities to plan and manage their own development initiatives for poverty reduction. Experience shows that communities, even in the remotest rural areas, can organise themselves according to democratic principles and can greatly contribute to their own social and economic development. Traditional village leaders can be part of modern self-governing structures. To safeguard and expand on the achievements, the right of communities to govern themselves needs to be legally recognized. Especially in the initial stage, communities need to be technically and financially assisted in their aspirations to improve their living situation. To disseminate the positive experience, a huge national effort would be required alongside the establishment of decentralised technical and fiscal support systems. However, the national costs of introducing the concept can be almost balanced by the savings made through the lower-than-usual costs, if communal projects are not commissioned to government departments or commercial enterprises, but are implemented and thereafter managed by the communities themselves using their own resources and possibilities.

[See Annex G-3 for his contribution, both as a paper and in PowerPoint form.]

Working groups

WG 4.1 Cross-sector cooperation at the provincial and district level in **Zambia** (Nkatiko & Yenga)

Discussion Starter: Peter Ngobese, South Africa
Rapporteur: Angela Dannson, Ghana

Through no fault of the above persons, this report was not available for inclusion in the Proceedings.

WG 4.2 Integrated Development Planning in **South Africa** (Agyemang)

Discussion Starter: Uwe Otzen, Germany
Rapporteur: Rita Weidinger, Ghana

What experiences can you add?

- Phases for IDP are well developed. Is South Africa overdoing it? Too many documents.
- Legislative framework for community development well developed.
- Cooperative governance.
- Integrate area governments.
- Sectoral development.
- Intersectoral debate falls short in strategic planning.
- High participation from communities in IDP
- Municipality plans integrate IDPs.
- Sectoral priorities are checked against local needs.
- One planning process, many sectoral products.
- Alignment of budget planning for integrated development: not yet reached.
- Deconcentration and Decentralisation.
- Capacity building for local authorities (by NGOs).
- Process support unit at district level.

What lessons have you learnt for your work?

- There is no blueprint for decentralisation; need to adapt to country environment.
- Target specific planning, not all steps for everybody.
- Important to develop a legal framework for integrated development planning.
- Decentralisation is a national project.
- Key elements of strategy.
- Local government planning system.
- Financial decentralisation.
- Institutional authority.
- Consensus on planning and implementation of IDPs reached with some but not all partners.
- Decentralisation is an ever on-going process. It is the responsibility of all sectors (departments).
- Sector services shall be under local government.
- Need for “change agent” – facilitation /support.
- Subsidiarity principle: tasks at the appropriate level.

4. BUILDING BRIDGES: CROSS-SECTOR COOPERATION

Open issues and questions

- Budget procedures?
- How to integrate national programmes into municipal development plans and vice versa?
- Change of location of powers and functions.
- Who leads the decentralisation/development process?
- Capacity building for:
 - Planning
 - Budgeting
 - Implementation
- Decentralisation is one way to implement PRS. What other options are there?
- Risk of overloading local government with too many tasks.

WG 4.3 Community driven development in **Kenya** (Salzer)

Discussion Starter: Owens Chirambo, Malawi
Rapporteur: Jerry Tschoba, South Africa
Write-up: Gesa Wesseler, the Netherlands

What messages have you heard?

- Communities take charge of their own development.
- Intensive investment and facilitation needed for this system to work.
- Scaling up such an effort might be difficult in a highly centralized government system.
- Registration with a particular Ministry is the only way for communities to become a legal entity in Kenya, which is necessary for opening up bank accounts, etc.
- Project operates mainly through Government staff; only 3% of all staff is directly paid by GTZ.
- Only a few years ago, meetings had to be approved by chiefs and all types of people.
- Communities should be legalized and become part and parcel of the overall government structure. This would give them rights, but also obligations.
- Every village development committee has a constitution, which also specifies how often they need to be replaced.
- Contributions by communities are important.
- Community management of projects saves costs.

What experiences can you add?

- World Bank project in Zimbabwe – Ministry of Social Services received money that could be accessed by communities that came up with proposals. District development committee reviewed, Ministry issued the check straight to the community account. Worked very well. Poverty alleviation fund.
- Same thing in Malawi – Social development action fund, World Bank project.
- Same thing in Ghana, sponsored by DANIDA for land rehabilitation. Very high illiteracy rates make implementation difficult. Also, conflicts between different communities – one didn't burn their bush for more than 6 years, then another community came in and burnt their bush, almost leading to a tribal conflict.
- In Kenya, management through elders contributes to conflict resolution.
- Question of managing success – how to make success stories a learning example for others?
- Giving money for financing gaps is highly successful. (That is, when the project is already there and just some of the money is lacking?).
- Problem of sustainability. Interventions that charge user fees are generally more sustainable.
- Leadership at the local government level – in Zimbabwe, one district was successful because councillor was very supportive. In another district, the councillor was trying to destroy the project because he felt threatened by it. Thus, supportive local authorities are very important.

4. BUILDING BRIDGES: CROSS-SECTOR COOPERATION

- Social investment fund in Ghana was driven more from the top than from the bottom – had to disburse the money in a certain period of time, so did away with the participation element, therefore not very successful. Project was implemented from outside: no community involvement, no sustainability.
- If different stakeholders are involved, need to clearly identify roles and responsibilities.
- Participatory processes require time.

What lessons have you learnt for your work?

- Communities need to make a contribution.
- Poor communities that cannot make contributions might not be able to participate in the process.
- But unless you make communities contribute, they won't have any ownership and won't bother with the project.
- Even very poor communities can contribute, e.g. by providing labour and receiving less than the average wage rate, the difference then being the cash contribution.
- Contributing money gives communities the right to look into the books and find out how the money has been used.
- Need to strike a balance between facilitation costs and investment costs, especially when trying to scale up.
- Traditional authorities (elders) play a critical role in helping or hindering a project. Bring them on board!
- Need a forum in which matters are handled openly and transparently. Checks and balances need to be in place, e.g. public auditing.
- It's time consuming, but there are no shortcuts. Coaching over a long period of time is needed, because it's such a new process for most communities. But it pays – once they have mastered the processes, they can manage on their own. How else can you approach 15 million poor people in Kenya?

Open issues and questions

- How to scale up?
- What to do in situations with restrictive bureaucracies?
- What happens when the external support is discontinued? How sustainable is the approach?
- Are there inherent limitations to the concept of self-governing communities? Constraints that communities themselves cannot address? The KDDP makes a clear distinction between projects that can be done by one community, and projects that cannot be done by one community alone. In such cases, the communities federate, i.e., they create a new committee that takes care of this project (e.g., a secondary school). And then there are clear state responsibilities – the main road network, public health issues, etc. These are not included under KDDP.
- Who is providing teachers and ongoing support to the schools? In Kenya, it is the responsibility of the communities to build schools and equip them (incl. the books). Only the provision of teachers is responsibility of the government.
- Scaling up in Kenya – KDDP is trying to find funds from other sources to do that. Ministry of Planning is interested in replicating this approach. Recognition in the new constitution that communities take charge of their own destiny.
- Have other development agencies made the communities, which are now well organised, their entry point? Yes, at least in Ghana. Successful communities attract other donors.
- How high are illiteracy rates in these communities? Around 60%. But there are always some individuals in a community who are highly literate and who can help others.
- How high is corruption? Zero.
- What about auditing? Done at various levels, in the community, at the project level, and in Germany. Is it then still self-governing? There is an external eye looking at the whole thing. It's not only German money; GoK is now also giving money. That might lead to process overload, but it's still better than not getting the money.

Plenary discussions

Session 4: Building bridges: experiences with cross-sector cooperation

Presentations: 4.1 Making cross-sector cooperation work at the provincial and district level: experiences from the Southern Province in Zambia; 4.2 Integrated Development Planning: what we can learn from South Africa; and 4.3 Community driven development: lessons from Kenya

Community driven development

- It may be difficult to replicate such an approach. If that is true, should we support it?
- The Kenyan case is replicable in terms of costs, both from a financial perspective as well as in terms of staff. Even covering the whole country would only cost a fraction of the aid that Kenyan gets (300 mill. KSh for the next five years). As for staff, ministries tend to have more staff than there is work for them to do.
- The fund flow in Kenya went directly to the community (via a bank account) rather than through the national treasury (or a basket). Communities were trained in accounting practices in order to manage them.
- Traditional leaders are ex-officio members of community based committees and they have proven to be very valuable to the process.
- The entry point is an essential determinant to success: in a sparsely populated and remote area such as Kilifi, the number of households to be covered by a project has to be based on the size of the area where people can still manage to meet without having to walk too far (in this case 80 to 150 households per community is still feasible).
- What about the institutional linkages: PID was also introduced in Zambia where it was linked to Local Government. However, that appeared to be too weak an institutional link to guarantee sustainability, as it did not tally with the actual mandate of Local Government there.
- The impact on poverty of the projects supported under this approach has not been measured. This is a complex and costly process. Instead, data are collected on what projects are funded and where, how much they cost and who is using them.

Contrasting cases of decentralisation

- The three case studies presented offer an interesting insight in three different forms of how to bring local actors together in the fight against poverty. These countries are at various stages of decentralisation. This means that not only the entry point, but also the actors are different.
- In South Africa, the decentralisation concept and approach, as well as its required legal framework, are well thought through and prepared (e.g. the IDP document is binding to the actors involved in the approach). The problem here is to implement the approach at local level.
- In Zambia, they have gone through a learning process where they built on successes and learned from mistakes and are now getting closer to a working concept.
- The Kenyan approach is a true bottom-up approach. National level now has to think about it and can no longer ignore what is on the ground. The challenge here is to find ways to replicate the approach to cover more communities.

Issues put forward after the Group Work

- The difference between 'self-governing' and 'autonomous': self-governing communities still abide by the national (legal and policy) frameworks.
- Have we identified 'the bridges'? Bridges have been discussed in every presentation. They occur at different levels. They can consist of mechanisms to communicate between actors or of institutions that guarantee a free information flow.
- Appropriate legal frameworks are essential and, when legislation hinders development, then it needs to be reviewed and revised. This is a very common process in all countries and one that we should not shy away from.

External challenges:

The case of international trade

5. International Trade Agreements: Which ones are important and why?

5.1 Opportunities and limitations of linking International Trade Agreements to national programmes

Alexander Werth, International Centre for Trade and Sustainable Development, Geneva

WTO Trade Negotiations

Most African states are members of the World Trade Organisation (WTO), the successor of the former GATT and which is now the umbrella organisation for a broad set of international trade agreements covering the full spectrum of trade, including goods, services, intellectual property rights, and even elements of investment. The WTO is a very dynamic organisation creating a tough negotiating environment in which “you don't get what you deserve, you get what you negotiate.” WTO Members have entered into a new round of ambitious trade negotiations - the Doha Round - with new negotiating mandates given to Members on issues such as agriculture, essential generic medicines, textile tariffs, special & differential treatment (S&D) provisions for developing countries, and trade in services, to name a few. The ongoing process of successively liberalising international trade has both positive and negative implications for developing countries' struggle for pro-poor growth. On the one hand, enhanced market access and fairer trade rules help developing countries to better compete with stronger trading partners, and – also domestically – liberalisation can promote much needed restructuring. On the other hand, however, the reform process limits countries' spaces for trade policy, liberalisation without appropriate flanking measures tends to sideline the weak, and some new trade obligations even appear to be inherently against the developmental interests of the South. So as to minimise such negative effects of trade liberalisation at the domestic level, developing countries need to accurately assess past and future liberalisation in an integrated manner – taking into account economic, social and environmental aspects. In this exercise, all relevant stakeholders amongst policymakers, NGOs, business, etc, should be integrated.

To effectively build bridges between pro-poor policymaking and trade rule negotiating, the window of opportunity provided through the Doha round should not be missed. Therefore, African countries should proactively engage, to the extent possible, in the Geneva negotiations, and should take a comprehensive approach by not focussing on traditional areas of interest only. Moreover, it is critical to develop joint strategies as well as nation- and/or region-specific agendas on trade and sustainable development. In principle, there are two tracks to be pursued to arrive at pro-poor pro-development trade rules: first, to negotiate better market access and fairer trade for exports from African countries (demand-side policies); and second, to defend, reopen and create 'spaces for development' available to developing countries. Should this chance be missed, no new bridges between domestic pro-poor policymaking and global trade rules can be created for the next decade(s), but, instead, countries will

be subjected to the trade agenda of the other trading partners. In conclusion, as African states have very high stakes in the current WTO negotiations, African countries should come up with their individual trade-supported development strategies, and push them through effectively in the Doha trade round.

[For the complete presentation, see Annex H-1.]

5.2 A review of trade related issues in PRSPs and Agriculture SWAps for eight selected countries in Africa

Helmut Albert, GTZ, Germany

SWAps, PRSPs and Trade: The presentation began with some basic terminology:

- *Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs)* are important policy documents that provide the basis for a government's eligibility for lending and debt relief under the World Bank's HIPC-initiative.
- *Sector Wide Approaches (SWAps)* are a major focus of development efforts in Africa and can also serve as 'pillars' for the implementation of Poverty Reduction Strategies.
- *Trade* impacts so greatly upon growth, development and poverty that it cannot be ignored by PRSPs, SWAps or other development approaches.

Trade is a key link to poverty and should be a binding element between PRSPs and SWAps. But how are trade issues addressed in these documents – and how well are they dealt with? Little information about this was available and thus an analysis was undertaken of the extent to which trade-related aspects are contained in PRSPs and SWAps.

For this purpose, eight African countries, primarily LDCs, were selected for study (Benin, Burkina Faso, Ghana, Kenya, Malawi, Mozambique, Uganda, Zambia) on the basis of the availability of PRSP and agricultural SWAp documents for analysis. Of these eight countries, all had a PRSP (or Interim PRSP) document and seven had an agricultural SWAp document available.

For both SWAps and PRSPs, guiding questions for the analysis included whether the respective policy document included (a) an identifiable section on trade, (b) a discussion of trade options that was differentiated in terms of sector, gender, vulnerable groups, consumers versus producers, etc., and (c) discussion of trade-related factors such as supply-side constraints (e.g. input supply, credit, infrastructure, education, information), demand side constraints (e.g. market access, quality standards, certification), WTO rules and regulations, and a consideration of various levels (local, regional, national, international). For PRSPs only, the researchers also looked for (d) the relation of the section on trade to the poverty analysis, also in terms of non-income issues such as risk, service access and 'voice', (e) a description of the participation process and (f) conformity to the World Bank Sourcebook's chapter on trade.

Treatment of trade in PRSPs: Within the PRSP documents of eight countries, five had an identifiable trade section. The relation of this trade section to the poverty analysis was specified in terms of risk and in terms of access to services in three countries each. The focus was on export aspects, neglecting the role of imports. Trade options were discussed in all eight PRSPs, including sector-specific implications for some sectors. Fewer countries dealt with specific impacts on vulnerable groups (4 PRSPs), gender (5) or consumers versus producers (3). Some trade-related factors, such as supply-side constraints with focus on infrastructure, were discussed in all PRSPs. Factors that were less often mentioned included demand-side constraints (4 PRSPs) and WTO aspects (a superficial treatment was found in 3 PRSPs). The participation process was described in all PRSPs, only three of which were in specific terms.

Treatment of trade in SWAps: Trade was generally less adequately treated in SWAp documents than in PRSPs. Of the seven countries with SWAps, only two had an identifiable trade section in that document (like PRSPs, focussing on exports rather than imports). Trade options for specific target groups were discussed in four of the seven SWAps, including specification by gender (4 SWAps),

5. EXTERNAL CHALLENGES: INTERNATIONAL TRADE

impact on vulnerable groups (3), and producers versus consumers (3). Specific trade-related factors were discussed in five SWAp, including supply-side constraints with focus on infrastructure (4), demand-side constraints with focus on unfair trade practices (2), WHO aspects (2), and differentiation of levels (6 SWAp distinguished local and national levels, although not regional or international levels).

An overall summary by country was presented, in terms of overall adequacy of its PRSP and SWAp documents with respect to trade issues.

Assessment of the treatment of TRADE in national policy documents (very weak to excellent)

Country	PRSP	SWAp
Benin	-	-
Burkina Faso	--	---
Ghana	+	--
Kenya	+/-	---
Malawi	+	n.a.
Mozambique	+	+/-
Uganda	---	+
Zambia	+	+/-

Conclusions and recommendations: Based on the analysis of policy documents in these eight African countries, trade issues need to be addressed more adequately – especially in SWAp, but also in PRSPs. This includes doing a better job of:

- Linking the poverty analysis to trade issues, including also non-income issues (risk, services, voice).
- Doing impact studies beforehand (ex-ante analysis and impact assessment).
- Differentiating trade issues in terms of target groups, producers versus consumers, gender, vulnerable groups, etc.
- Improving consistency in a country's policy documents about trade issues (between PRSP and SWAp).
- Addressing better supply-side (especially information) and demand-side constraints (especially technical barriers of trade).
- Dealing with imports (not just export promotion).
- Addressing all levels of trade, not only local and national but also regional and international.
- Attending to the country-specific context, instead of applying a “one-size-fits-all” (blueprint) approach to trade.

The presentation concluded with the following guiding questions for the discussion in the plenary:

- Is the Integrated Framework and especially the Diagnostic Trade and Integration Study a suitable approach to better mainstream trade issues in PRSPs?
- What is the role of national governments and donors, respectively, to increase ownership of trade issues in developing countries?
- What kind of support is needed to adequately address trade issues in developing countries (e.g. technical assistance, reduction of subsidies and technical barriers of trade in developed countries, special and differentiated treatment for developing countries)?

[See Annex H-2 for his presentation.]

5.3 Trade Agreements under the European Union and how developing countries can take account of them

Jürgen Lovasz, Delegation of the European Union, South Africa

How can developing countries benefit from trade agreements? Benefits are very limited if these trade agreements are not part of an overall cooperation agreement. Trade Agreements between countries are therefore only one element within an overall Trade Related Sector Wide Approach that is aiming at enhancing economic growth and employment by increasing exports and imports and investments in the respective country. Moreover, Trade Agreements evolving into comprehensive Cooperation Agreements must cover both Developmental and Trade related aspects and also take into consideration the complexity of the political, economic, social and natural environment of the respective countries. The EU has declared that it is willing to take up the interests of the developing countries and the resulting challenge, both at the level of the WTO and the level of bilateral and other multilateral agreements as well. The approach chosen under the Cotonou Agreement between Development and the establishment of Economic Partnership Agreements is meant to lead into the right direction and will hopefully make a positive contribution towards the desired overall objective of assisting developing countries to reduce their poverty.

[For his presentation and also a text summary of major points, see Annex H-3.]

5.4 The importance of International Trade Agreements for **Kenya**

Agayo Ogambi, Trade Point Representative, Kenya

Poor economic growth, rising poverty, negative world trade trends, liberalisation, and globalisation forced Kenya to shift her economic orientation from inward looking, reliant upon import substitution, to an outward looking one with emphasis placed on export development.

As an antidote to pro poor economic growth, Kenya adopted an open and fairly outward development strategy in an attempt to seek out configurations that can help to improve the welfare of her people and the economy and has entered into multilateral and bilateral trade agreements aimed at enhancing her trade and export development.

Kenya thus became a signatory to the East Africa Community (EAC), COMESA (Common Market for Eastern Southern Africa), ACP - EU, and to the Inter Governmental Authority on Development (IGAD) agreement and has also ratified the WTO agreement.

Kenya, which has faithfully complied with its basic commitments on the trade agreements in the belief of freer trade, has also put in place several export promotion schemes including the EPZs, MUB, Export Promotion Programmes Office and the establishment of an Export Promotion Council. Kenya believes that improved market access could provide a powerful impetus to poverty reduction efforts especially if linked to domestic, regional and international strategies that truly provide opportunities to the poor and overcoming market barriers.

As a result of some of the agreements, markets for Kenyan exports have expanded over the years due to changing policy environment, chiefly regional integration and other initiatives providing market access to key trading blocks and markets. The full potential that may lead to poverty reduction, however, remains to be attained due to lack of market access and conditions in other areas.

Whether the international and bilateral trade agreements are beneficial, fair and transparent remains the centre of a contentious debate between the north and the southern states. There is an urgent need to re-define the objectives of the multilateral and bilateral trade agreements with an underlined socio-economic clause to take into account the differential and special needs of low income and resource poor developing countries.

Based on the views expressed above, this paper presents the importance of such trade agreements as the World Trade Organisation (WTO), African Caribbean & Pacific co-operation with the European

Union i.e. ACP-EU relations, and the regional integration agreements such as Common Markets for Eastern and Southern Africa (COMESA) and East African Community (EAC).

[See Annex H-4 for his contribution, both as a PowerPoint and in the form of a paper.]

5.5 The NEPAD initiative: A report from the Secretariat

Edwin Ijeoma, NEPAD Secretariat, South Africa

NEPAD Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Programme (CAADP) and Action Plan

The New Partnership for African Development (NEPAD) is a project of the Organisation of African Unity / African Union. Under NEPAD, African Heads of State and Government have adopted an overall vision of Africa's development, which states

“We agree on the overall vision of Africa's development: a prosperous continent free of conflict in which all our people can fulfil their potential and which participates effectively in the global economy on an equal footing”.

NEPAD seeks to complement other African initiatives and to use existing frameworks for action. It concentrates on priorities organised under two broad themes: (a) Peace, security, democracy and political governance and (b) Economic and corporate governance. Agriculture is viewed as the key sector for achieving economic advancement and poverty alleviation in Africa. However, all is not well in African agriculture, as evidenced by hunger, malnutrition, and the progressive growth in food imports in the last years, including food aid.

The NEPAD Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Programme (CAADP) was introduced along with its Action Plan, prepared in 2002 by FAO and NEPAD. The programme aims to guide member governments on how to help end the food crisis and revitalise African agriculture. Its main pillars are:

- Extending the area under sustainable land management and reliable water control systems.
- Improving rural infrastructure and market access including inputs and finance.
- Increasing food supply and reducing hunger.
- Agricultural research, technology dissemination and adoption.

In 2003 the CAADP Action Plan was finalised by the Regional Economic Communities and their development partners – FAO, WFP and IFAD DBSA, FARA, ISNAR, Millennium Hunger Task Force and the development banks – to address the food crisis and kick-start African Agriculture. The plan laid out the framework and process of NEPAD program/project implementation. This includes the development of criteria for selection of programs/project, the program approach mechanism and the timetable for the implementation. More specifically, as a head start, the document presents selected program/project profiles as NEPAD flagship projects, under the four pillars of CAADP, and defines a calendar for the implementation process of these flagship projects.

Criteria by which projects are selected were described. A total of 29 project profiles and project concepts have been prepared by COMESA, ECCAS, ECOWAS, IGAD, SADC and AMU, with technical assistance from FAO, ADB, IFAD and WFP. A summary of these projects and the amount of investments required was presented.

In conclusion, the current status of this very new initiative can be summarised as follows:

- The CAADP document has been published and a popular version is also available. Immediate action, which will include consultations with the African Farmers Association, the private sector and national governments, is being taken to get flagship projects off the ground.

5. EXTERNAL CHALLENGES: INTERNATIONAL TRADE

- As a matter of urgency, NEPAD is developing the Disaster Prevention and Emergency Response Food Crises Program that will strengthen government response to address food crises and increase food security whilst generating development. This programme will include a response to HIV/AIDS and food security.
- Specific projects that have already emerged from this programme include projects on school feeding with locally produced food, soil fertility, small scale water management and the up-scaling of key crops. This is being done in cooperation with the World Food Programme, The Hunger Task Force, and the Food and Agricultural Organisation and will be launched in countries to be identified.
- CAADP and its action plan will be marketed to African governments, the private sector and civil society .

[For the complete presentation, both in PowerPoint and as a more-detailed paper, see Annex H-5.]

Plenary discussions

Session 5 International trade agreements: which ones are important and why?

Presentations 5.1 Opportunities and limitations of linking International Trade Agreements to national programmes; 5.2 A review of trade related issues in PRSPs and Agriculture SWApS for eight selected countries in Africa; 5.3 Trade Agreements under the European Union and how developing countries can take account of them; 5.4 The importance of International Trade Agreements for Kenya

Raising awareness and strengthening negotiation skills

- If negotiating skills of developing countries (DC) are not developed, the strong ones will only get stronger and the weak will only get weaker. (See the WTO principle: ‘you don’t get what you deserve: you get what you negotiate’).
- Nevertheless, the ongoing trade negotiations (the Doha round) emphasize concerns of developing countries (agriculture, food aid). DC themselves feel that, for the first time, they have been taken into consideration and that the agenda has been adapted to reflect their needs.
- There are several institutions and organizations that support DC with respect to the strengthening of negotiation skills.
- For example: the ICTSD, which has several relevant publications (e.g. *Trade Negotiation in ACP countries*).
- In addition, CTA organises forums and symposiums in Europe and in developing countries and produces reference material (e.g. *Cotonou WTO: The challenge of ACP countries*). They also offer a platform on the Internet on the CTA website (agritrade).
- UN organizations that support LDCs in this are UNCTAD and ITC (International Trade Centre).
- Trade-related technical assistance by the donor partners in the form of projects and programmes.
- Funds for capacity development are catered for under the EU and various national programmes, as well as the SADC Regional Programme.
- Finally, there are quite a few concerned CSOs who assist with negotiation skills, not only in developing countries themselves but also in ‘the North’.
- However capacity cannot be built up overnight but needs years to develop.
- However, lack of negotiation power is not only a problem of limited capacity but also of limited financial and human resources: for example, the US and Japan send over 100 people to the WTO talks, while most developing countries can afford to send only a few.
- In fact, comparing the US, EU and ACP countries, we have a case of unequal partners trying to negotiate. Is there a way in which ACP countries can be helped by the public-at-large? Examples are the largely successful consumers’ boycott of ‘blood diamonds’, GMO-food, furs and unethical leather, etc. Is there a

5. EXTERNAL CHALLENGES: INTERNATIONAL TRADE

way in which we can raise awareness about the fact that agricultural subsidies in the EU and US are hurting producers in developing countries?

The role of the EU: Economic Partnership Agreements

- Special support measures are offered by the EU in relation to the ongoing negotiations on agricultural trade issues.
- These include EPAs (or Economic Partnership Agreements). However, for countries to gain full benefit from these, there has to be a certain amount of capacity and a regional market.
- Capacity building and the development of a regional market take time but are very important first steps.
- The fact that the EU supports South Africa with a number of programmes doesn't mean that other countries are neglected. In fact, there is an EU support programme for every country, as well as available financial assistance. However, when national programmes such as the PRSPs do not address trade issues, then how can the trade support under the EU 'buy into' these programmes? The EU can provide budgetary support, provided that countries themselves (under their own ownership) can address these issues in their national programmes.
- With respect to borders and tariffs: we should focus blindly on the relation LDCs versus EU. When you want to export products from South Africa to Malawi or Zimbabwe, look how many borders and barriers you need to be overcome then! These issues have to be solved in the SADC or COMESA circles, rather than by the EU.
- In fact, International Trade Agreements (especially with respect to trade tariffs) under Cotonou are much fairer to ACP countries than to the rest of the world.
- Countries like Namibia are not doing enough to protect themselves from international competition, especially from South Africa and India. It also doesn't comply with anti-dumping rules itself, which backlashes on itself.
- Therefore, the EU is not the sole responsible actor here: ACP countries have to look at what they can do themselves.
- Nevertheless, it has to be admitted that US and EU agricultural subsidies are a major stumbling block, especially as these monies are often not captured in trade agreements.
- There is a proposal on the table for the EU to cut its trade-distorting subsidies to farmers by 55% and its subsidies for exports by 45 %.

Partners in trade vs. recipients of aid (what developing countries can do for themselves)

- In developing opportunities for trade and growth, countries should not overlook the importance of removing barriers in the production chain within their own countries: e.g. from harvesting through processing and marketing to consumption. These barriers need to be dealt with also.
- A first step has to be to better integrate trade issues into national agricultural policies and programmes (e.g. SWAps) and into the Poverty Reduction Strategy. Important is that, at a country level, consistency between the various policy documents is assured.
- Trade issues should be linked to information on the nature of poverty: this means that also non-income issues are addressed, such as vulnerability to risks, limited access to services and the lack of a political voice.
- It is not enough to look at the agricultural sector alone: one has to take the back and forward linkages into account, especially in the context of manufacturing-chains. This means we should not only concentrate on the export of agricultural raw products, but also have to develop linkages to the industrial sector in order to exploit the opportunities for value adding.
- In particular, LDCs should identify the niche markets for which they possess a competitive advantage. A promising example is organic farming.
- With respect to pro-poor growth, we should not only focus on the export side, but also address import matters as well as issues of equitable distribution of growth. The latter may require ex-ante analysis that looks at the impact of a growth in trade on socio-economic indicators.
- It is important to remember that there is no blueprint: for example, the supply-chain of rice may look different from one country to the next.

Presentation 5.5: The NEPAD initiative

Mission and strategy

- NEPAD is different from existing initiatives and organisations. It is African-grown and African-owned and because of the fact that African Heads of State sit together.
- In the OAU, African Heads of State antagonised each other, were afraid of each other; in NEPAD they work together.
- NEPAD tells African Heads of State that their budgets should reflect NEPAD-priorities.
- Where there is strife and conflict in Africa, such as in West Africa or the Great Lakes Region, NEPAD has a Peace and Security Committee headed by South Africa. The President and Vice President of South Africa visit the conflict areas to mediate.
- NEPAD is different from the ECA (Economic Commission for Africa) because the ECA falls under the UN, whereas NEPAD is African owned. The UN have endorsed NEPAD as an equal partner; the Secretary General of the UN has created an office with Advisors for Africa headed by the NEPAD Secretary General, which is an avenue into the UN for NEPAD.
- NEPAD does not replace ECA however. Instead, NEPAD ensures that whatever is done also affects the people. Organisations have been there for a long time and people are still poor and getting poorer. The female child is still not trained because of African culture. These are issues that need to be dealt with and can only be dealt with by an African-owned body.
- NEPAD looks at development from an African perspective.
- In its development strategy, NEPAD uses Regional Economic Communities as entry points in key areas such as environment, trade, etc.
- Each of these key areas is handled by experts. However, the concept of Regional Economic Communities forms a difficult basis of negotiation with development partners (donors), as these claim that the RECs are weak (for example Canada wants to fund NEPAD but does not buy into the REC concept).
- Another mechanism for development is the Peer Review Mechanism. This is voluntarily compulsory. It follows from a Memorandum of Understanding; however, despite the fact that the MoU had a regional 'flair', NEPAD now realises that this Peer Review Mechanism will likely only operate at a national level.
- During one of NEPAD's last meetings, eminent members were opposing components of the Peer Review Mechanism.

Institutional arrangements

- The relation between NEPAD and OAU is as follows: The latter organisation is in transition and has changed last year from OAU to AU (African Union). NEPAD should be seen as the AU's socio-economic initiative.
- During the last AU meeting in Abudja, the NEPAD was integrated into the AU Commission. However, cooperation continued on an ad-hoc rather than a structural basis.
- During the next meeting in Maputo, a report on full integration will be presented to the AU. A decision will then be taken and NEPAD should, from then on, be fully integrated into the AU.
- NEPAD is necessary despite the existence of organisations like World Food Programme and FAO. In fact, these organisations need to be harmonised. The UN created a cluster of agencies, each of which caters to an area of NEPAD. So all these should now be held accountable to the NEPAD framework.
- In fact, NEPAD provides a socio-economic framework for Africa.
- The link between NEPAD and existing regional or national programmes such as PRSPs and SWAps is not entirely clear. It was stated that any programme that is a regional or national programme is a NEPAD programme. For example, SADC's food security and food storage programmes were looked at and endorsed by NEPAD as a NEPAD programme. This is so because nations live in clusters: NEPAD cannot deal with food security in South Africa alone and leave out Zimbabwe.

Money matters: Resource flows to local levels

6. Poverty and budgeting

Chaired by Anthony Mwanaumo, Agricultural Consultative Forum, Zambia

6.1 The role of Trust Funds in ensuring that resources reach intended beneficiaries

Sehoai Santho, Regional African Leadership Development Programme, University of Pretoria, South Africa

Case study of Matelile Tajane Development Trust Model

The Matelile Tajane Development Trust (MTDT) is a product of cooperation between various stakeholders. The Mafeteng Development Project (MDP), as well as the Ministry of Local Government, Ministry of Agriculture, both represented on district level, the chiefs, and most important, the communities were involved in the design, legalization, planning and implementation of this trust model. The involvement of the different stakeholders occurred at different stages and to a varying degree.

The main purpose of undertaking the efforts of developing a community development model were

- to ensure empowerment of the communities to handle their own affairs in the overall process of decentralisation in Lesotho.
- to provide a way for MDP to hand over assets of project activities to the community as a beneficiary in a sustainable manner and beyond the life span of MDP

During a project review mission, MDP (operating on district level) was advised to promote community development with a strong emphasis on participation and ownership of development through the communities. Pilot areas for the planned activities were the Matelile and Tajane wards of the Mafeteng District, which were targeted by the Matelile Rural Development Project (MRDP) before. In order to accomplish the development of a community model, the unit 'Community Management Development' was established under MDP and an organizational development consultant, S. Santho was entrusted with the task to develop a model suitable for community empowerment in the framework of decentralisation and with respect to regional rural development. The organizational form to be developed should guarantee sustainability of development efforts and replicability of the model to other areas and districts.

Mr. Santho's paper [see Annex I-1] gives details on this model and how it was put into practice: the Deed of Trust, the Reserve Fund, the organisational structure, agricultural and non-agricultural services provided by the trust, the capacity building component, the bookkeeping system and its limitations, the current financial situation of the Trust, income sources, the need for more income generation, and the monitoring & evaluation system.

A brief PowerPoint was then presented by Mr. Santho's colleague, Thabo Ramokgopa. It dealt with public/private partnerships (PPP) at Provincial/Local Government level, using an example of effective

6. POVERTY AND BUDGETING

delivery of water and sanitation services. This PPP model has enabled a national ministry (water and sanitation) to meet its targets by channelling resources to needy communities and providing water and sanitation infrastructure on a participatory basis. In South Africa, this has unlocked resources at central level and shifted them efficiently to the local level to address real needs of poor communities.

6.2 How, when and why does poverty get budget priority: A brief synthesis of and introduction to country experiences

A study by CAPE/ODI, London, presented by Désirée Dietvorst, Consultant, Namibia

In the wake of Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs) being formulated in a growing number of countries, a study was carried out by the Centre of Aid and Public Expenditure (CAPE) of the Overseas Development Institute (ODI) in London to find out how Public Expenditure Management has been linked to Poverty Reduction Policy goals. Case studies were carried out in Ghana, Malawi, Mozambique, Tanzania and Uganda with country reports presented for each. A synthesis paper compiling and analysing all country findings was prepared, entitled *How, when and why does poverty get budget priority? Poverty Reduction Strategy and Public Expenditure Reform in five African countries* (Foster et al., May 2002).

This presentation broadly describes the study's methods and research hypotheses before highlighting selected findings along the three main groups of hypotheses: (i) the institutional framework (ii) information & analysis and (iii) participation.

With respect to the institutional framework, emphasis is placed on the importance of Public Expenditure Management, including the role of the Ministry of Finance and the use of financial instruments such as the Medium Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF). The conditions for an effective MTEF are spelled out followed by a discussion on the reasons why these conditions are often not met or are undermined.

Whether and how the Participatory Poverty Assessments have influenced policy and budget-priorities is briefly discussed under the heading of information and analysis. Findings discussed under the heading of participation relate mostly to the role of users and civil society in ensuring that budgeting becomes more pro-poor.

The presentation concludes with a few remarkable insights which hope to provide some food for thought as well as some encouragement that pro-poor growth is actually possible.

[For her complete presentation, see Annex I-2.]

6.3 How, when and why does poverty get budget priority: The case for **Ghana**

Douglas Zormelo, Consultant, National Development and Planning Commission, Ghana

In view of the poverty situation in Ghana in recent years, it is not surprising that poverty reduction is a key governmental policy focus. The new Government, which took office in 2002, decided to make the Ghana Poverty Reduction Strategy (GPRS) the basis for the 2002 budget and the foundation for its new five-year plan.

The questions that arise are whether poverty reduction issues will get priority in the budget and whether resources allocated to poverty reduction will indeed be for programmes that really reduce poverty? To a certain extent, the answer to these questions will depend on whether the following lessons have been learnt from the past: (1) for poverty to get budget priority, there must be the recognition of the importance of poverty reduction; (2) there must be consensus about the methods for poverty reduction; (3) there must be costed plans targeting poverty reduction; (4) the various aspects of poverty, including the incidence of poverty, must be taken into account in resource allocation; and

6. POVERTY AND BUDGETING

(5) budgeting must be realistic and resource allocation must be credible. Mr. Zormelo then assessed the current situation in Ghana with respect to the first four of these lessons.

Poverty reduction only received universal attention in Ghana when the country was declared HIPC in 2001. Although it can be said that poverty reduction now forms the basis of planning in the Ghana, there is a certain level of ambivalence on the part of government about how to reduce poverty, related to the government's stated philosophy of building a wealth-creating democracy. The government believes that targeting the provision of services to the poor alone will not reduce poverty on a sustainable basis and hence that it is critical that Ghanaians are encouraged to create wealth at all levels, as that is the only way to create jobs and also to wean the country from dependence on donor funding. The Ghana Poverty Reduction Strategy therefore approaches poverty reduction in the country from two angles. The first is targeted programmes that directly lead to the provision of goods and services that alleviate the difficulties of the poor. The second is programmes and projects that are geared towards increasing business activity in the country, with the expectation that this will lead to the creation of jobs and also wealth. These two perspectives have been rationalized as not being mutually exclusive concepts, since the immediate needs to alleviate the suffering of the poor must be done in tandem with the implementation of long-term policies that will underpin poverty reduction on a sustainable basis.

Whether there will be consensus on the way forward in poverty reduction is to a large extent determined by how participatory the process of finding solutions to poverty is. This means planning must be as participatory as possible. The preparation of the GPRS was described in some detail, including several weaknesses. These weaknesses were reflected in the 'zero draft' of the policy framework, which was circulated at the time this study was done. This document is much stronger on proposing ideas than on prioritising them, costing them, or relating them to a review of the strengths and weaknesses of existing policies and programmes.

One possible reason why the results from the community consultations may have been given less weight is that Ghana has a more difficult macro-economic position than countries such as Uganda, which committed itself to using debt relief savings to fund additional spending on poverty programmes. In Ghana, a portion of these savings had to go to reduce the domestic debt burden, which was justified as indirectly helping the poor. This flexibility in interpreting poverty reduction may subtract from single-minded focus on targeting resources to the poor. However the issue clearly is that poverty reduction strategies expressed in the GPRS did not go through the decentralized planning system and therefore are not a product of the people as such.

The identified policy areas have been translated into programmes and projects in the GPRS, each of which has been broken down into activities and costed. A full costing of the entire GPRS was estimated to be US\$ 5,283 Billion. This exceeded the funds immediately available, hence the need to prioritise the programmes and projects. The prioritisation resulted in the Medium Term Priority Programmes (MTP) costed at US\$ 2,515.2 million. The GPRS started in 2002. However, the prioritisation into Medium Term Priorities was not participatory and therefore one could be question if the national development-planning framework is being as the blueprint for planning. Additionally, costing did not fully take account of the incidence of poverty. Nevertheless, the GPRS recognizes the vulnerable groups and geographical disparities in welfare and poverty, in that emergency social relief measures for poverty reduction have been included for a number the poorest regions and hardest hit groups, including those with HIV/AIDS.

It is somewhat difficult to evaluate the extent to which resources have been allocated to pro-poor issues. Whereas the GPRS has the five thematic areas as the basis for policy proposal, the annual budget is organized not by thematic area but along five sectors: Administration, Economic Services, Infrastructure, Social Services and, Public Safety. Even though the 2003 budget reflects many Medium Term Priorities, several priorities also remain under funded. Agricultural modernization is estimated to need \$80.2 million in total resources, but only \$0.63 million is available in investment spending in 2003. Spending on skills for the disabled is nil even though \$15 million is required for the year, etc.

6. POVERTY AND BUDGETING

Clearly poverty reduction is now an important policy thrust of the government of Ghana. It is too early to give a verdict on whether poverty issues will receive priority in budgets, but the indications are that there has been a shift in sector allocations so far and these reflect a shift toward the funding of areas which impact on poverty.

[For the complete presentation, see Annex I-3.]

Working groups

WG 6.1 Trust funds in **Lesotho** (Santho)

Discussion Starter: Tom Buringuriza, Uganda
Rapporteur: Phillemon Mathebula, South Africa

What messages have you heard?

- Trust funds need seed money from external sources.
- The deed of donation triggers the release of funds.
- Due to poor/long central government systems, the seed money may be the *only* funds for the trust fund.
- Consultant/facilitation has played accountability roles.
- Public-Private Partnerships (PPP) with trust funds: Interesting for private sector, government, agricultural donors and beneficiaries.
- There is a need for innovations and experimenting with different institutional arrangements.
- The Trust allowed legally secured transfer of ownership to communities.

What experiences can you add?

- Local leadership can play a critical role in involving the community.
- The trust is intended to be permanent and to exist in perpetuity.
- Fiduciary aspects are a problem in community projects.
- Co-op. movement model can work if well managed, since it has an elaborate legal framework (Co-operative Acts).
- Donors would rather give loans to trusts rather than to co-operatives for sustainability.
- Model for transition process.
- Trust as a useful and innovative tool for strengthening public/private sector partnerships in delivery of services, research, livestock, crops, training, etc.

What lessons have you learnt for your work?

- Deed of donation opens up another entry point of co-operation.
- Establishment of trusts, in situations where no formal local funding mechanisms exist, prepares Local Authority in incidences of fiscal decentralisation.
- Trusts can be used to transfer resources from central government to communities.
- High input needed in capacity building and institutional support.
- Trust model has the potential to be an integral part of decentralisation.
- Analysis of different options in search for an appropriate model.

Open issues and questions

- What is the relation between Trust and local government?
- What is the role of Local Authorities in management and use of assets under decentralisation?
- Who should lead trust formation: Local Authorities, communities, traditional leaders or central government?
- How to reconcile donors' preferred funding modalities (DBS, Swaps) with community-based trust funds (especially where decentralisation is weak)?

6. POVERTY AND BUDGETING

- Are there high transaction costs associated with community-based trusts targeting “small” numbers of people? (Economic) comparison of “high” transaction costs (capacity building, institutional development) towards long-term impact for beneficiaries?
- How do you source trainers in a changing environment?
- Why wasn’t the sustainability issue addressed from the start?
- Should successful parallel structures be integrated into on-going reforms (top-bottom) or should they be nurtured to become bottom-up reforms?
- Community based trusts – should they be sectoral or multi-sectoral?
- Should trusts be the way to *end* projects or should they be a *start* of programme design/ implementation?
- Can a Trust be used to mobilize (local and other) resources?
- Who controls the assets after handing over?
- Looking back, will you still go by the trust model? vis-à-vis SWAp/PRSP.
- Why establish a new body (a Trust)? Why not collaborate with existing institutions?

In Conclusion

- Attention has to be paid to transitional arrangements vis-à-vis long-term arrangements with emphasis on institutional framework.
- There is a need to develop hybrid models, which are ready to be implemented when local council structures stabilize.
- There is need for heavy investment in capacity building for boards of trustees. Therefore we need to subject our systems to a serious accountability regime.
- This has to be aligned with the preference of the founding donor as well as the prevailing democratic principles and political trends.
- All this investment can be justified by appropriate deliverables.

WG 6.2 Getting budget priority for poverty in five African countries (Dietvorst)

Discussion Starter: Heike Hoeffler, Kenya
Rapporteur: Duncan Chione, Malawi

What experiences can you add?

- At the policy level:
 - ...government is still uncomfortable with pro-poor growth vs. economic growth.
 - ..there is need to “match” different programmes with each other.
- At the level of the Treasury of the Ministry of Finance:
 - ...budgets and planning cycles are “out of sync” with each other.
 - ...there are gaps between budget allocation and releasing of funds.
 - ...and there is a lack of capacity in budget preparation.
- At the level of the different sectors or service provision:
 - ...activity based budget-planning contradicts with the practice of expenditure recording by cost-item.
 - ...disbursement peaks at end of budget year to such an extent that there is insufficient capacity to absorb.
 - ...and operational costs “eat up” the budget.
- At the level of the ultimate beneficiaries:
 - ...there is a lack of monitoring capacity and authority at the “client” level.

Country experiments

- Institutionalized dialogue: government with development partners.
- P.A.F. in Uganda.
- P.R.F. in South Africa.
- Staff performance monitoring system in South Africa.

6. POVERTY AND BUDGETING

- Results-oriented budgeting in Zambia and South Africa.

What lessons have you learnt for your work?

- Need to deal *decisively* with corruption.
- Poverty reduction activities should be embedded in existing programmes.

Open issues and questions

- Is our problem the lack of a public-relations programme? Or should we better deal with problems in existing programmes?
- How to empower the “client” to:
 - demand accountability
 - pay for services
- Is demand-driven service provision possible?

WG 6.3 Getting budget priority for poverty in Ghana (Zormelo)

Discussion Starter: Helmut Albert, Germany
Rapporteur: Gordon Ekekpi, Ghana
Write-up: Gesa Weseler, the Netherlands

What messages have you heard?

- Lack of linkages between policy planning and allocation of budgetary resources (the planning-budgeting link, or gap in this case).
- How can we link allocation of budgetary resources to implementation? (budgeting-implementation link, or gap in this case).
- Not enough financial resources available to address poverty issues.
- Addressing pro-poor issues motivated by external actors.

What experiences can you add?

- Given that there are always limited resources at hand, there must be a re-allocation of funds from, e.g., the defence budget, payment of salaries – creating a lean government, to agriculture, health, education, etc. and promote privatisation of certain services. This is difficult.
- Cutting personal emoluments – real wages are falling, no incentive for people to go to the rural areas. Real term personnel costs aren’t all that high.
- MTEF started in Ghana, to monitor costed activities and to provide feedback to resource use. Was a bit too ambitious. M&E divisions of ministries need to be strengthened in order to do this.
- Wealth creation is important for poverty reduction, but it should be broad-based, benefiting a broad number of people.
- Access to land is an important ingredient for poverty reduction.
- If no donor money comes in for pro-poor policies, there would be difficulties to implement them.
- Role of civil society to demand pro-poor policies in Ghana: participated to a certain extent in GPRS, but didn’t get the opportunity to see conditionality terms of WB and IMF; felt that they were doing things in isolation, and would have liked more information.
- Government’s ownership – they realized that things were worse than they thought it was, so even reluctantly, they opted for HIPC. Philosophy of wealth creation is two-sided – create some rich people in the country and wait for trickle-down, and also do something for the broad masses. This two-sided approach might be the cause for the sometimes-contradictory policies in Ghana.
- Checks and balances – poor monitoring of budget implementation. Needs to be improved.
- Corruption – main enemy of poverty reduction.
- PRSP = “Public Resources Support Politicians”.
- Do we know what kind of public investment is really pro-poor? How do we avoid distortion of private sector initiatives?

What lessons have you learnt for your work?

- Specific to everybody’s area of work.

6. POVERTY AND BUDGETING

- The recipients should have a say in the allocation of resources.
- It's not always more money that's needed but to ensure that it is well-spent.
- Poverty reduction programmes need a MTEF. Annual budgeting cannot cope with long-term problems.
- Consistency with emphasis on leadership statement and actions is an important ingredient in poverty reduction strategies.
- Strengthening of civil society organisations through information and capacity building (CTA).
- Empower the poor people to participate in decision making.
- Impact analysis and feedback to the top political levels. Donors have a role to play in this, as intermediaries and feedback to higher government levels.
- Political will beyond donor conditionalities is needed.
- Planning needs time – take that time to plan.
- Follow logical sequences of MTEF – PRSP – SWAs and look at how they link to each other.

Open issues and questions

- What is the role of the private sector in poverty reduction?
- Do we know what kind of public expenditure is pro-poor?
- Is budget support a way to strengthen MTEF and PRSP procedures? Or should money go directly to local levels? When do we start giving communities the cash directly?
- New role of government assistance: technical assistance in terms of guidance.
- How do we strengthen civil society so that they become the drivers of the process, demanding services?
- What to do in environments where civil society organisation levels are extremely low? Legitimacy of those civil society organisations that are present?
- How to do proper M&E? Methods, tools, etc.
- How do we force hard budgets on our governments?
- What to do with process overload from changing donor priorities and instruments?
- How and when do we do impact assessment?

Plenary discussions

Session 6: Poverty and budgeting

Presentations 6.1 The role of Trust Funds in ensuring that resources reach intended beneficiaries; 6.2 How, when and why does poverty get budget priority: a brief synthesis of and introduction to country experiences; and 6.3 How, when and why does poverty get budget priority: the case for Ghana

What do we suffer from? Lack of programmes or lack of programmes that work?!

- In addressing poverty, it looks as if the answer is not so much adding a new programme (e.g. a PRSP) but rather making existing programmes more pro-poor.
- As long as we cannot ensure that our budgets are allocated as stated, then we cannot begin to tackle poverty in a systematic way.
- The fact that budgets are planned on an activity basis, but expenses are recorded on a cost-centre basis (e.g. fuel, stationary, etc.), makes it virtually impossible to monitor effectively and this should be one of the first things to change in the budget system.
- We need to monitor not only the budget allocation of a programme but also its performance against poverty indicators to make sure that the activities budgeted for were indeed appropriate.
- Budget support at national level should be looked at critically.

Changing fund flows: give money to end-users

- The idea to give financial support directly to end-users of services or other ultimate beneficiaries is a good one. However, it also harbours a lot of risk and, once initiated, may be difficult to revert. The issue should therefore be looked at critically.

6. POVERTY AND BUDGETING

- We could save ourselves a lot of time and worry by adopting ‘the plane solution’. We pack a plane with money and drop it over poor areas: one third will never be found, one third will be used and wasted and one third will be used properly and have a true poverty reduction effect. This gives the plane solution a success ratio that is possibly not matched by most poverty reduction programmes.

7. Channelling resources to the field

Chaired by Ian Kumwenda, Ministry of Agriculture, Malawi

7.1 The role of Local Authorities and Traditional Leaders in emergency relief operations with particular reference to the current food crisis in **Malawi**

Owens Chirambo, Border Zone Development Project, Malawi

We sometimes fail to reduce poverty because of external factors like disasters. It is appropriate to have a proper legal framework to guide, co-ordinate and manage disasters so that poverty can be alleviated. In Malawi, the Disasters Preparedness and Relief Act was passed by Parliament in 1991. In 1994 a Cabinet Committee on Disaster Management Affairs was established and this year the Ministry of Poverty and Disaster Management Affairs has been created to give policy guidelines on disaster issues.

The Local Authorities and Traditional Leaders alert Government on impending disasters, assess damage, identify beneficiaries and assist implementing non-governmental organisations in distributing food to victims. The activities are co-ordinated by Steering Committees at district, area and village levels.

There are constraints in relief operations, in that Local Authorities lack capacity and resources to manage the operations, the urban poor are not covered and the relief items are not adequate to cater for all the victims.

The future direction of the relief programme includes establishing civil protection committees at district, area and village levels and involving civil society, community based organisations and NGOs in the operations. Attempts will also be made to implement projects and introduce drought resistant crops. Local authorities will be requested to make budgets for disasters. The Ministry of Poverty and Disaster Management Affairs will be requested to train and send staff to District Assemblies and start programmes that target the urban poor.

The GTZ Border Zone Development Project also made a contribution to the emergency relief operation. BMZ provided 2,000 metric tonnes of maize and 386 metric tonnes of Likuni Phala (flour for porridge), which went to 20,920 direct beneficiaries and via food-for-work arrangements; 23,051 children received Likuni Phala, 9,091 households got cassava and sweet potato cuttings, and 20,00 household received vegetable seeds.

[For the complete presentation, see Annex J-1.]

7.2 **Kenya** Poverty Impact Monitoring: First empirical results including a consideration of HIV/AIDS

Leonard Obidha, Ministry of Finance, Kenya

The presentation highlights the progress made in Kenya in monitoring government performance in implementing pro-poor policies through the service delivery mechanisms and resource allocations to the pro-poor priorities as defined in the PRSP

7. CHANNELLING RESOURCES TO THE FIELD

After producing the final PRSP document in the year 2000, efforts were made to establish a monitoring system. Work on the development of this national or umbrella M&E framework is ongoing and is being coordinated by the Ministry of Planning and National Development.

Meanwhile the HRSSD & CBS departments in the ministry, with technical support from the GTZ/SPAS project, started developing and testing tools (KePIM & CiReCa) that could be used as part of the monitoring efforts. The tool dubbed “The Kenya Participatory Impact Monitoring -KePIM” was piloted during its first phase in the year 2000, where the policy issues on Education, Health, Water, and food security were examined. This saw the production of a book, “Perspectives of the Poor On Anti-Poverty Policies in selected Districts”, as well as various bulletins.

The communities raised several issues concerning the provision of extension services and credit to enhance productivity among the poor. This became the research issue in phase two of KePIM, which was carried out in late 2002. The presentation touches on the outcome of this monitoring exercise.

The extensions services are inadequate and favour the well-to-do in the community, while credit is limited to so-called merry-go-rounds, which can only be used for consumption smoothing.

It may be difficult to achieve pro-poor growth if these issues are not addressed.

[For the complete presentation, see Annex J-2.]

7.3 Participatory community-based budget performance monitoring in Uganda

Daisy Owomugasho, Makerere University, Uganda

The Uganda Debt Network (UDN) is an advocacy and lobbying coalition of over 100 NGOs, Institutions and individuals, formed in 1996 out of civil society concerns that Uganda's debt burden had reached unsustainable levels (e.g., that only 33% of expenditure in health and education were reaching the target beneficiaries). It currently works in over 17 districts out of 56. Among other activities, in 1999 UDN initiated a Participatory Budget Performance Monitoring project to track government releases at Local Government levels & evaluate performance of poverty eradication strategies. Community Based Monitoring and Evaluation Systems launched in 2002.

More specifically, UDN established the Poverty Action Fund (PAF) in 1997/8. In 1999 the Budget Advocacy Initiative (BAI) was established. *Community Based Monitoring Committees* were launched under both the PAF and BAI. Both cases involved a process of building the capacity and developing skills of communities in monitoring and evaluation, advocacy and lobbying and in understanding budgeting and policy planning at national and local levels.

The presentation detailed how they built up this community capacity, their use of Participatory Learning and Action Oriented Approach, what was monitored, how the community based M&E system fed up through the sub county, district and national levels, and the numbers of community people trained in monitoring and evaluation (500) and sensitised on budget work (over 100,000).

Changes at community level were listed, leading to benefits to the community ranging from improved performance of teachers and health workers and better availability of drugs to the arrest of thieving chiefs and improved dialogue with local government officials. Lessons learnt included the greater effectiveness of partnership with local governments. Many challenges remain, such as linking macro-policy with micro-policy and the difficulty of interpreting information after access is attained (complex figures, etc.).

In conclusion, Participatory Budget Performance Monitoring proved to be an effective strategy for increased accountability and transparency. It enables the poor to increase their choices and voices in policy formulation and implementation. It improves local governance, in that poor people's concerns influence local agendas, and it ensures scrutiny of public officers.

[For the complete presentation, see Annex J-3.]

Working groups

WG 7.1 Local Authorities and Traditional Leaders in emergency relief operations in **Malawi** (Chirambo)

Discussion Starter: Collins Nkatiko, Zambia
Rapporteur: Harry Potter, Malawi

What messages have you heard?

- District emergency and disaster committee – is its role and status clear? (Duplication?).
- Ministry created for poverty and disaster management.
- Recognition of long-term nature of problems.
- Interventions should build up, and not just be for relief only.
- Some people may not be reached: possible tension (SA).
- Food relief can distort markets.

What experiences can you add?

- Danger of food relief causing dependency.
- Existing machinery may be able to deal with a crisis. (Z.)
- Area committees identified beneficiaries.
- Distributions: public and scheduled.
- Massive external interventions kill traditional coping mechanisms.
- Disaster response measures (e.g. FFW) should include environmental rehabilitation measures.
- Local authorities may have limited operational capacity, so will need effective linkages with line ministries.
- Crisis can lead to excessive damage to common property resources (formats include Africa).

What lessons have you learnt for your work?

- Poverty relief programmes are important.
- The need to extend them to development interventions.
- Handing out food *in public* improves transparency.
- Food relief may provide opportunities to change production.
- Partnership can act to ensure “fair play”.
- Disaster relief is a coordination exercise which can best be managed by strong local government.
- Contribution from beneficiaries: promote ownership of the transition from crisis to stability.
- Interventions can damage existing coping mechanisms.
- Disaster relief has a regional solution.

Open issues and questions

- Institution.
- How does the new Ministry link to others? (process overload).
- Why create new structures?
- Does new Ministry prolong the crisis?
- Indicators.
- How to ensure that the right people are reached? (targeting/tensions).
- How accurate are the tools used for estimating food deficits?
- Process.
- What is the role of donors in food relief? (solution or problems).
- How do we make the transition from one level to the next? (crisis→ SN→ growth).

7. CHANNELLING RESOURCES TO THE FIELD

- How do we deal with environmental damage in crisis?
- Can interview self targeting? (e.g. FFW).
- How do we deal with the extra effects of HIV/AIDs?

WG 7.2 Poverty Impact Monitoring in **Kenya** (Odiiba)

Discussion Starter: Jonathan Arnold, Ghana
Rapporteur: Joost Gwinner, Cameroon

What messages have you heard?

- Indicators to be formulated carefully and be limited in number.
- Need to align the various levels of indicators.
- Monitoring (indicators) vary from level to level.
- Specific actions may be required to gather data at different levels.
- What data are required at what level for what purpose.
- Need to coordinate M & E activities, e.g. of line ministries.
- Who is using the data and how?
- No good monitoring without thorough planning.

What experiences can you add?

- Need to focus indicators on poverty.
- HIV to be included and stressed.
- Data to be analysed and conclusions be drawn at each level.
- No good planning without thorough M & E.

Open issues and questions

- How should a poverty impact monitoring system look like?
- How to capture the requirements for monitoring for millennium goals, PRSP, etc.

WG 7.3 Community-based budget performance monitoring in **Uganda** (Owomugasho)

Discussion Starter: Klaus Droppelmann, Zambia
Rapporteur: Ian Kumwenda, Malawi
Write-up: Gesa Weseler, the Netherlands

What messages have you heard?

- Presentation on community-based budget monitoring; project on community-based crime prevention; presentation on community-based trust funds.
- If the community owns the ideas, they work without any external incentive.
- Training of people has to be very thorough. If you can save resources from public funds, that's incentive enough.
- Materials for this exercise are needed – pens, notebooks, etc., which otherwise would be too expensive.
- Uganda Debt Network is registered as an NGO and has received funding from international donors (DfID, Oxfam, others). If they stop operating, what will happen to the monitoring initiative? Started monitoring fund use from Poverty Action Fund. Then found that people would have to understand budgetary matters in order to be able to monitor. Maybe will move into transparency issues in the future. Problems on the ground dictate the set of activities.
- Covers four districts at the moment.
- How are results made public? Sometimes there are supplements in the national newspaper; presentations to MPs from the four districts. They are supposed to channel the findings to the various budget or policy processes.

7. CHANNELLING RESOURCES TO THE FIELD

What experiences can you add?

- Criminal crime prevention project visited yesterday in the field trip – also a community-based initiative.
- Peasants have high degree of ownership of the current government in Uganda, because of the civil war and how the government came into being.
- Monitoring has to be done by somebody outside of the system, thus this set-up is actually how things are supposed to be. The community is monitoring the service providers.
- There are always local structures => look for them and work with them.
- Who are the promoters of these community-based initiatives? Here, started by Uganda Debt Network, an NGO for lobbying and advocacy.
- Uganda constitution gives citizens the right to monitor. Citizens are encouraged to use this right.
- In Mali, there was a conflict of interest between the promoters of these initiatives, who were at the same time service providers. This is not the case in Uganda.
- In other cases this has worked when MPs are interested, because it also provides them with useful information. Public support is very important; otherwise the process becomes frustrating. Can make MPs and other officials more responsive by making their behaviour official.
- The movement in Uganda started with insecurity concerns.

What lessons have you learnt for your work?

- By setting up parallel structures, you can achieve a lot. Traditional thinking is “avoid parallel structures at all costs”, but they can be very helpful and add a lot if they’re rooted in the community. Need to re-think current paradigms of “parallel structures are bad”, and find ways of taking them along, of integrating them in processes that are mostly top-down.
- Maybe refer to these structures as supplementary rather than parallel.
- If you get the start right, you can get a snowball effect and achieve more than was initially planned.
- Build on existing local structures when working with communities.
- Avoid conflict of interest for civil society organisations by avoiding them also being service providers.
- Increasing accountability can actually lead to poverty reduction. Ownership + empowerment + accountability = poverty reduction.
- An open and free press helps a lot to achieve accountability and responsiveness! Misbehaviour by officials can be made public in the newspaper or radio. Release of funds can also be made public, enabling the communities to follow up. Radio has been very important in Uganda, with programmes in local languages. Newspaper alone is not sufficient.
- Using local languages empowers people in the communities.
- Awareness and sensitisation are very important.
- Don’t talk about building capacity only – there is always capacity there waiting to be released. People in the communities have a lot of capacity.
- There is poverty at the top – poverty of skills, of attitude, etc. Abuse of local people by using PowerPoints, complicated language, intimidating attitudes, etc.
- Build confidence and trust of local people; respect their rules and customs; report to the local chief first and get proper introduction.

Open issues and questions

- How to integrate parallel/supplementary structures into ongoing processes and structures?
- How do you reconcile interests of civil society with the interests of the government? Not all countries have this degree of ownership feeling of peasants with their governments.
- How to upscale with reasonable levels of coaching?
- How to adjust to the level of local communities? How to win their trust and confidence?
- How to release local people’s capacity?

Final resolution

- We need to be proactive in enhancing the inherent (M&E) potential and structure at the community level

Plenary discussions

Session 7: Channelling resources to the field

Presentations 7.1 The role of local authorities and traditional leaders in emergency relief operations with particular reference to the current food crisis in Malawi; 7.2 Poverty impact monitoring: first empirical results including a consideration of HIV/AIDS; and 7.3 Participatory community-based performance monitoring in Uganda

HIV / AIDS not sufficiently addressed

- The issue of HIV / AIDS featured in the title was discussed in only a few slides. Admittedly, it needs a session on its own.
- What we need to hear is not only that HIV / AIDS is a major problem, but especially success stories about how it can be taken account of in the rural context.
- Recently a Forum discussing this issue was hosted, also in Pretoria, and some of the programmes present there also presented their findings here.

What to do in the case of drought

- What can be done to increase food production at the level of the farmer? For example, Namibia imported food from Zimbabwe some years back. Zimbabwe advised Namibia to use silos at the producers' level, but how can you encourage such practices?
- Malawi has a pro-poor budget, part of which was used to buy maize. But we also invested in Starter-Packs, which allowed farmers to increase their food production through improved seeds and fertilizer. In addition, there is a strong emphasis on irrigation and the use of drought-resistant crops, which also implies a diversification away from maize.
- The relief programme in Malawi has three stages: 1. crisis management; 2. maintain stability (through social protection measures such as safety nets and employment opportunities); and 3. look for opportunities for growth. There is no real distinction between these phases; there is only a gradual progression from one into the other.
- Not enough was said on the role of traditional leaders in cases of crisis management. Food security efforts in Malawi emphasise the role of democratically elected institutions (e.g. district assemblies and dep of local government) with traditional leaders in a support role.

Structures, conflicts and incentives in community based performance monitoring

- In Uganda, existing structures are used that include governmental and non-governmental as well as traditional structures.
- From grassroots levels upwards, Local Councils and Area Chiefs as well as technical people (within or outside government) are used. The responsibility for coordination is with the Local Council.
- In addition, though, communities themselves set up parallel structures for M&E purposes. These start at village level and go up to parish, sub-county and district level.
- Communities select their representatives, who are then trained for three weeks. They continue to be accountable to their communities.
- Incentives are informal rather than formal. No money is paid, but through the work of community reps, a hospital or school may be built, which gains them a lot of respect and standing in the village.
- Issues that come up are discussed with policy makers at the level where they are collected. Each level reports either upward or sideward, e.g. to the police.
- Conflicts do occur: Sometimes people refrain from becoming community reps because they fear conflicts. In one case, the brother of the headmaster refused to be on the community board that would monitor performance of the school.

Conclusions and way forward

8. Where we are and where we're heading

8.1 What we have seen, heard and talked about: A brief overview of the Forum's findings

Johann Hesse, GTZ-Ministry of Agriculture, Ghana

What have we heard? A very subjective summary of key issues and questions

At the beginning of the week, participants were asked to be alert for: What messages have YOU heard? What lessons have YOU learnt for YOUR work?

In the way of summary, Johann Hesse shared what he personally had "heard" this week, from each of the major programme components.

Introduction

1. Making SWApS work for the poor (donor perspective, grassroots perspective)

- Program based approaches (PBA) – a new paradigm.
- Improvements of governance are necessary at all levels.
- PBA are primarily innovative in terms of financial management (who signs the cheque?)
- Accountability: to whom?
- Are SWApS re-centralising and focusing too much on the state (as compared to private sector)?
- Emerging importance of non-state actors.
- Donor-caused transaction cost still high.
- Programme alignment is still a challenge.
- Ill-advised and premature moves of donors: what drives donor decisions?

→ There is still little evidence whether or how PBA actually deliver on poverty reduction!

Top down or bottom up?

2. Bottom up approaches (in Kenya, South Africa, Uganda)

- Political commitment needed to make bottom up work.
- Approach must be well designed: clear allocation of functions and responsibilities.
- Planning creates expectations that must be managed.
- Links to other government levels/spheres must be managed.
- Need for alignment with budgetary processes.
- Bottom up will eventually follow 'where the money is'.
- Poverty assessment studies can guide the political decision making – lobby for the poor.

→ We know how good structures should look like. What stops us from implementing them?
→ The planning system has to go hand in hand with the budgetary process – otherwise: failure is likely!

Poverty and participation: Implementation at decentralised levels

3. Getting local actors to cooperate in the fight against poverty (in general and in Uganda & Ghana)

- Local government can provide the right structure to address poverty issues – but *must* it, will it automatically do so?? (implicit assumption!)
- Funding to Local Government can shift process overload to that level: responses needed (Uganda: fiscal decentralisation).
- Focus on agriculture: beyond production (now including post-production).
- There is no action without money !
- Even if systems all work well: the problem of poverty might remain.
- Order of events: what comes first, what second – what pre-conditions **MUST** be in place? Legal framework, restructuring, clearly defined roles, etc. ?

→ The Challenges: poverty targeting, capacities for managing coordination, alignment, integration, reconciliation and process facilitation

4. Building bridges: Experiences with cross-sector cooperation (Zambia, South Africa, Kenya)

- Coordinating councils: their authority, responsibility, incentives need clear definition.
- Participation is important, but there is the danger of fatigue.
- National programmes might counteract integrated, bottom up initiatives: the need for ‘clean’ approach.
- How does cross-sector cooperation through the examples we have heard address poverty? Implicit assumption?
- How does ‘self governing’ fit into official governance structures ?

→ We have good systems to choose from, but how is pro-poor growth ensured?

5. External challenges

a. International Trade Agreements

- Negotiation capacities are important: even pro-poor development needs to be negotiated.
- Doha round opportunities must not be missed.
- Trade needs more attention in PRSPs and SWApS.
- Blueprint approach is not suitable.
- Potential of regional trade relationships to be acknowledged.
- Economic Partnership Agreements with the EU: the new link of trade and development.
- Are EPA between equal partners?
- Removal of tariffs, tariff escalation, non-tariff trade barriers, is necessary to enhance market access.

→ New recognition: the role of trade for development
→ If market access is ensured, are there products for sale? We need to look at the whole supply chain!

b. NEPAD

- a laudable initiative, but: is it taking note of previous achievements in terms of approaches, participation, poverty focus, ownership at local level, etc.
- NEPAD seems to be not known well.

→ Many questions unresolved about NEPAD

Money matters: Resource flow to local levels

6. Poverty and budgeting (role of trust funds, how does poverty get budget priority – in Ghana and elsewhere)

- New approach: giving assets to beneficiaries instead of governments, but what structures are managing this, with what accountability? Is it not a new mix of roles between government and beneficiaries?

→ The way money-spending is planned, exercised, monitored is perhaps the most important issue for pro-poor development initiatives

8. WHERE WE ARE AND WHERE WE'RE HEADING

- Poverty targeting = budget targeting.
- Does poverty reduction really reflect the political priorities of governments?
- What is said is only as good as what gets funded in the budget.
- Roles of civil society and other non-state actors should be strengthened.
- How is pro-poor spending being monitored?

→ Links of budgeting with participation, accountability, and tracking need more attention.

7. Channelling resources to the field (emergency relief, impact monitoring – Malawi, Kenya, Uganda)

- Food relief is important but can distort markets.
- Danger that food aid can create dependencies.
- Food aid should not distort coping strategies.
- Why new structures?
- Interest of institutions?
- Are donors part of the solution or part of the problem?
- HIV/AIDS: an extra need for attention.
- Too many indicators for M&E: more process overload?
- Is the use of M&E results ensured?
- Local structures to be used for M&E pro-actively.
- How to reconcile interests of civil society vis-à-vis government?

→ What does an adequate poverty monitoring impact system look like?
→ How to ensure that M&E results are actually used?
→ Integration of community or civil society seems promising and needs further attention.

Hesse concluded by noting **five overall conclusions** that ran through the entire conference, namely:

- ▶ Difference in perceptions on program based approaches;
- ▶ Poverty reduction doesn't come automatically;
- ▶ Success stories are there to learn from, let's go use them!
- ▶ There are still areas that need attention (private sector, budget issues);
- ▶ The problem of process overload, which can be reduced via
 - clear allocation of roles and functions
 - using existing structures

[See Annex K-1 for his presentation.]

8.2 Spinning the Wheels:

How to get most mileage out of our 'Regional SWAp Network'

Albert Engel, GTZ, Namibia

The presentation began with a backward look the African Forum series over the years

1997 Lusaka, Zambia	ASIP: from projects to programs
1997 Lilongwe, Malawi	ASIP Institutional arrangements
1998 Harare, Zimbabwe	ASIP training
1999 Lusaka, Zambia	Participation in sector programs
2000 Harare, Zimbabwe	SIP/SWAp: Still on course or heading for collapse?
2001 Accra, Ghana	SWAps: Do they really help the poor?
2003 Pretoria, South Africa	Struggle for pro-poor growth

and the trends and phases over that time-span:

- From donor dominated debates to greater ownership and a focus on implementer viewpoints.
- The development of these fora into a regional (implementation-oriented) debate which acts as a useful counterweight to the international donor dominated and policy-oriented debate.
- From an agricultural focus to a focus on cross-sector operational challenges.
- The introduction of the poverty focus.
- An increased awareness of the relevance of local governance issues (i.e. 'the New Vehicle'.....).
- A realisation that international factors (e.g. WTO commitments) have been insufficiently addressed and need to be (better) reflected in national programs.

This effort has now reached an impressive number of African countries involved in sector approaches, as shown by the cumulative number of participants from African countries (past and present Fora together) below:

Zambia	91	Uganda	12	Ivory Coast	2
Malawi	58	Tanzania	9	Gambia	2
Ghana	55	Nigeria	7	Ethiopia	2
Kenya	53	Cameroon	6	Senegal	1
Zimbabwe	51	Namibia	6	Sierra Leone	1
Mozambique	31	Benin	3		
South Africa	18	Egypt	3	Total	427
Lesotho	13	Burkina Faso	3	African participants	

Then the focus shifted to future options: *How can we improve our knowledge management beyond the yearly forum?*

For several years participants have been suggesting that we should find ways of sharing information between the Fora, such as a webpage, but beyond a rudimentary sub-page on the SNRD site it has not happened. It was announced that funds (50,000 Euros) were available for setting up an electronic platform (website) and the related hardware, software and initial training, for purposes such as a database for document retrieval, information exchange, events information, etc. For the working group deliberations to follow, he described basic options for their consideration, such as a central set-up only versus having regional / national focal points.

This was but one of the topics for the last Working Group discussions, which Engel proceeded to introduce:

The road ahead (country group brainstorming) -- Based on your country's perspective:

1. What are the *key issues*, in the context of sector reform for rural development that should be tackled in our network?
2. Which *lessons learnt* from your country could you make available, which could be of interest to other countries and our network?
3. How can we improve *knowledge management* and get more out of our regional forum network? (include comments/suggestions on website)

Would you make use of an electronic platform (web-site) and what other suggestions do you have?

He then closed his presentation by suggesting that participants divide up into Country Groups, with one "donor group" for headquarters people. [This presentation can be found in Annex K-2.]

Country working groups: The road ahead

WG Burkina Faso

Key issues that our network should tackle

- Decentralized agricultural sector management.
- Sectoral decentralisation.
- Role of state?
- Top-down / bottom up policies.
- Implementation approaches.
- Basket-funded Action Plans.
- Programmes / projects.
- Trust funds.

What our country could share with Forum network

- Experiences from a country-wide rural community development programme.
- Experiences from implementation of several "basket-funded" Programmes (Rural financial professional organization).
- Experiences from building up of professional organizations in the agricultural sector.

Ideas for improving our Forum

- Include beneficiaries.
- Find ways to include francophone Africa (like NEPAD).

WG Cameroon

Key issues for our Forum network to tackle

- Poverty assessment methods ⇒ Impact
- Models of fiscal decentralisation.
- Top level involvement/commitment in decentralisation.
- Initial experiences with community development planning.
- Experiences with running programmes: PADC: Community Development Support A. PNDP: Participatory Development projects, HIPC projects.
- Various policy and strategy papers (PRSP, DSDSR (rural sector development, etc.).

WG Donor Group

Key issues for our Forum network to tackle

- Impact of inter-regional trade on national programs.
- Stocking of SWApSs.
- Governance issues (urban bias, decentralisation).
- Corruption, budgets.
- New forms of development finance trust model.
- Private sector involvement, investment.
- Integrating organized civil society into local government.

What our country could share with Forum network

- Newsletter (on trade issues).
- Training offer (on trade).
- Forum impact in work environment.

Ideas for improving our Forum

- Bringing in political decision makers.

WG Ghana

Key issues for our Forum network to tackle

- Include country / donor representation.
- Organizing Committee should include other donors and country representatives.
- Include political representation in Forums.
- Training on model, i.e. community based monitoring.

What our country could share with Forum network

- Offer to share experience on positive lessons.
- Willing to avail Technical Papers.
- Offer a member to be on the organizing committee.
- Ready to exchange info by electronic mails (Motivation – self driven).
- To establish a forum to exchange ideas In-House (in Ghana).
- Undertake country level training.
- Undertake to explore and assess the potential of establishing a Trust Fund and PPP.

Ideas for improving our Forum

- Focused too much on GTZ. Where are the other players? WB, IFAD, DFID, AFDB.
- Political representation missing.
- Ensure consistency in sector representation (agriculture, health, education, housing,, water=.
- Should training be a component of the network?

The way forward

- Targeting the poor: How?
- Alignment of strategies and plans.
- Importance of monitoring.
- Community monitoring.
- Include HIV/AIDS.
- Institutional Framework.
- Budget approach and release for plan implementation.
- Capacity for planning budgeting and information on National strategies.
- Importance of trade for pro-poor growth.

WG Kenya

Key issues for our Forum network to tackle

- Awareness and sensitization (ownership) for effective formulation and implementation of poverty reduction strategies.
- Consistency and harmonisation of programmes and donor funding = streamline poverty issues in existing programmes.
- Sharing of best practices on poverty reduction efforts. → Information and knowledge sharing network.
- Ownership and CSO/NGO/donor coordination = host country in drivers seat.
- Coordination of and monitoring of poverty reduction activities.

What our country could share with Forum network

- Small scale agricultural production/exports = distribution and contribution to rural income.
- Regional and international trade and agreements.
- Community driven development experiences.
- Policy monitoring (=KEPIM). National Monitoring + Institutional Framework.
- Bold decisions by government based on demand by its citizen = free education.
- Micro financing (rural) for poverty reduction.
- Promotion of micro-entrepreneur ship (Jua Kali) for poverty reduction.
- HIV/AIDS initiatives.

Ideas for improving our Forum

- Clear definition of the focus, training, knowledge exchange.
- Best practices/innovations exchange/information sharing (journal).
- Feedback mechanism.
- Establish/introduce Sub-regional and National networks (with known schedules).
- What we do before the next Forum.
- Establish a forum to track pro-poor budget processes (budgeting and allocations) = GTZ/GOK/PS.
- Make a contribution to the on-going constitution review in Kenya = Topic: Devolution/ Decentralisation Ch10.

WG Malawi

Key issues for our Forum network to tackle

- Institutional issues.
- Core functions analysis MoA & FS (Ministry-wide).
- Decentralisation.
- District agriculture extension.
- Focus on Demand Driven pluralistic extension approach in process and appraisal and implementation plans on devolution.
- Experience of SIP/SWApS.
- Health.
- Education.
- Agriculture – Review status and update on progress.
- Transport.

What our country could share with Forum network

- Experience of Policy Reforms.
- New food security & nutrition.
- Concept of New Agricultural Extension Policy and Lessons from GTZ-funded projects.
- Linking Food Crisis Into Medium – Long Term Strategy.

8. WHERE WE ARE AND WHERE WE'RE HEADING

- Website: Modify to use a single website for communication.
- Experience of MASIP to date & links to PRSP Decentralisation.
- Newsletter stakeholders Forum (Quarterly), i.e. CISANET (Civil Society Agricultural Network) is an example of networking and communication.
- Implementation & budgeting: early lessons on process, e.g. District Development Funds and Budget Allocation formulae. Conditionality Grant' mechanisms, equalization grant mechanics.

Ideas for improving our Forum

- Additional modes of info sharing:
- Electronic Network: Sharing documents, lessons, updates, challenges.
- Exchange visits for country experience.
- Sub-regional meetings to supplement the annual forum.
- Selection of themes, setting the programme, etc.:
- There should be more input by network members, i.e. agree on theme for next year's meeting.
- More diversity in presentation, i.e. country perspectives and no platform for theoretical concepts.
- Can we reflect on what the Forum has actually achieved and the way to sustain interest in participation, i.e. stakeholders.
- Can we get a wider range of project examples, practitioners and participation (beyond GTZ), e.g. NEPAD, governments' own projects, SADC.
- Forum participation:
- Encourage participation by more donors, NGO's and Private Sector.
- Gender balance – Invitation.
- Consider participation of politicians and it's pluses and minuses. What would be their role?
- Continuity of participation & follow-up of issues.

WG Mozambique

Key issues for our Forum network to tackle

- Monitoring & evaluation of poverty reduction programmes.
- Implementation of agriculture SWAps (success and failures).

What our country could share with Forum network

- Experience of Mozambique on issues like;
 - PRSP (PARPA)
 - SWAp
 - Decentralisation and Part Planning

Ideas for improving our Forum

- Draft agenda should be sent in advance.
- A summary available during each session.

WG Namibia and South Africa

Key issues for our Forum network to tackle

- Wealth creation.
- Equitable land distribution.
- Infrastructure development.
- Market issues: regional + international.
- Environmental rehabilitation + protection.
- Best practices, i.e. in HIV/AIDS management.
- Gender mainstreaming.

8. WHERE WE ARE AND WHERE WE'RE HEADING

- Review possibilities of a fund for the participants and others.

What our country could share with Forum network

- Land reform success.
- Welfare programme and safety nets.
- Private sector involvement in poverty.
- HIV/AIDS orphans.

Ideas for improving our Forum

- Involve more role players.
- Ensuring continuity of attendance.
- Continuous contact through ICT links.
- Taking issues raised to decision makers.

WG Uganda

Key issues for our Forum network to tackle

- HIV-AIDS.
- Cross-sector cooperation.
- Rural-urban linkages.
- Growth vis-à-vis redistribution of wealth.
- Creation of alternative livelihood.

What our country could share with Forum network

- Partnership structures (developing partners, civil society, private sectors, central and local authorities).
- Local governance system.
- Fiscal decentralisation.

Ideas for improving our Forum

- Advance preparation for Forum, i.e. distribution of papers.
- Link with next forum.
- Disseminate information on successes, failures and what was learned from other countries.
- Exploration of existing websites before establishing a new one.

WG Zambia

Key issues for our Forum network to tackle

- Strengthening linkages between policy and implementation.
- Capacity building on local government (policy interpretation).
- Capacity building on community involvement.
- Cross-cutting issues: HIV/AIDS, gender, environment, monitoring and evaluation.
- Trade for development: making markets work for the poor.
- How to prevent market distortion (from relief food).

What our country could share with Forum network

- Institutionalized stakeholder consultation/participation.
- Agriculture Consortium Forum: DDCC (DAC etc).
- PDDC.
- Trust models.
- Research & extension.
- Livestock development.
- Training.

8. WHERE WE ARE AND WHERE WE'RE HEADING

- Sustainable agriculture.
- Best bet technology (conservation forum).
- Contract farming.

Ideas for improving our Forum

- Web site to include discussion forum, contributions.
- E-Conference (on agreed dates and times).
- Contribution to workshop themes.

Plenary discussions

Session 8: The road ahead and where we're heading

In the reactions of the audience to the country presentations, the following additional key themes emerged for follow-up fora:

1. Role of NGOs;
2. How to direct funds to support the private sector (public sector, communities);
3. Donor resource allocation: need for innovative forms, e.g. trust funding, decentralized budget funding;
4. Focus on higher level issues:
 - Rural and urban poor,
 - Policy level,
 - Decision makers;
5. Sustainability of community based activities;
6. Allocation of productive resources to the poor, e.g. land.

Evaluation and closing

Of course, no African Forum would be complete without an evaluation. Moderator Nathaniel Mjema chose a simple procedure, whereby participants voted by placing coloured circles on a chart at the front of the room. Every aspect averaged at least “good”, with most being between “good” and “very good”. Highest rated was organisation, perhaps in recognition of the special challenges faced by this year’s organisers and local arrangements people.

	Fair	Good	Very Good	Mean rating (1.0=fair to 3.0=very good)
Presentations		33	12	2.27
Plenary Discussions	2	29	13	2.25
Group Work	13	22	12	1.98
Facilitation	1	23	23	2.47
Organization		13	34	2.72
Total votes	16	120	94	2.34

Time was running out and the meeting was drawing to a close. Klaus Pilgram of SNRD ceremoniously awarded the first “certificate of attendance” to Anthony Mwanuomo of Zambia, the only person to have participated in all seven African Fora, and there were certificates for all other participants as well. After brief words of farewell from Speaker Johann Hesse and others, the 7th African Forum officially came to an end.

Annexes

Annex A. Workshop programme



Programme

The Struggle for pro-poor growth

Linking national programmes to local priorities and overcoming process overload

7th African Forum, 8 to 13 June, Burgers Park Hotel, Pretoria, South Africa

Sunday 8 June		
Internal opening		
Word of welcome and registrations	17:00	Dr. Hubert, GTZ Country Director, South Africa
Introduction of participants	17:15	All participants
<i>Tribute to Werner von der Ohe</i>	18:00	Dr. Ch. Beier, GTZ, Germany Mr. J. Grimm, SNRD Chairman, South Africa Dr. J. Hesse, Speaker SNRD Working Group on Sector Reform, Ghana Mr. Julius Nduati, Ministry of Agriculture, Kenya
Joint dinner	19:00	

ANNEX A: PROGRAMME

Monday 9 June		
Top down or bottom up? Linking national policies to local priorities		
Welcome	9:00	Mrs. A. Peters, German Ambassador to South Africa
Official opening of the Forum	9:15	Ms. Bongiwe Njobe, Director General, Ministry of Agriculture, South Africa Michael Lake, EU Delegation, South Africa Dr. Gesa Wesseler (Ms.), CTA, The Netherlands Eberhard Hauser, German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ), Germany
Introduction of programme	9:50	Dr. Johann Hesse, SNRD, Working Group on Sector Reform, Ghana
Tea/ Coffee	10:00	
Session 1: Introduction		Chaired by Jerry Tshoba, Ministry of Agriculture, South Africa
1.1: Making SWAps work for poor: A bilateral donor's perspective	10:30 – 11:00	Dr. Christoph Beier, Department of Planning and Development, (and Kathrin Lauckner) GTZ, Germany
1.2: Making SWAps work for the poor: The view from the ground	11:00 – 11:30	Anthony Mwanaumo, Agricultural Consultative Forum, Zambia
<i>Plenary discussion</i>	11:30 – 12:30	<i>All participants</i>
Lunch	12:30	
Session 2: Top down or bottom up?		Chaired by Peter Ngobese, Ministry of Agriculture, South Africa
2.1: Bottom-up district planning: linking local level needs to national programmes in Kenya	14:00 -14.20	Kenda Mwenja, Kilifi District Development Project, Kenya
2.2: Integrating local priorities into national policy frameworks in South Africa	14.20 -14.40	Marc Feldman, Consultant, South Africa
2.3: Planning the PRSP from below: the Ugandan Poverty Participatory Assessment	14.40 -15.00	Daisy Owomugasho, Makerere University, Uganda
<i>Brief plenary discussion and introduction to group work</i>	15.00 - 15.30	
<i>Group Work (incl. tea / coffee), 3 Groups (one on each topic of session 2)</i>	15.30 - 17.00	
<i>Plenary session to discuss results of group work</i>	17.00 - 18.00	<i>All participants</i>
Reception hosted by the GTZ, South Africa	19:00	

Tuesday 10 June		
Poverty and participation: Implementation at decentralised levels		
<i>Getting started: collecting comments and suggestions from the floor: A bit of a 'clean-sweep' to prepare the ground for the day's deliberations</i>	8:00 – 8:30	<i>Moderator and all participants</i>
Session 3: Getting local actors to cooperate in the fight against poverty		Chaired by Collins Nkatiko, Ministry of Agriculture, Zambia
3.1 Addressing rural poverty in sub-Saharan Africa: institutional and organisational opportunities	8:30 – 9:00	Dr. Uwe Otzen, Institute for Development Studies, Germany
3.2 The role of local government in addressing rural poverty, the case of Uganda	9:00 – 9:30	Martin Oloo, Min of Local Government, Uganda
3.3 Participation and district level planning in Ghana	9:30 - 10:00	Kofi Atta-Agyepong, Min. of Agriculture, and Frank Obeng Dapaah, Regional Coordinating Council
<i>Brief plenary discussion and introduction to group work</i>	10.00 - 10.15	
Tea/ Coffee	10:15 – 10.30	
<i>Group Work, 3 Groups (one on each topic of session 3)</i>	10.30 – 12.00	
Lunch	12.00	
Session 4: Building bridges: experiences with cross-sector cooperation		Chaired by Lena Otoo, Ministry of Agriculture, Ghana
4.1 Making cross-sector cooperation work at the provincial and district level: experiences from the Southern Province in Zambia	14:00 – 14:30	Collins Nkatiko, Provincial Agricultural Coordinator, and Fewdays Yenga, Provincial Local Government Officer
4.2 Integrated Development Planning: what we can learn from South Africa	14:30 – 14:50	Danso Agyemang, Integrated Development Planning, South Africa
4.3 Community driven development: lessons from Kenya	14:50 – 15:10	Walter Salzer, Kilifi District Development Project, Kenya
<i>Brief plenary discussion and introduction to group work</i>	15:10 – 15:30	<i>All participants</i>
<i>Group Work (incl. tea/coffee): 3 Groups (one on each topic of session 4).</i>	15:30 – 17:00	<i>All participants</i>
<i>Plenary session to discuss results of group work</i>	17:00 – 18:00	

Wednesday 11 June		
External challenges: the case of international trade		
<i>Getting started: collecting comments and suggestions from the floor</i>	8:00 – 8:30	<i>Moderator and all participants</i>
Session 5: International Trade Agreements: which ones are important and why?		Chaired by Dr. Douglas Zormelo, Consultant, Ghana
5.1 Opportunities and limitations of linking International Trade Agreements to national programmes	8:30 – 8:50	Alexander Werth, International Centre for Trade and Sustainable Development, Geneva
5.2 A review of trade related issues in PRSPs and Agriculture SWAps for eight selected countries in Africa	8:50 – 9:10	Dr. Helmut Albert, GTZ, Germany
5.3 Trade Agreements under the European Union and how developing countries can take account of them	9:10 – 9:30	Jürgen Lovasz, Delegation of the European Union, South Africa
Tea / coffee	9:30 – 10:00	
5.4 The importance of International Trade Agreements for Kenya	10:00 – 10:20	Agayo Ogambi, Trade Point Representative, Kenya
<i>Plenary discussion</i>	10:20 – 11:00	<i>All participants</i>
5.5 The NEPAD initiative, a report from the Secretariat	11:00 – 11:30	Edwin Ijeoma, NEPAD Secretariat, South Africa
<i>Plenary discussion</i>	11:30 – 12:00	<i>All participants</i>
Lunch	12:00	
Field trip Visit to a GTZ supported project or a tour to Soweto and the anti-apartheid museum	13:00	

Thursday 12 June		
Money matters: resource flow to local levels		
<i>Sweeping the floor</i>	8:00 – 8:30	<i>Moderator and all participants</i>
Session 6: Poverty and budgeting		Chaired by Anthony Mwanaumo, Agricultural Consultative Forum, Zambia
6.1 The role of Trust Funds in ensuring that resources reach intended beneficiaries	8:30 – 9:00	Sehoai Santho, Regional African Leadership Development Programme, University of Pretoria, South Africa
6.2 How, when and why does poverty get budget priority: a brief synthesis of and introduction to country experiences	9:00 – 9:30	A study by CAPE, London presented by Désirée Dietvorst, Consultant, Namibia
6.3 How, when and why does poverty get budget priority: the case for Ghana	9:30 – 10:00	Dr. Douglas Zormelo, Consultant, National Development and Planning Commission, Ghana
<i>Brief plenary discussion and introduction to group work</i>	10:00 – 10:15	<i>All participants</i>
Tea/ Coffee	10:15 – 10:30	
<i>Group Work</i>	10.30 – 11.30	<i>All participants</i>
<i>Plenary, presentation of group work</i>	11.30 -12.30	
Lunch	12:30 – 14:00	
Session 7. Channelling resources to the field		Chaired by Ian Kumwenda, Ministry of Agriculture, Malawi
7.1 The role of Local Authorities and Traditional Leaders in emergency relief operations with particular reference to the current food crisis in Malawi	14:00 – 14:20	Owens Chirambo, Border Zone Development Project, Malawi
7.2 Kenya Poverty Impact Monitoring: first empirical results including a consideration of HIV/Aids	14:20 – 14:40	Leonard Obidha, Ministry of Finance, Kenya
7.3 Participatory community-based budget performance monitoring in Uganda	14:40 – 15:00	Daisy Owomugasho, Makere University, Uganda
<i>Plenary discussion and introduction to group work</i>	15:00 – 15:15	<i>All participants</i>
<i>Group Work</i>	15:15 – 16:50	<i>All participants</i>
<i>Plenary session to discuss results of group work</i>	16:50 – 17:20	<i>All participants</i>

ANNEX A: PROGRAMME

Friday 13 June		
Conclusions and way forward		
Session 8: <i>Where we are and where we're heading</i>		
8.1 What we have seen, heard and talked about: a brief overview of the Forum's findings	8:00 – 8:30	Dr. Johann Hesse, GTZ-Ministry of Agriculture, Ghana
<i>Plenary session</i>	8:30 – 9:00	<i>All participants</i>
8.2 Spinning the Wheels: how to get most mileage out of our 'Regional SWAp Network'	9:00 – 9:15	Albert Engel, GTZ, Namibia
8.3 The road ahead: Group Work	9:15 – 10:15	<i>All participants</i>
Tea/ Coffee	10:15 - 10:45	
<i>Presentation of Group Work</i>	10:45 - 11:00	
Evaluation of the Forum	11:00 - 11:30	<i>All participants</i>
A.O.B. / Closing	11:30 - 12:00	<i>All participants</i>
Lunch	12:00	
<i>Participants depart</i>		

Annex B. List of participants

No.	LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	COUNTRY	PROJECT / ORG.	E-MAIL	TELEPHONE NO.	ADDRESS
1.	Agobia	Charles	Ethiopia	CIDA	psufoodpolicy@telekom.net.et	+251 1715600	P.O. Box 1009, Addis, Ethiopia
2.	Agyemang	Danso Poku	South Africa	GTZ / DDP TT	agyemang@intekom.co.za	cell +27 836764693	P.O. Box 1956, King Williams Town 5600, South Africa
3.	Albert	Helmut	Germany	GTZ-HQ	helmut.albert@gtz.de	+49 (6196) 791480	Postfach 5180, 65725 Eschborn, Germany
4.	Arnold	Jonathan	Ghana	CIDA Canadian High Commission, Ghana	jonathan.arnold@dfait-maeci.gc.ca	+233 (21) 7011593/94/95	Canadian High Commission Box 1639, Accra, Ghana
5.	Atta-Agyepong	Kofi	Ghana	Ministry of Food & Agriculture, and GTZ-SFSP (Sedentary Farming Systems Project)	agyepongk@hotmail.com	+233 (61) 27316, fax +233 (61) 27376	GTZSKSP, P.O. Box 473, Sunyani, Ghana
6.	Bahm	Andrea	Burkina Faso	Adviser NRM	Andrea.Bahm@gtz.de	+226 331910	GTZ-Ouagadougou, 01 BP 1485, Ouagadougou 01, Burkina Faso
7.	Beier	Christoph	Germany	GTZ-HQ	Christoph.Beier@gtz.de	+49 (6196) 791401	Postfach 5180, 65725 Eschborn, Germany
8.	Benson von der Ohe	Elizabeth	Germany	Consultant	vdoh@gmxpro.net vdohe@ginko.de	+49 (89) 496481, fax +49 (89) 1488-200476	c/o Schmaus, von-Trotha-Strasse 2, 81827 Munich, Germany
9.	Buringuriza	Tom	Uganda	GTZ Pevot	Pevot.tomb@infocom.co.ug	+256 (41) 346471 +256 (77) 406462	P.O. Box 10346, Kampala, Uganda
10.	Cheluget	John	Kenya	Ministry of Agriculture & Livestock Dev.	via gtzkasim@nbnet.co.ke	+254 (20) 2719013 +254 (20) 2718870	P.O. Box 30028, Nairobi, Kenya

No.	LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	COUNTRY	PROJECT / ORG.	E-MAIL	TELEPHONE NO.	ADDRESS
11.	Chione	Duncan	Malawi	Ministry of Agriculture		+265 1789033	P.O. Box 30134, Lilongwe 3, Malawi
12.	Chirambo	Owens	Malawi	Dept. of Local Government, Border Zone Development Project	via bzdp@malawi.net or localgovt@globemw.net	+265 1334135, +265 9957263, +265 1789388, +265 1756925, fax +265 1332576	P.O. Box 627, Mzuzu, Malawi or P.O. Box 30312, Capital City, Lilongwe 3, Malawi
13.	Clements	Douglas	Ghana	Program Support Unit, CIDA	dclements@cidapsu.org	+233 (21) 7011573, fax +233 (21) 7011572	c/o Canadian High Commission, P.O. Box 1639, Accra, Ghana
14.	Dannson	Angela	Ghana	Ministry of Food & Agriculture (MOFA), Policy Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation Directorate (PPMED)	angela_dannson@hotmail.com	+233 (21) 668523 Ext. 112	Box M.37, Accra, Ghana
15.	Dietvorst	Desirée	Namibia	Consultant, Rural Development	dd@salamandernet.de	+264 (61) 229050	P.O. Box 11662-Klein Windhoek, Windhoek, Namibia
16.	Droppelmann	Klaus (Dr.)	Zambia	GTZ-ASSP	assp@zamnet.zm Klaus@coppernet.zm	+260 (32) 20530, fax +260 (32) 20048	P.O. Box 630613, Choma, Zambia
17.	Ekekpi	Gordon K.	Ghana	Ministry of Food & Agriculture (MOFA)	sadep@africaonline.com.gh	+233 7122908, +233 7122708	Box 14, Tamale, NR, Ghana
18.	Eledi	Emmanuel Doricles	Ghana	Ministry of Food and Agriculture / CIDA	emmaeledi@yahoo.com	+233 (744) 22347, +233(71)25073, +233(24)296034, fax +233 (744) 22347	P.O. Box 22, Yendi, Ghana
19.	Engel	Albert	Namibia	GTZ Coordinator Rural Development	albert.engel@gtz.de	+264-61-222447	P.O. Box 8016, Bachbrecht, Windhoek, Namibia

No.	LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	COUNTRY	PROJECT / ORG.	E-MAIL	TELEPHONE NO.	ADDRESS
20.	Feldman	Marc	South Africa	Decentralised Development Programme (DDP) (SA) & National Dept. of Provincial & Local Government	marcfeld@global.co.za	+27 (11) 487-1002, cell +27 (82) 882-7820, fax +27 (11) 487-1025	8 Gadcoyne Street, Observatory, Johannesburg, 3298, South Africa
21.	Fischer	Roland	Zambia	District Development Programme, Zambia	ddpfisch@coppernet.zm	+260 (32) 20538, fax +260 (32) 20538	P.O. Box 630145, Choma, Zambia
22.	da Graca	José	Mozambique	Ministry of Agriculture & Rural Dev.	jgraca@dpadrmanica.org	+258 (51) 22075, fax +258 (51) 22706	P.O. Box 42, Chimoio, Zambia
23.	Grimm	Joseph	South Africa	GTZ MRDP	grimm@pixie.co.za	+27 (13) 755-1450, cell +27 (82) 881-5917, fax +27 (13) 755 1980	P.O. Box 101 36, Nelspruit 1200, South Africa
24.	Guigma	Salif (Dr.)	Burkina Faso	Permanent Secretariat of Agricultural Sector, Policy Coordination, SP/CCPSA	Sguigma.sp-cpsa@cenatrim.bf00226318461	00226 331910	03BP7081, Ouagadougou 03, Burkina Faso
25.	Gwinner	Joost	Cameroon	RSP / GTZ (Projet Réorientation de la Stratégie Phytosanitaire)	gtzresp@aol.com	+237 770-2361	B.P. 7814, Yaounde, Cameroon
26.	Hauser	Eberhard	Germany	GTZ/BMZ	Eberhard.hauser@gtz.de		
27.	Hesse	Johann	Ghana	Agricultural Policies & Services Support, Ghana Ministry of Agriculture, and GTZ	Johann.Hesse@gtz.de	+233 (21) 671415, fax +233 (21) 671416	P.O. Box KA9698, Accra, Ghana
28.	Hoefler	Heike	Kenya	GTZ	Heike.hoefler@gtz.de	+254 (20) 2722419, fax +254 (20) 2722424, cell +254 (722) 345 301	P.O. Box 41607, Nairobi, Kenya
29.	Hoffmann	Reimund	Zambia	GTZ / ASSP	assp@zamnet.zm	+260 (32) 20530, fax +260 (32) 20048	P.O. Box 630613, Choma, Zambia
30.	Ijeoma	Edwin	South Africa	NEPAD Secretariat	edwini@nepad.org	+27113133123	P.O. Box 1234, Halfway House, Midrand, South Africa
31.	Kachikopa	Lawrence	Malawi	MOAIFS	kachikopaim@malawi.gov.mw	2658822253	P.O. Box 30134, Lilongwe 3, Malawi

No.	LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	COUNTRY	PROJECT / ORG.	E-MAIL	TELEPHONE NO.	ADDRESS
32.	Kapiye	Sam	Namibia	Ministry of lands Resettlement and Rehabilitation	kapiye@web.com.za	264-61-257104 264-811223316	P/Bag 13343, Windhoek, Namibia
33.	Khonje	Chris	Malawi	Ministry of Agriculture	chrisssonje@hotmail.uk	265-1332083	P.O. Box 131, Mzuzu, Malawi
34.	Kirsch-Jung	Karl P.	Germany	GTZ	karl-peter.kirsch-jung@gtz.de	+49 6196 79 1554	P.O. Box 5180, 65726 Eschborn, Germany
35.	Kumwenda	Ian	Malawi	MASIP Secretariat	inkumwenda@malawi.net	+265 1755202, fax +265 1752186	P/Bag 8, Lilongwe, Malawi
36.	Magagula	Charles	South Africa	Premier's Office: Macro Policy & Strategy Management	cmagagula@nel.mpu.gov.za	+27137662386	P/B x11291 Nelspruit 1200 Republic of South Africa
37.	Mathebula	Phillemon	South Africa	Department of Agriculture, Conservation & Environment	pmathebula@nelagri.l.agric.za	+27 137666006	P/Bag X11219, Nelspruit 1200, South Africa
38.	Medou	Jean Claude	Cameroon	Ministry of Agriculture, Agricultural Policy Support Unit	jmedou@yahoo.fr	+237 222-1152, +237 751-8116, fax +237 222-1151	Ministry of Agriculture (DEPA/CAPA), Yaouande, Cameroon
39.	Meinzer	Elsa	Uganda	GTZ-BEUPA project (Basic Education in Urban Poverty Areas)	beupa@africaonline.co.ug	+256 (41) 258-378, cell +256 (75) 791-792	GTZ, P.O. Box 7016, 23 Nakasero Road, Kampala, Uganda
40.	Mwanaumo	Anthony	Zambia	Agricultural Consultative Forum (ACF)	mwanaumo@zamnet.zm		Private Bag 16, Woodlands, Lusaka, Zambia
41.	Mwenja	Kenda	Kenya	Kilifi District Development Project	via Walter Salzer kddp@africaonline.co.ke	+254 (41) 522383, +254 (41) 522382, fax +254 (41) 522285	P.O. Box 666, Kilifi, Kenya
42.	Nduati	Julius	Kenya	Ministry of Agriculture & Livestock Dev.	via gtzkasim@nbnet.co.ke	cell +254 (722)- 308960, +254 (20) 2719013	P.O. Box 30028, Nairobi, Kenya

No.	LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	COUNTRY	PROJECT / ORG.	E-MAIL	TELEPHONE NO.	ADDRESS
43.	Neves	Leonor	Mozambique	Ministry of Agriculture & Rural Dev.	leonor@dpadmanca.org	2585122075	P.O. Box 42, Chimoio
44.	Ngobese	Peter	South Africa	Farmer Support & Development	adgfsd@nda.agric.za	+27123197202/7008 or 082 805 2946	+27123196707
45.	Njau	Ruth	Kenya	GTZ PES/KASIM	gtzkasim@nbnet.co.ke	+254 (20) 2722419, fax +254 (20) 2722424	PO. Box 41607, Nairobi
46.	Nkatiko	Collins	Zambia	Min of Agriculture & Cooperatives	cnkatiko@zamnet.zm	+260 (32) 20796, fax +260 (32) 20796	P.O. Box 680042, Choma, Zambia
47.	Obeng-Dapaah	Frank	Ghana	Programme for Rural Action/R.C.C, Sunyani		+233 (61) 27115 (office) +233-061-26189	P.O. Box 104, Sunyani, Ghana
48.	Obidha	Leonard	Kenya	Ministry of planning	lobidha@yahoo.com	+254 (20) 338111	P.O. Box 30005, Nairobi, Kenya
49.	Ogambi	Agayo	Kenya	Kenya Trade Point/KNCCI1	agayoo@yahoo.com	+254 (20) 20867, cell +254 (722) 970936	P.O. BOX 47024, 00100 Nairobi, Kenya
50.	Ohemeng-Boateng	Daniel	Ghana	Ministry of Food & Agriculture	ohemengboat@yahoo.co.uk	+ 233 (21) 7011520/19, fax +233 (21) 668245, fax +233 (21) 668264	PPME, P.O. Box M37, Accra, Ghana
51.	Onyach-Olaa	Martin	Uganda		martinolaa@yahoo.co.uk or peri@imul.com	+256 (41)232741, cell +256 (71) 700178, +256 (77) 486757	P.O. Box 2290, Kampala, Uganda
52.	Otoo	Lena	Ghana	Ministry of Food & Agriculture PDMED	lena_otoo@yahoo.com or via johann.hesse@gtz.de	+233 (21) 668523, fax +233 (21) 668248	P.O. Box MB 37, Accra, Ghana
53.	Otzen	Uwe (Dr.)	Germany	German Dev. Institute, Africa Dept.	via Gisela.Kuhlmann@DIE- GDI.de	+49 (228) 94927-130, +49 (228) 94927-164, fax +49 (228) 94927- 130	German Development Institute (GDI), Tulpenfeld 4, 53113 Bonn, Germany
54.	Owomugasho	Daisy	Uganda		owomugasho@yahoo.com		

No.	LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	COUNTRY	PROJECT / ORG.	E-MAIL	TELEPHONE NO.	ADDRESS
55.	Paans	Bart	South Africa	EU Political Economics & Trade Section	BART.PAANS@CEC.EU.INT	+27 (12) 452 5226	George Storrak Drive Pretoria, South Africa
56.	Pilgram	Klaus	South Africa	SNRD-secretariat; RD-Advisor	pilgram@gtzpsdp.co.za	+27 (12) 342-3537, fax : +27 (12) 342-3510 cell: +27 83 3279790	P.O. Box 13732, 0028 Hatfield/Pretoria, South Africa
57.	Potter	Harry	Malawi	DfID	H-Potter@dfid.gov.uk	+265 (1) 772400, fax 265 (1) 772657	P.O. Box 30042, Lilongwe, Malawi
58.	Rabitsch	Maria- Waltrud	Austria	Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Department for Development Co- operation	m.rabitsch@utanet.at	+43 (1) 5446021	Wimmergasse 34/11, A- 1050 Vienna, Austria
59.	Salzer	Walter	Kenya	KDDP - Kilifi District Development Programme	kddp@africaonline.co.ke	+254 (41) 22382, fax +254 (41) 22285	P.O. Box 666, Kilifi, Kenya
60.	Santho	Sehoai	South Africa	Council of NGOs Lesotho	sehoai.santho@up.ac.za	+27 (12) 420 4439,	P.O. Box 12948, Hatfield 0023, South Africa
61.	Shanyengana	M	Namibia	Ministry of lands Resettlement and Rehabilitation	Mukwaita@namibia.com.za	+264 (61) 257104 +264 (81) 244668	P/Bag 13343, Windhoek, Namibia
62.	Stubblefield	Leigh	Malawi	DFID	Lk-stubblefield@dfid.gov.uk	+265 (1) 772400, fax 265 (1) 772657	DFID Malawi P.O. Box 30042 Lilongwe 3, Malawi
63.	Tshoba	Jerry	South Africa	Premier's Office: Macro Policy & Strategy Management	jtshoba@nel.mpu.gov.za	+27 137662387/8	P.O. Box 64, Whiteriver, South Africa 1240
64.	Weidinger	Rita	Ghana	GTZ-SFSP	gtzsun@ncs.com.gh	+233 (61) 27376, fax +233 (61) 27376	Box 473, Sunyani, Ghana
65.	Werth	Alexander	Switzerland	ICTSD	awerth@ictsd.ch	+41 (22) 9178379	13, Chemin des Anemones, 1219 Geneva, Switzerland

No.	LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	COUNTRY	PROJECT / ORG.	E-MAIL	TELEPHONE NO.	ADDRESS
66.	Wessler	Gesa	Netherlands	CTA - Technical Centre for Agricultural and Rural Cooperation (ACP-EU)	wessler@cta.int	+31 (317) 467 135, fax +31 (317) 460 067	Postbus 380, NL 6700 AJ Wageningen, The Netherlands
67.	Yenga	Fewdays (Mr.)	Zambia	District Development Programme, Zambia	c/o Roland Fischer ddpfisch@coppernet.zm	+260 97844414, +260 1224647, +260 (3) 323284, fax +260 (3) 321658	c/o GTZ/DDP, Private Bag RW 37 X, Lusaka, Zambia
68.	Zormelo	Douglas	Ghana	Zormelo & Associates	douglaszormelo@yahoo.com	+233 (20) 201 9291	PMB CT 126, Cantonments, Accra, Ghana