PN-ACD-245
98783

FROM CRISIS MANAGEMENT TO STRATEGIC PLANNING FOR SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT:

SUB-COUNTY/TOWN PLANNING PROCEDURE AND PROCESS GUIDELINES

Prepared for

USAID/Kampala

and

NEAP Secretariat
Kampala, Uganda

Prepared by

Peter G Veit
World Resources Institute
Washington, D C , USA

8 August 1994

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acronyms

I Introduction

II Sub-County Development Planning

III Town Development Planning

IV Strategic Sustainable Development Planning

Policy, Legislation and Institutions

Local Government By-Laws

Extension Staff

Financial Decentralization

Capacity-Building
- Technical Expertise
- Organization and Management
- Strategic Planning for Sustainable Development

Sub-County Decision-Making Process

Sub-County Strategic Planning Process

Town Decision-Making Process

Town Strategic Planning Process

References

Annex A The Local Governments (RC) Statute, 1993 (Statute No 15)
Annex B The (Draft) Environment Management Bill, 1994 (Bill No 7)
Annex C Terms of Reference
Annex D Methodology
Annex E Schedule of Activities
Annex F Primary Contacts
Annex G Kasese District
Annex H Comparison Charts
Annex I Resource Maps
Annex J Seasonal Calendars

B

ACRONYMS

ADES	Assistant District Executive Secretary
APE	Applied Program for the Environment (USAID)
CG	Central Government
CGR	Central Government Representative
D&D	Diagnostic and Design
DDC	District Development Committee
DDES	Deputy District Executive Secretary
DEC	District Environmental Committee
DEO	District Environmental Officer
DES	District Executive Secretary
DHEC	District Health and Environment Committee
DRC	District Resistance Council
DSC	District Services Committee
DTB	District Tender Board
DTPC	District Technical Planning Committee
EEC	European Economic Community
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
EMB	Environment Mnagement Bill (draft)
GOU	Government of Uganda
GRO	Grassroots Organization
LGAC	Local Government Accounts Commission
LGFC	Local Government Finance Committee
LGHEC	Local Government Health and Environment Committee
LGS	Local Governments Statute, 1993
MOLG	Ministry of Local Government
MOPS	Ministry of Public Service
NEAP	National Environment Action Plan
NEIC	National Environmental Information Centre
NEMA	National Environmental Management Authority
NGO	Non-Governmental Organziation
PRA	Participatory Rural Appraisal
RC	Resistance Council
RC1	Resistance Council/Community
RC2	Resistance Council/Parish
RC3	Resistance Council/Sub-County
RC4	Resistance Council/County
RC5	Resistance Council/District
RRA	Rapid Rural Appraisal
S/C	Sub-County
SD	Sustainable Development
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
WB	World Bank
WRI	World Resources Institute

I INTRODUCTION

Decentralizing environmental planning and management is an important component of the NEAP in Uganda The NEAP Secretariat, USAID, DANNIDA (Rakai District), World Bank, UNDP, and other organization have allocated significant time and resources towards this effort This effort builds on the on-going decentralization program by the Government of Uganda (GOU), by providing more specific guidelines and options for decentralizing environment management, including planning, by-laws, financial resources, information, etc In addition, the NEAP Secretariat is providing specific project assistance for implementing environmental projects at the local-level In these efforts, the NEAP Secretariat has worked with other government departments, including the Ministry of Local Government, Ministry of Public Service, and Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning

In December 1993, the Local Government Statute (LGS) was passed into law which devolves new rights, responsibilities, and authority to local governments for purposes of local development and environmental management (Annex A) The draft Environment Management Bill, prepared by the NEAP Secretariat, builds on the LGS and provides more specific guidelines and recommendations for decentralizing environment management, particularly at the district level (Annex B) Other government initiatives will similarly strengthen local governments (i e , unified extension services, further streamlining local administration, redefining local administration boundaries, etc)

While the LGS proposes that all levels of local government are to prepare and implement development plans, the focus is on the district and urban levels (The LGS is silent on several issues, particularly on operations and on issues below the district) Yet about 90 percent of Ugandans live in rural regions With the further strengthening of local government, including financial decentralization, there is need to examine the roles of local governments below the district, especially with regard to development planning "Centralizing at the district-level" is a concern of all involved in the decentralization effort

In 1993 and 94, the NEAP Secretariat made progress on decentralizing natural resource management below the district The NEAP examined sub-district environmental planning (Veit 1993), environmental information (Brusberg 1994), and will soon examine issues of local by-laws for environmental management and economic incentives for natural resource management Given current capacity and powers, the sub-county is an appropriate and preferred level of local administration in the rural regions for development and environmental management planning Among its advantages are (see Veit 1993, LGS)

* Lowest level of public administration with civil service, including RC3, chief, tax office, police unit, prison, and extension staff (agricultural assistant, veterinary assistant, health inspector, forest guard/ranger),

* Effective links with local people ("the sub-county presents the 'local' level in

Uganda") Each sub-county includes an average 8-9 RC1s/villages, 15,000-30,000 people) Highest administrative level with good understanding/knowledge of local problems and opportunities,

* A legal corporate body with the power to sue and be sued The lowest administrative level with political authority to generate government revenue, including graduated tax, collect fines, impose charges, etc The sub-county now retains 50 percent of government revenues collected (up from 20 percent),

* Lowest administrative level directly represented in RC (every DRC includes one representative from each sub-county and town RC), and

* Lowest RC level in which members receive allowances (no RC level is paid salary)

This report provides guidelines -- decision-making, institutions, technical assistance, authority, planning methodologies -- for environment/development planning at the sub-district level, with a focus on the RC3 - sub-county/town (Annex C) It proposes a planning methodology to prepare sub-county sustainable development plans The work makes several assumptions regarding national actions and is based on some specific changes at the district, town, and sub-county levels

It is important to note that not only has the NEAP in Uganda addressed issues of decentralization for environmental management in more detail than NEAPs in other sub-Saharan nations, the NEAP Secretariat has also been at the fore of other government agencies in strengthening local government below the district

The fieldwork for this report was undertaken in Kasese District with a focus on four sub-counties and Kasese Town (Annex C, D, E, F) Kasese District is also one of six NEAP pilot districts The development and environment issues in Kasese District are typical of Uganda in general and probably representative of other districts (Annex G) This is not to mask the many, sometimes very important difference between sub-counties and districts, especially in power and influence which significantly impact government decision-making, including development planning For example, DRCs more powerful in the southwest because government influence, while DES more powerful in the north where there has been less government impact) Similarly, the Chiefs and RCs at the local level vary in power and influence

II SUB-COUNTY DEVELOPMENT PLANNING

All levels of local government have long had legal responsibilities in development planning and implementation For various reasons, including political, financial, and technical, these responsibilities have not been effectively undertaken in most cases Districts and urban councils (and formerly regions) have received some technical/financial support and granted some needed

authority from central government which has enabled them to (attempt to) undertake these tasks As a result, however, these levels have more experience than other (lower) levels of government (although, in some cases, the realignment of local administrative boundaries means that some such levels are newly established and have less development planning/implementation experience) In the last 2 years, however, central government has also provided some resources and power (see above) to some sub-counties (RC3s) for development planning and implementation purposes

The LGS reiterates the need for all levels of local government (RC1-RC5) to prepare and implement development plans The LGS, however, represents a major change in the structure of the planning system The most significant change is in the level of responsibility With the streamlining of local government (no regions, sub-parishes) and the interest to further devolve decision-making powers for development purposes, a greater degree of responsibility and initiative in planning has been conferred on the local councils, in particular the districts, urban councils, and, increasingly, sub-counties New powers and resources have been availed to the sub-counties for these purposes (see above) For example, RC3 (and RC5) Councils have been given corporate legal status, so they can engage in economic as well as political activities, and donors (and some PVOs/NGOs) are increasingly working with these levels of local government in implementing projects

The administrative procedures established with the creation of the Resistance Council (RC) statute, coupled with the increased level of financial resources made available to the sub-counties in the last two years have facilitated some development planning The local government statutes, however, offer few guidelines on how the development plans are to be prepared, or how the RCs are to make decisions It appears that many sub-counties with experience in development planning have utilized a similar planning process -- one based on a conservative and narrow interpretation of the RC system and decision-making procedures

This interpretation recognizes that the various local government statutes identify the RC as the policy-making organ within its area of jurisdiction, including formulating and initiating development plans (Figures 1) A Village Resistance Council (RC1) includes all adults (18+ years of age) residing in the village, higher level RCs (RC2-RC4) include that level's RC Executives, plus all members of RC Executives one level below the concerned level Most RC3s include 45 or more members (RC3 Executives plus RC2 Executives from each of the sub-county's parishes) Local chiefs and some other government officials are ex-officio members

The RC5 Council includes one elected representative from each sub-county and town RC and one elected representative for women from each county and municipal RC Thus each sub-county (RC3) is represented not only at the county (RC4), but also at the district level This has important implications for both district and sub-county development planning

The 9-member Resistance Committee (RC Executive) is responsible for implementing the policies and decisions of its Council, including to encourage, support, and participate in self-help

projects and to mobilize people, material and technical assistance for development actions The Chairman of the RC Executive is the political head of the area (and in the district, also the chairman of the District Development Committee), and many parts of the country, the senior person in the area, especially below the district (where there is no DES or CGR) The sub-county/parish chiefs are the administrative heads responsible for collecting government revenue, implementing development projects, policing, and implementing RC policies and decisions (same as RC Executive)

Kasese District sub-counties began development planning -- as they do today -- when given the authority to retain 20 percent of the Graduated Tax and other taxes, fees and licenses (i e , financial resources stimulated planning) Development planning for self-help or the chance of donor assistance was rarely, if ever, undertaken Collections for a development fund provided relatively few resources and resulted only in project planning

The current sub-county planning process is a three-pronged approach

* Financial Assessment The process commonly begins with an assessment of the available financial resources by the RC Executive or a subset thereof, often the RC Executive Chairman, Chief, and sometimes the RC Secretary for Finance

* Project Design Bounded by the available resources, a list of projects/actions is then prepared, again more often by the RC Executive Chairman or the same small group of individuals The actions are identified and selected based on these people's understanding of local problems and the residents' wishes In some cases, informal discussions are held with RC1s or RC2s, but rarely are they formally requested to submit their recommendations on how to spend sub-county funds

  Amounts (or percentages) of the sub-county funds are then allocated for each selected project In addition to the available financial resources, the actions often also require local resource contributions, such as labor and materials, as well as additional external support, such as medicine for a dispensary or a teacher for a school Agreements for these other resources are rarely secured before the plan is prepared and approved

* Review and Approval This plan is then presented at a RC3 meeting for discussion and approval Rarely are significant changes made to the draft plans, although is some cases, the percentage of resources allocated to separate activities within the plan are adjusted In most cases the bulk of the financial resources are allocated to one effort (i e , school, dispensary) which may require most of the resources for several years

  Finally, the RC3 approved plan is sent to the district for RC5 approval and then returned to the sub-county for implementation Similarly, the RC5 rarely makes

changes to the RC3 plans

Despite this generalization of the planning process and outcomes, it is important to recognize variability (both within and across districts) in sub-county planning and development actions One of the most important and obvious difference is the individual or group of individuals which takes the lead in preparing the draft plan In Kasese District, the Chairman of the RC Executives of all levels has relatively more actual power and influence than the chiefs and CGR so they take the lead In other districts in Uganda, the chiefs and/or CGRs tend to have more power than the RC3 Executives

Sub-counties also varied in the actions undertaken in part because of different local economic circumstances -- some sub-counties were wealthier or more densely populated than others and had access to more financial resources In addition to financial differences, sub-counties differ in their access to technical support, important in both development planning and implementation Actions also vary across sub-county because of differences in socio-cultural needs and ecological realities

The RC system established in 1986 and strengthened with the passing of the LGS 1993, empowers local government and offers considerable opportunities for popular participation in national policy-making and local decision-making The complex hierarchy of elected local councils stretching from village to district level legally allows for true representation by communities in local and even national government (RC4 Councils while generally inactive, do form the electoral college for NRC elections) The success of the RC system is crucial to long-term development in Uganda, and could correct the excessive centralization and lack of accountability inherent in the previous systems

To achieve its goals, the RC system must be able to identify social needs, mobilize local resources, enforce accountability, and ensure efficiency Despite the new roles, responsibilities, powers, and authorities of the RC3s, however, their experiences in development planning and implementation in the last 1-2 years highlights several weaknesses and shortcomings In particular, they have been hampered by limited financial resources, technical skills, and experience There has also been some lack of social responsibility, and discipline Equally important, the opportunities for local participation offered by the RC system have not always been effectively capitalized on

The current RC3 development planning process has several shortcoming with multiple impacts on the final plan which is approved by the RC3 and RC5 Councils Some of the most obvious include

* Crisis Management/Disaster Relief The planning approach identifies actions in support of short-term interests and needs These actions often address symptoms rather than root causes, and the interests/needs are often isolated and disparate For example, each year local governments spend scarce resources on repairing

roads and bridges, never addressing the causes of flooding and landslides, such as denuded hillslopes At best, the planning approach results in a piecemeal or "building-block" approach to development which is usually not sustainable or environmentally sound More often, this planning process amounts to crisis management and/or disaster relief, and the development plan is simply a list of urgent actions (this approach has also been encouraged by central government/donors which focus on project design)

The reasons for such planning are clear Underdevelopment, disasters (earthquake, army worms, floods), and other urgent challenges preoccupy most levels of local government, including sub-counties, and use up most local resources Under such overwhelming circumstances, it is often difficult to undertake strategic long-term development planning or to allocate scarce resources toward actions in support of new opportunities, growth, or some distant/future benefits It is also important to note that many development assistance agencies do not encourage strategic planning by local government or support the implementation of such plans Most donors, PVOs, and central government department prepare separate projects in defining their support to the local level (often developing initiatives which first support their institution's strategic plan, rather than the region's priorities) In many cases this is done in isolation from local government

* RC Executives in RC Decision-Making In most cases, the development plan is essentially the product of one or a few individuals, often only the RC3 Executive Chairman RC Executive Chairman are particularly influential in RC Council decisions (especially in Western and South-Western Uganda) [1] For example, Kasese District RC3 Councils have rarely made substantial changes to the draft development plan, although some have adjusted the percentage of money allocated to each action/project Similarly, the RC5 Council has rarely made changes to the RC3 Council approved plans Thus, in practice, the RC3 and RC5 Councils are rubber stamps for the RC3 Executive Chairman's decisions In the process, the inherent opportunities for popular participation in the RC system are lost by silent or weak Councils

* Lack of Technical Expertise The sub-county development planning process and implementation often lack critical technical expertise Most sub-counties have a limited extension staff and civil service (at most only an agricultural assistant,

---

[1] The reasons for the RC Executive Chairman influence are debatable but may include strong support from central government, literal interpretation of the decentralization laws, and the large size of the RC3 Councils which makes reaching consensus difficult

veterinary assistant, forest ranger, and health inspector), many having been "retrenched" as a result of the on-going "right-sizing" of government And most RC Executives, while responsible for certain sectors, have limited technical expertise/experience (particular apparent in the RC Executive Secretary of Finance) Most such "politicians" are voted into office because of their influence in society, not because of their capacity to effectively undertake the position's responsibilities (voting is conducted by standing behind the candidate of choice) Equally important, the RC Executive and Council rarely capitalize on the independent expertise and experience within their constituencies (such options are legal but are not explicitly mentioned in the LTS are not considered, or may be assumed to be illegal) Thus, many development decisions and actions that require technical experience are made/undertaken by unqualified politicians

* Political Economy of Decision-Making The sub-county development plans include actions important for social welfare and economic gains, but they often do not address the priority needs and concerns of the rural farmers For example, most sub-counties in Kasese District have spent the great majority of their resources in the last 1-2 years on one capital-intensive project, most often a school or dispensary (little money is spent at the community or village-cluster level) While these are important contributions to local development, their selection (by the RC3 Executive Chairman) has been influenced by political agendas and government statements/promises The RC3 Executives (and therefore Councils) are elected for 3-year terms by their constituencies Politicians preoccupied with be re-elected prefer large, visible projects because they better highlight/showcase their contributions than multiple, small "invisible" efforts Similarly, many schools are being constructed because of a recent Presidential statement that primary education would be free to all Ugandans by 2003, dispensaries are often constructed because of promises of supplies and health workers

III TOWN DEVELOPMENT PLANNING

Town Council (RC3) and administration authority, capacities, and experiences in development planning and implementation differ significantly from those of sub-county Towns also face unique environment and development challenges that require responses different from those in the predominantly rural sub-counties These differences result in town development planning processes and actions that differ from sub-county plans

* Self-Accounting All Urban Councils -- town (RC3), municipal (RC4), city (RC5) councils -- have for many years had responsibilities in development planning and implementation, and some power and resources to effectively undertake these activities Unlike rural councils, including sub-counties, which are accountable to district authorities, Urban Councils are self-accounting affording them considerable autonomy from district oversight For example, town

development plans do not need to be approved by District Councils Although town (and municipal) councils do not report to the district authorities, they remain part of the district Most districts include only one urban council which is also the district headquarters (and county headquarters) as well as the "heart" of the district

* Financial Resources Urban councils have for many years had corporate legal status to enable them to generate and utilize government revenue for local administration and development purposes, engage in economic activities, and work directly with banks and donor agencies For example, town councils have for many years retained 20 percent of the graduated tax and other taxes and fees, while sub-counties have only had this authority for the last 1-2 years Towns also generally include more tax payers and a larger number of tax payers in higher tax brackets than rural sub-counties This relative wealth means that town councils not only have more money from the graduate tax, but their residents are also in better economic position to pay additional taxes The urban setting also makes collecting of taxes, fines, licenses, fees, and other government revenue logistically much easier than in rural settings

* Technical Expertise Unlike sub-counties, most towns have a suite of civil servants with a range of technical expertise, including an agricultural officer, forester, veterinarian, as well as a treasurer, accountant/cashier, land officer, tax collector, health inspector, police force, etc The head of the civil service is the Town Clerk who is appointed by central government (the sub-county equivalent is the chief) Towns are also better positioned than sub-counties to attract qualified and experienced extension staff and other civil servants because they can offer better accommodations and other staff benefits and most government employees prefer to live in an urban, rather than a rural setting

Equally important, town councils participate more in district affairs than sub-county councils and have better access to district extension staff and other technical expertise For example, District Councils include one elected representative from each sub-county, county, town, and municipal council, but only town and municipal councils are represented in the District Development Committee (DDC) In Kasese, the Town Council is also a voting member of the District Environmental Committee These positions and other opportunities give towns greater influence over district development planning than sub-counties, and enable them to tap into district expertise For example, Kasese Town Council will not establish a Town Environmental Committee, rather the Kasese District Environmental Committee will provide assistance and guidance to the town on sustainable development and environmental matters The physical proximity of the town's administrative offices to the district headquarters also facilitates their participation/involvement in other district committees and sub-committees

* Environmental Challenges The relatively dense human populations, urban environments, and non-farming economic activities of towns lead to "brown" environmental problems, such as sanitation/health, pollution, and waste management While rural environmental problems are often related to soil erosion, water availability, and fuelwood shortages, urban environmental problems may be related to sanitation/sewage, air pollution, industrial pollution, clear water, flooding, etc Although towns generally cover a smaller geographic area than sub-counties, and they have more financial resources and technical expertise at their disposal, these town environmental and development challenges are frequently more capital intensive and technically complex (i e , requiring specific technical knowledge) than rural problems Town sustainable development efforts are often complicated by rapid urbanization and expansion in the absence of an effective urban plan (i e , building-block approach) From a technical perspective, the "best" solutions to many town environmental challenges require fundamental changes in the layout of the town (i e , disassembling and rebuilding many existing structures and infrastructure) On this note, it is important to mention that small urban centers are developing in many rural sub-counties These fledgling urban centers should be well planned to accommodate future growth and development

Assuming the Kasese Town development planning process is representative of town planning in Uganda (and other urban councils), the effort involves different institutions/individuals than sub-county planning and is a more involved and comprehensive process, in part because of the greater technical skills available to the Town Council For multiple reasons, town planning is also more complex, politically charged, and difficult to manage

Unlike Kasese District sub-county planning which is led by the RC3 Executive Chairman, Kasese Town development planning is spearheaded by the Town Clerk -- although the RC3 Executive Chairman provides important support It was not possible under this work to assess whether this structure is common in other towns However, because of the important role of the civil service in development planning, Town Clerks may be in a better position to lead the planning effort than the RC3 Executive

The Kasese Town development planning process is essentially a three pronged effort

* Financial Assessment Town development plans must be in line with available financial resources, so Kasese Town planning begins with an assessment of the expected financial resources available in the coming fiscal year (which may vary -- sometimes significantly -- from year-to-year) It is recognized/assumed that funds -- for purchasing needed material resources or technical assistance -- are the principal constraint to development This assessment is undertaken by the Town Clerk with support from the RC3 Executive Chairman and assistance from the Town Financial Committee

The percentage/amount of development funds (total resources minus recurring costs -- administration, salaries, etc) available to each sector -- health, education, etc -- are then allocated In Kasese Town these figures have remained fairly consistent over the years and so there is generally little discussion needed on this matter

* Sectoral Planning The Town Clerk then instructs the relevant civil service heads/RC sub-committees to prepare sectoral plans which fit into their respective budgets For example, the Town health inspector works with the health sub-committee, the Town engineer works with the General Purpose Committee, etc In most cases, the civil service heads, because of its technical expertise, take the lead in preparing the draft sectoral plans These plans are basically lists of projects which are not necessarily selected because of their contribution toward a strategic long-term goal/objective (although Kasese town theoretically is to prepare 5-year plans)

* Review and Approval The sectoral plans are first reviewed by the RC Financial Committee to ensure they fit within their allocated budgets Special projects which require additional resources are highlighted The plans are then passed to the RC Executive for review The RC Executive brings the sectoral plans together into a single draft town development plan This plan is then presented to the RC3 Council for discussion and final approval The approved plans are then passed back to the relevant civil service heads/departments for implementation

Town development planning and implementation have several advantages over sub-county planning For example, town civil service staff (and district staff) provide offers technical expertise absent in most sub-counties This helps ensure that the plans/projects are technically feasible and financially viable It also offers opportunities for better financial management and project administration in the implementation of the plans Towns also have access to more financial resources than sub-counties, so it is more likely that projects can be implemented More financial and technical resources also allow for more actions to be undertaken in each year

Town planning, however, also suffers many of the same problems as sub-county planning For example, town planning is essentially project identification for crises management rather than strategic, long-term objectives The RC Council is also basically a rubber stamp for the draft plan that is forwarded to it by the RC Executive Several problems associated with town development planning are particularly noteworthy because they are often more acute in town planning than in sub-county planning These include

* Political Influence The available technical expertise of the town civil service would suggest that projects are more likely to be selected on the basis of their technical feasibility and financial merit, and that development planning is somewhat delinked from local politics In reality, however, the political

dimension/economy of decision-making in towns significantly impacts development planning (and often makes financial accountability more difficult) For various reasons, town public administration has significantly more power and influence over local decision-making, resources, and development than its counterparts in the sub-counties In addition, their decisions often have greater impact on more people than sub-county decisions Thus, individuals and institutions involved in economic or other activities in towns can be significantly and differentially impacted -- for good or bad -- by different town administration decisions

For these and other reasons, individuals and institutions in towns seek to influence town administration and public decision-making more than farmers and other rural residents seem to do in the sub-counties Public administrators are confronted with various interests and must make decisions which may invariably be beneficial to some residents and harmful to others The decision-making process is often influenced by the individuals/institutions concerned, the impacts of alternative decisions, and the short- and long-term benefits to the public policymakers Those individuals and institutions which have greater resources at their disposal often have greater influence with policymakers In essence, this reduces the opportunities and capacities for most town residents to participate in town policy-making Indeed, many individuals who stand in town administration elections often do so as much to serve the public as they do to better their own welfare

* Popular Participation While on the one hand, town residents have fewer opportunities/capacity to participate in the policy-making, on the other hand, many also often have less interest in doing so When given opportunities to participate (for example, to attend town planning meetings), there is less RC1 and RC2 involvement than in sub-county meetings Several reasons were proposed to explain this situation Kasese Town residents live there principally for business and economic reasons The residents are from different backgrounds and ethnic groups, and most usually reside in Kasese town for only a few years before moving elsewhere As a result, the residents are less interested in the long-term development of Kasese Town, RC1s and RC2s are less organized and involved in town decision-making (although as noted above, individuals/institutions are involved to advance other agendas This involvement/participation, however, takes a different form than for town development) Because of the larger number of people in each town as compared to sub-counties, each RC includes more people, making it also more difficult for the RC Executive to represent the range of interests of its constituency Similarly, it was expressed by some in Kasese Town that the civil service -- which until recently was selected by central government and rotated to new posts every 3-5 years -- had few incentives and little interest to contribute to long-term development

Potentially, however, the opportunities for preparing and implementing development plans which capture the interests/needs of the local residents is high The relatively small geographic size of most towns (compared to sub-counties), means that involving RC1s and RC2s in public decision-making is not as logistically complicated or financially expensive as it is in sub-counties Similarly, both the civil service and policy-makers have greater opportunities to travel the town areas and interact with the people This can help facilitate a good understanding of the principal needs, opportunities, constraints, and problems of the town and its residents

IV STRATEGIC SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT PLANNING

With the further strengthening of local government, including further financial decentralization, there is an increasing need to shift from project design/crises management to more strategic planning for sustainable development While the goal is for all levels of local government to eventually prepare their own long-range development plans, the current focus is on the district, urban (town, municipal, city), and sub-county levels Given current capacity and resources, in most cases the sub-county will be the lowest level of local government to prepare and implement a strategic sustainable development plan

Sustainable development "meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs" (Our Common Future) To facilitate sustainable development, local governments must shift from their current mode of operation of crisis management and disaster relief to strategic planning and implementation of long-term goals and objectives Strategic planning involves establishing long-term goals, identifying an appropriate approach to achieve each goal, and implementing actions in support of the priority goal and approach To be truly sustainable, the plans must be economically feasible, socially acceptable, and environmentally sound Once prepared, local, national, and external resources -- financial and technical -- must be allocated in support of the strategic plan

A well-implemented and approved sustainable development plan will result in more coordinated activities, more effective development, and more efficient use of local resources, both in the short- and long-term (over time, sustainable development will help reduce the frequency and severity of crisis as well as the costs of disaster relief) A well-articulated strategic development plan will put sub-counties in better positions to attract and negotiate with development interests and development assistance agencies, such as higher levels of local government, central government, the local and multi-national private sector, local NGOs, international PVOs, and multi-/bi-lateral donor agencies Currently, these groups often set their own agenda which in some cases is not in the best long-term interest of the sub-county It is important for central government, the private sector, and the development assistance community to facilitate strategic development planning by local governments, and to support the implementation of the action program

The sustainable development of sub-counties and towns can be facilitated with the preparation of strategic plans The sub-county/town guidelines which follow make several assumptions and

require some preliminary actions for effective strategic planning These include

Policy, Legislation and Institutions Currently, a number of policies and laws are being reviewed and revised in Uganda Many of these reforms have resulted (will result) in significant changes from the past and, if well implemented and enforced, will significantly impact the local level, and change the way resources are governed and used Two statutes with significant implications for local governments, including sub-counties, are the Local Government Statute (LGS) and the Environmental Bill The LGS was past be Parliament in December 1993, while the draft EB was completed in early 1994 and will be debated in Parliament shortly The guidelines presented in this report assume that the LGS will be well-implemented, the EB will be approved and similarly well enforced, and new legislation does not contradict these statutes Both the LGS and EB outline central and local government institutional reform measures with some fundamental changes in power, resources, and responsibilities (i e , DEC, DEO) But both are also silent or provide considerable flexibility regarding implementation and the logistics of government operations (some of which is furthered by this report) For example, the LGS clearly states that the RC is the local policy-making organ (i e , decision-making body), but it is open on how it should make decisions/reach consensus or how it could/should include outside perspectives in its decision-making process

Local Government By-laws There has been some discussion in Uganda regarding the role of local government by-laws, particularly at the district-level, in sustainable development and natural resource management Local government by-laws are a means to help implement local/national policy and legislation Legislation is often useful when individual costs must be incurred for the benefit of the community or public unit Thus, while certain aspects of public policy are best implemented through legislation (taxes, etc), many policy guidelines (including most in this report) can probably be implemented without legislative action The authority of the RCs as perceived by lower-level RCs and the rural population is often sufficient to ensure compliance For example, many RC3s in Kasese District closely follow the RC5 guidelines for financial decentralization (i e , 5 65 20 10 split of sub-county funds), despite they not being promulgated in any by-law

In the past, legislation in support of environment and natural resource management has been punitive and sanction-laden (command-and-control), rather than based on market forces and economic incentives They have also been overly specific to not allow for alternative, sometimes equally effective, means of achieving similar policy goals and objectives The differences in local circumstances and the reality of crisis, disasters, and other demands on scarce resources means that the development process must be flexible and adaptive to effective in the longer-term

Extension Staff The on-going government SAP/ERP has had some significant impact on the civil service within local government Government retrenchment has meant that some extension staff have been let go, others have left on their own accord because government salaries are no longer competitive and, in many cases, do not provide sufficient salaries to support a family The result has been that local government, especially the sub-county, has lost some of its extension

staff There is also some discussion that the extension staff would be unified, meaning that the staff would be further reduced, but those remaining would be trained in the range of technical expertise A unified extension service will both free up more technical expertise and help facilitate a multi-disciplinary approach to development It could also mean that the extension services reaches lower levels of government This report assumes, however, that the unified extension system, if approved, will require several years to fully implement

Coupled with the discharge/new posting of regional extension officers, however, these actions have meant that many educated and experienced (now private) individuals are unemployed Many have returned to their rural regions to look for new employment These individuals constitute a pool of resources which the district should consider hiring or otherwise using (i e , DEO, etc) Furthermore, it suggests that independent input could in fact contribute to local government decision-making and planning

Financial Decentralization The LGS states that in rural areas, government revenue is to be collected by the district and sub-county RCs, and the sub-county RC will retain 50 percent, or any other higher percentage as the district RC may approve (note, only central government, districts, and urban councils can negotiate with donors for direct financing, although all levels can receive money from NGOs/PVOs) Towns retain 100 percent of the government revenues they collect The total graduated tax collected depends on the wealth of the district/town (GT levels are established by central government, but local government assesses farmer holdings The graduated tax was recently doubled across the board), but within a district it can range from USD $30-30,000 per year ($15-15,000 for the subcounty) Graduated tax accounts for about 90-95 percent of the sub-county budget, usually less in towns because of other sources, such as fees, licenses, fines, and other taxes

Guidelines have been established by central government on how the sub-county government revenues (the 50 percent of total government revenues) are to be disbursed -- 10 50 25 5 In some districts, such as Kasese District, the RC5 has set guidelines that call for a slightly different distribution -- 5 65 20 10 (Figure 2) In Kasese District, the sub-counties included 4-5 RC2s and 13-35 RC1s (Figure 3)

In FY95, the sub-counties visited in Kasese District expected between Ush 9-12 5 million (i e , 50 percent of government revenues) (Figure 4) Assuming each RC2 and RC1 gets the same amount from the RC3 (no guidelines have been established to ensure this equal distribution), the expected distribution of financial resources is relatively low at the RC2 and RC1 level (Figure 4), about Ush 500,000 and Ush 70,000, respectively

Over time, as RC2 and RC1 capacity and government revenue increases, the percentage of resources to these levels should be increased (there is also some discussion about phasing out of the county level) It is also recommended that there be no by-laws established requiring equal distribution of resources to the RC2s and RC1s RC2s and RC1s vary in their populations, needs, and costs of their needs The RC3 should have some flexibility to distributing the

financial resources If it is clear that some RC2s or RC1s are being favored at the expess of others (perhaps for political reasons), the RC5 can establish guidelines to discourage such favoritism Finally, it is proposed that central government work with RC3 to establish fiscal policies which not only generate (or save) government revenue, but also provide economic incentives for natural resource management (green fees, environmental taxes, environmental games/competition, etc)

While all districts will in the future have larger budgets (higher graduated tax, but smaller share -- offset by larger block grants from central government), the districts will also have significantly more expenses because of the need to pay all ministry/department extension staff There will also be the need to hire additional staff such as planners, financial experts, legal specialists Thus there is the need for districts to generate more government resources to pay for these services Districts must balance development with recurring costs The additional revenue can be generated in ways that do not require much enforcement (incentives rather than sanctions) because they are easy to implement thereby not only generated revenue but also cutting costs of police, etc Donors should also directly support districts, by-passing CG

Capacity-Building In Kasese District, effective sub-county sustainable development planning, must be accompanied by integrated capacity-building at both the district and sub-county/town levels, but particularly at the latter level In addition to the new powers, resources, and technical assistance given local governments under the LGS and EB, several other resources must be at the disposal of local governments for effective strategic planning as proposed in these guidelines Some of the most important include new technical assistance, sensitization/training for local government in strategic planning and environmental management, a more open decision-making process, and an improved planning process These prerequisites and preliminary actions are summarized below and in the Recommendations section It is important to note that while some districts have established some of these committees, in most cases they are less than one year old Few, if any, have hired these personnel (or any of the others suggested in the LGS)

1 Technical Expertise

* District Infrastructure/Urban Planner In the past, districts and towns have relied on the central government for technical assistance in urban planning The assistance has been short-term, and usually provided by urban planners with limited experience and expertise (these planners were also often influenced by town officials or powerful local elites) District civil service staff should include a qualified and experienced infrastructure/urban planner District plans should focus on establishing infrastructure (roads, electricity grids, future urban centers, etc) to facilitate town and sub-county development The sustainable development of urban and peri-urban centers (common in many sub-counties) requires the specialized technical expertise in an urban planner The rate of urbanization in Africa requires more technical expertise in urban planning This individual, therefore, should also be available to town and sub-county councils as necessary

to assist in RC3 development planning as necessary

* District Strategic Planning Facilitator Each districts should be encouraged to hire a planning facilitator to work with the sub-county/town officials and residents to initiate and assist the development planning process (as presented in this report) The facilitator should have experience in working with local people, and skills in information analysis, organizing meetings, priority setting, consensus-building, participatory planning methodologies (i e , PRA, RRA, ZOPP, D&D), etc

* District Environmental Officer The DEO, as proposed in the EB, will have responsibilities that differ somewhat from those proposed in the draft bill These include advising on policy and legislative matters, advising on environmental issues, district contact point for citizens concerns, coordinating EIAs, monitoring environmental changes/impacts, public environmental awareness, and environmental training/sensitization of local government staff The DEO should also be a member of the DDC, the DDC's technical planning committee, and the District Environment Committee (DEC) To be effective, DEOs should be experienced environmentalists or ecologists with broad interests and knowledge of natural resource management, rather than specific sectoral or technical specialists

* Accounting/Financial Record-Keeping Establishing a credible and standardized accounting system at the district, sub-county, and town levels is critical to ensuring sound financial management (and to passing the required annual audits) Financial decentralization will mean that all level of local government will have more financial resources at their disposal It is recommended that it be the responsibility of the RC3 to keep financial records of the government revenues at their disposal, including those funds which are used by the RC2s and RC1s in their jurisdiction (see below) Financial records for the resources going to the county should be kept by the RC4 (but the RC3 must have copies to pass audits) As the level of resources to sub-district councils increases and the technical capacity for financial management improves, the accounting responsibility can be shifted to the lower levels

Central government, financial consultants, and auditors should help design a simple and transparent accounting means for local governments Preferably, the accounting system would be sufficiently simple to allow the RC3 Executive to keep sub-county financial records Most/all districts and urban centers have accountants on their staff (and Local Government Accounts Committee, Local Government Finance Comission, Local Government Tender Board, etc), while few sub-counties do (and given financial circumstances, adding additional staff is unlikely) The LGS also requires that the Auditor General post external auditors to the districts to conduct annual audits on district, urban, and sub-county

accounts Every district will also provide for internal audit

Decision making with regard to resource use and expenditures already has several checks-and-balances in place At the district level, the DES (and staff) and the DRC (and committees) share responsibilities in decision-making with regarding development planning and resource use Neither one can use public resources without the approval/work of the other It should be noted that already RC Committees and DES/DRC are checking each other for effectiveness And extension staff have expressed concern and anxiety over being held accountable by the DES, rather than the distant parent ministry/department Similar checks-and-balances should be considered at the sub-county level For example, several RC3 signatures should be necessary before money is withdrawn from the sub-county bank account (or RC2 signature for RC2 actions, etc)

To ensure accountability, it is recommended that there be established a transparent process for reviewing and authorizing contracts, and for verifying expenditures It is important that the sub-county/town (and district LGTC) encourage competition for contracts and that the selection of contractors and supplies is fair It should be clear to all who collects the revenue and where it is stored (i e , the Treasurer/Accountant should be able to easily verify collection, deposits, and expenditures) The RCs and concerned civil service should be well aware of the paper work and reports needed for an audit In this respect the district should work closely with the sub-counties and urban councils to ensure their records are sound Accountability can be further improved by rotating the external auditors posted to the district to discourage collaboration with district and sub-county treasurers and other officials The external auditors should be paid and accountable to central government, although they could be government or private companies (a list of reputible private firms should be maintained by the Auditor-General)

2 Organization and Management

* District Environment Committees The LGS requires that each district establish a District Health and Environment Committee, while the draft EB proposes the creation of a District Environment Committee In some districts, environmental conservation and natural resource management are particularly important issues, perhaps for health (industrial pollution) or economic reasons (national parks) Because of the district attention that may need to be given to environmental matters in these districts, it may be preferable to separate the planning and implementation of health and environment actions and establish a separate District Environment Committee (DEC) This is particular relevant when the pressing environmental issues are separate from health matters The DEC would have responsibilities and powers similar to other district committees In addition,

it should be a link between the district officials and district residents on environmental matters For example, while all district committees include only RC Executives (because of their powers), DECs should be open to independent input and non-voting participation of private citizens (ex officio members) DECs should also organize forums for public discussion and debate

* Sub-County Development and Environment Committees The LGS allows for the establishment of local committees as necessary by the RC, and the EB encourages for the creation of Local Environment Committees It is proposed that each sub-county establish a Sub-County Development Committee (SCDC) and, if necessary, a Sub-County Environment Committee (SCEC), with responsibilities, powers, and composition (except lower-level RC representation) similar to those at the district level Depending on the workload of the RC3 Executive, committee meetings and other activities could be absorbed into more general RC Executive/Council meetings Of particular importance, however, such committees would help ensure attention and facilitate focused discussion on environment and development The committees and committee meetings should be open to independent input, including direct participation Private input is particular important in sub-county committees because of the near absence of technical expertise and experienced extension staff Because of the political authority committees have, direct involvement must be ex officio (see below)

* Town Development and Environment Committees Because of the longer history of development planning in towns, many sectoral committees (or sub-committees) have already been establishing and contribute to development planning Few/no towns, however, have established development or environment committees, or have environmental officers on staff Kasese Town is a member of the District Development Committee (DDC) and participates in the District Environment Committee (DEC), but has no Town Development Committee or Town Environment Committee In the past, town development planning has been lead by the Town Clerk/Chief, rather than a committee, which has restricted contributions from other groups/individuals It is proposed that town planning be the responsibility of a Town Development Committee Towns should remain active members of the DDC to help shape district development in support of town development

It is also proposed that towns establish Town Environment Committees (TEC), if only to serve as a means for focused discussions on the environment and natural resource management Unlike in rural regions, many urban environmental issues have significant/direct health implications, therefore establishing a Town Health and Environment Committee might actually be appropriate In Kasese Town, the DEC has advised the town on environmental issues, primarily because Kasese is the district headquarters and the "heart" of the district Such district support is

important, just as is district assistance to the rural sub-counties (less common in Kasese) The establishment of a TEC in Kasese will enable the DEC to focus more of its attention on the sub-counties TEC should also be open to independent, ex-officio participants and input

3 Strategic Planning for Sustainable Development

* Roles and Responsibilities Public resources should be used for public goods and services Among their LGS-stated responsibilities, local governments should identify problems and solutions, formulate development plans, and initiate programs for the development of basic infrastructure and provide municipal works and services More specifically, in addition to administrative costs -- now also including all field services and activities of every decentralized ministry/department -- the LGS (Sixth Schedule) states that the districts and urban councils (including town councils) are responsible for (Central government responsibilities are outlined in LSG - Second Schedule)

  * Primary education, rural trade and technical schools,
  * Medical and health services (i e , dispensaries, health centres, ambulance services, child welfare services),
  * The maintenance of water services outside the jurisdiction of National Water and Sewerage Corporation,
  * Construction, rehabilitation and maintenance of roads not under the responsibility of central government,
  * Local government police and prisons, and
  * Urban Authority services

The development responsibilities of the district, town, and sub-county as well as other levels of local government must be clearly defined For example, "basic infrastruture" and public "works and services" can be interpreded in many ways The clearer the line distinguishing the development responsibilities of the various levels of local government, the better the planning process can be by the local levels In this way, the specific level of government can best understand its responsibilities vis-a-vis those of higher and lower levels, which will enable each level of government to focus its planning attention of its responsibilities,

* Strategic Planning In many cases, the reasons for the current development approach of crisis management and disaster relief (as well as meeting political agendas) are valid The new responsibilities, powers, and resources of local government, however, create opportunities and the necessity that there is a shift from crisis management to sustainable development, especially at the district, town, and sub-county levels (the financial resources and technical expertise at the RC2 and RC1 levels are limited, making strategic planning less likely and

necessary at this time Project design will remain the principal approach to development planning at these levels) Many people in Kasese District and elsewhere in Uganda favor sustainable development, and recognize the importance and need for long-range, goal-oriented planning to achieve sustainable development Still there is a need to sensitize the local level, in particular local government, to the importance, advantages, and logic of sustainable development and strategic planning, as well as the planning methodology and procedures Such sensitization can be achieved relatively quickly and inexpensively through a series of district-level workshops for sub-county RC Executives (SCDC) and other local government officials In follow-up, the district can provide targeted technical assistance (perhaps by the DEO) to the SCDC or SCEC during the preparation of the sub-county sustainable development plan

* Environment and Natural Resource Management There is also the need to sensitize district and sub-county officials to the range of environment and natural resource management issues When asked about incorporating environmental concerns into development planning, many local people and local government officials expressed a very narrow view of environment (i e , tree-planting) There is the danger that environment is compartmentalized (District authorities talk about a "vote for the environment") Local governments should not be encouraged to prepare Environmental Action Plans (see LGS), rather resource management should be incorporated into all development planning/actions Clearly most rural people understand the relationship between, for example, agriculture and soil/water management, the problem is in the definition/perception of the term "environment " Because this term is used in the context of development, however, it is important that sub-counties, towns, districts, and central government share the same, much broader definition of the environment

More important, however, local government and people, in fact, do not make all connections between the environment and resource management and, for example, health or other sectors The environmental mismanagement roots of many social and economic problems are in fact not well understood or recognized There is a need to help local government/people to recognize the many connections between sound environmental management and improved social and economic well-being -- to better understand the dependence of local development on natural resources, the environmental impacts of development, and environmental solutions to development/problems (Repairing a bridge will not solve the problems of flooding, building a clinic will not eradicate malaria-ridden mosquitoes) There is also the need to highlight the consequences of actions with slow developing or incremental and small environmental impacts (The conversion of 5 acres of forests is only a problem if it occurs 20 years in a row) Several actions can be undertaken to sensitize local government (and other opinion leaders) on these issues, including local-level workshop or other discussions (church sessions),

targeted technical assistance (by the DEO, local NGOs, etc), and environmental awareness (posters, etc) (Figures 5, 6, 7)

Sub-County Decision-Making Process The RC system and structure offer considerable opportunities for popular participation, local representation, and consideration of local people's needs, constraints, resources, and opportunities Each RC1 includes all villagers of or above the age of 18 years, and each RC2, RC3, and RC4 includes all Committee members of the RC immediately below it The RC5 includes one elected representative from each sub-county and town RC and one elected representative for women from each county and Municipal RC Thus each sub-county is represented not only at the county, but also at the district level Equally important, a town (although not sub-county) representative is a member of the DDC This has important implications for district, town, and sub-county development planning

The structure, composition (locally elected representatives), and authority (the Council is the principal policy-making organ in local government) of the RC system has made government more participatory, democratic, and transparent It has significantly opened the policy-making process from the previous centralized political system The RC system is also an excellent structure for reaching the local people with government information and actions

Despite the improvements and achievements of previous political systems, the early experiences of development planning at the district, town, and sub-county suggest that popular participation has not been as real as the central government had hoped in designing the RC system and devolving political authority for decision-making Some of the more significant participation "problems" were discussed above The problem is both that some inherent participation aspects have not been effective (because they were not well designed, sabotaged), and other opportunities for popular participation have not been taken advantage of The fear is that the current operations and trends will result in centralized government at local administrative levels, initially at the district- and urban-levels and then at the sub-county level The challenge is to fully capitalize on the opportunities offered by the RC system for popular participation and involvement of local people in government and development

It is important to both create demand within local government for independent input, and to generate policy ideas from civil society (supply) Government must recognize the value and contribution of independent input, create opportunities for participation and input, and facilitate such input On the civil society side, it will require that NGOs, the private sector, other independent groups, and private citizens have the capacity to generate and share policy relevant information and ideas with the government These are complex matters and require sensitization, training, capacity-building, and resources which are increasingly being considered and addressed by the development assistance community, including that in Uganda As the political space and demand for independent participation in government opens (pluralism, democratization, privatization, etc), and the civil society seeks to become more involved in government, this trend will continue

In Kasese District, the NGO community and private sector are growing NGOs contribute significantly to development, and the hope is that the private sector will play an increasing role in development In Kasese, local NGOs/PVOs filter 4-5 times as many resources (the great bulk from donors and international PVOs) as the district government NGOs are becoming increasingly interested in working with local government to shape policy, by-laws, plans, and decisions which have impact on resource use and local welfare Similarly, many of the state-owned industries and other production is being privitized If the civil society is perceived to be legitimate and genuine by the government, and their opinions are valued, they may be asked to join decision-making bodies, such as the DDC and DEC In Kasese, several NGO "environmental activists" were asked to join the DDC and DEC These activitists are also interested in organizing themselves and others into a more formal independent and neutral lobby group (Environmental Panel) This Panel would advise the local government on environmental issues and act as a collective watchdog on government, industry, and others (if government employees are involved they should be on the panel as private citizens, not government employees) Such a group should/can work closely with the DEC, DEO, etc

In Uganda, the LGS provides a framework for government decision-making (i e , the RC is the policy-making organ) Several operational changes can be made to the LGS framework to further open the decision-making process enabling more people to share their ideas and concerns to the policymakers (RC) The assumption is that popular participation will improve the planning process and development by capturing independent knowledge and ideas, ensuring decisions meet local priorities, and developing a sense of local ownership which will improve implementation Several specific actions by the sub-county can be proposed, including

* Allow for direct participation (ex officio) of NGOs, the private sector, and citizens in the SCDC, SCEC, and other committees,

* RC3-organized public forums to discuss and debate local environment and development concerns ("planning by dialogue"),

* Help establish and strengthen independent pressure groups, activists, lobbyists, etc ,

* Engage the services of a professional facilitator at RC decision-making meetings to ensure broad participation (if necessary, allow for secret voting at Council meetings),

* Make available information on decentralization, environment, and development, including policies, by-laws, draft development plans, etc (i e , help establish local government information system, etc),

* Tap into the technical expertise at the county and district levels (or international, such as Peace Corps, VSO, etc), and

It is proposed that the RC decision-making process for development planning follow standard guidelines to help ensure broad participation and local input These include

* RC Executive The RC Executive initiates the development planning effort, provides overall guidance, and administers/coordinates the planning effort,

* Sub-County Development Committee In sub-counties, the SCDC leads the planning effort with input from specialized committees, including the SCEC, county/district technical expertise (DEO, county/district extension staff, District urban planner), and independent groups/private citizens,

* RC (Council) The RC Council makes final decisions and approves the sub-county development plan before it is sent to the district for RC5 approval

Sub-County Strategic Planning Process The sub-county development plan will include the RC3, RC2, and RC1 plans, as well as the RC4 proposed fiscal year expenditures of sub-county funds It is proposed that the sub-county will prepare a 3-year rolling plan, including a detailed 1-year action/implementation plan for the coming fiscal year (only 1 year detailed action plans are prepared because of the likelihood of changing circumstances and adapting actions) The sub-county plan should be in support of 20-year goals/objectives It is envisioned that the RC2 and RC1 development plans will include a list of projects to be supported by the resources provided by the sub-county

The proposed sub-county development planning process for sustainable development is essentially a 6-step approach (see below) The outputs/products of some steps will require RC approval/authorization before moving on to the next step (i e , approve strategic goals/objectives before identifying alternative approaches) As a result, the development planning process may require multiple RC meetings over a period of several months before a sub-county development plan is actually forwarded to the RC5 for final approval and implementation When the initial strategic plan is prepared, however, some decisions will not need to be made each year, or several decisions can be made at one RC meeting -- shortening considerably the planning process

The 6-steps in the proposed sub-county stratgic planning process for sustainable development include

1 Long-Range Goals The first step in the strategic planning process is to establish and approve long-range (20-year) goals The sub-county's vision should be articulated in a few, clear, but general goals These goals should recognize local needs and interests, as well as national priorities and concerns For example, a sub-county's goal might be to improve the wellbeing of its rural residents by increasing agricultural production by 20 percent It should be clearly understood if one goal is significantly more important than another or the others The RC should approve the 20-year goals before the planning process continues

2 Objectives and Approaches Development goals can be achieved in multiple ways The next step in the planning process is to identify the range of alternative approaches, and to select the "best bets " These "best bets" should be framed as specific objectives in support of the more general goals For example, agricultural output can be improved by expanding or intensifying production, which, in turn, can be achieved by replacing livestock with farming, improving hillside farming, establishing irrigation, etc

The alternative approaches to achieving each goal should then be evaluated and the "best bets" identified To help in ranking the alternative approaches, the various approaches could be assessed against a set of criteria (i e , use of comparison charts) (Annex H) The evaluation criteria (or weighting system for the criteria) may vary with sub-county and over time, depending on available resources, technical expertise, etc , as well as more general conditions such as political climate, economic growth, etc Potential criteria might include external resources requirements, labor requirements, capital costs, and other sub-county strengths and weaknesses Environmental costs/gains of each approach should be incorporated into this set of criteria It is important to involve the extension staff with technical expertise in identifying the best options The proper evaluation of some options may even require a more thorough analysis or survey which the extension staff can conduct or help organize

Some approaches may help towards achieving several goals, and so may be more preferable objectives Some may be dependent on the successful implementation of others Alternatively, it might be preferable to achieve one goal before addressing another which has implications on the preference of different objectives To ensure general consensus on the development approaches taken, it is important to allow for wide discussion in identifying the evaluation criteria Again, the RC should approve the "best bet" approaches/objectives before preparing a detailed action plan

To accurately identify the range of alternative approaches, and to select the "best bets," the sub-county must have access to relevant information on both current conditions and trends (to help forecast and make educated guesses on future conditions, such as population size and distribution) The proposed information system (Brusberg) will provide valuable information and analysis towards this end In addition, sub-county officials can collect, organize, and analyze data specifically for purposes of development planning Many participatory planning methodologies (PRA, RRA, D&D) utilize a range of tools (resource maps, transects, Venn diagrams, etc) to could be used in this effort Experience has shown that mapping and trend analysis are particularly useful tools, both allow for participation in data collection, clear organization of data for easy analysis and interpretation A minimum set of maps/trend charts are proposed for the SCDC to

prepare with RC1, RC2, and farmer assistance (Annex I) This set may vary, however, depending on the sub-county goals and objectives

3 Sub-County 3-Year Plan Based on the approved goals and "best bet" objectives, the SCDC can then prepare a 3-year plan To prepare this plan, the sub-county should consider how much progress it can realistically make (given current conditions, future trends, and available resources) towards the goals and objectives by the end of the 3-year period This can be presented in visually-form on a map -- the sub-county in 3-years with the successful implementation of the 3-year plan -- for more general discussion in the sub-county

The next step is to identify the actions/projects which must be undertaken to implement the 3-year plan This effort may also require specific technical expertise from the district or county extension staff It is important to identify any actions which, from a technical perspective or for other reasons, must be first undertaken and completed These actions should be given priority If necessary, the remaining activities can also be ranked with the use of a set of agreed-upon criteria (see above) Attention should be focused on the actions that contribute to the 3-year plan External development assistance should also be encouraged to assist in the implementation of the 3-year plan Actions which does not contribute or, more important, contradict or jeopardize the 3-year plan should be discouraged The RC3 Council should approve the 3-year plan

4 Sub-County 1-Year Action Plan The final step in the planning process is to prepare a detailed 1-year action/implementation plan The plan should recognize resources -- financial, labor, supplies, etc -- which are available or very likely to be available Actions for which no resources are available should not be included In preparing the action plan, it is important to involve those individuals and organizations which are expected to contribute to the actions/projects The RC3 Council should approve the 1-year action plan

For each action it is important to clearly identify the specific tasks to be undertaken, the responsibile individuals/organizations, the resources needed, the source of these resources, the time period for the tasks to be initiated and completed, etc The more detailed the action plan, the smoother will be the implementation, and the easier it will be to monitor performance and, later, to assess/evaluate the effort The various actions, resources, responsible individuals, etc can be put on a calander for easy tracking (Annex J), and a map can be prepared showing the sites These can be posted for the general public

5 RC2 and RC1 Project Design Because the sub-county development plan may have bearing on the RC2 plan and allocation of resources, it is encouraged that the RC2 planning effort not begin until the RC3 has approved the sub-county plan

Because the amount of RC3 government revenues to each RC2 will probably only cover RC2 administrative costs and a few actions (see chart), and due to the limited local capacity and scarcity of technical assistance, the RC2 development planning approach will probably be project design, rather than strategic planning As available resources and technical expertise improves, strategic planning at the RC2 level may be more likely and necessary

Adapting the RC3 decision-making process to the parish-level (with the exception that Parish Development Committees and Parish Environment Committees need not be established, rather the RC2 Executives will lead the planning process), the RC2 project design methodology should include the following five steps

* Gather and assess information relevant to sustainable development planning,

* Identify and rank the principal problems and new opportunities,

* Identify alternative solutions to the priority problems/opportunities, and select "best bets,"

* Prioiritize selected actions (this will require an assessment of available resources, including government revenues and locally generated development funds), and

* Prepare an implementation plan for the actions to be undertaken the next year

Given RC2 capacity and available technical expertise, the project design will most often have to rely on RC2 knowledge and skills Therefore it is important that the parish planning effort solicit the input and involvement of rural residents, especially those with some technical expertise on the concerned development issues While the comprehensiveness of this planning effort will vary depending in good measure on local expertise, it is important to conduct these five steps The PRA methodology would be ideal to prepare RC2 (and RC1) plans The RC Executives should not assume that the priority problems and best options are known and agreed to by all RC2 residents And the RC2 should have the opportunity to review and approve of each step before the planning process moves ahead The parish plans must be approved by the RC2 before being forwarded to the RC3 for approval

In addition to approving the RC2 plans, the RC3 has other responsibilities in RC2 planning If possible, the RC3 should provide some planning and technical assistance, at a minimum, it should be informed on the progress of the RC2

planning The RC3 should also encourage coordination and collaboration between RC2s in the design of their development projects It is important for the RC3 to ensure that the RC2 plans do not contradict each other or the sub-county plan

Following the approval of the RC2 plans by the RC3, the RC3 and the relevant RC2 plans should be sent to each RC1 to inform the RC1s in their project design While RC1s will have even fewer financial and technical resources available than RC2s, the RC1 project planning process should be encouraged to follow the same guidelines as the RC2 process (see above) RC1 plans should be reviewed by the relavant RC2, but approval should be made by the RC3

Rural RC4s (county-level) which also receive a portion of the sub-county funds, but is expected that these resources will be utilized primarily for administrative and recurrent costs (salaries, supplies, up-keep of headquarters, etc) Few resources will probably be available for development purposes Each RC4 should let the county's RC3s know how it will utilize the sub-county government revenues Counties also have the expertise to keep financial records of their incomes and expenses (i e , the sub-counties should not be burdened with managing county resources)

6 Sub-County Sustainable Development Plan The final step in the sub-county planning process is to bring the RC3, RC2, and RC1 plans together into a comprehensive sub-county sustainable development plan The full plan should be a compliation of the various RC3, RC2, and RC1 plans, plus the RC4 expected fiscal year expenditures, with a brief summary of sub-county actions, focusing on those in the coming fiscal year An outline of the full report might include the following sections

* Executive Summary
* Introduction
* Sub-county goals and objectives
* Sub-county 3-year plan
* Sub-county 1-year action plan
* RC4 use of RC3 funds
* RC2 plans
* RC1 plans
* Budget/Financial resources

The RC3 (Council) should review and approve this plan, before it is forwarded to the RC5 for government approval and returned for implementation In its review, the RC3 should ensure the various individual plans do not contradict each other, are consistent with sub-county goals and objectives, and address district priorities

and national interests, legislation, etc (also a task of the RC5 approval process)

If the RC5 have been kept informed of the planning process of the RC1s, RC2s, and RC3s, most or all of its concerns will have already been incorporated into the presented plans For example, during the planning process, districts should encourage and facilitate sub-county collaboration in addressing issues that cut across sub-county boundaries (i e , the Kilembe Cobalt mines are located in in Kilembe sub-county, but the environmental impacts cut across several Kasese District sub-counties, including Kasese Town Kasese Town includes 5 major gullies some of which originate outside the town In addition, fragile lands that cut across sub-county boundaries could be set aside and managed jointly by the sub-counties or the district) Any final comments and suggestions by the RC5 must be recognized/incorporated into the sub-county plan before final approval is granted and implementation can begin (Note, this report focuses on sustainable development planning and does not address issues of implementation)

It is also important that districts maintain links with central government on issues of natural resource management In Kasese District, central government is responsible for the management of about half the district's land For example, the central government is responsible for the Ruenzori National Park and the Queen Elizabeth National Park which include several districts, including Kasese District The central government (NEMA) is also responsible that the Kilembe colbalt mine (Kilembe Cobalt Company Ltd) and the cement factory are run in a manner that is environmentally sound and does not result in environmentally and health problems for the public

Near the end of each fiscal year, the RC3 should review its long-term goals, objectives, "best-bet" approaches, and the project accomplishments and achievements of previous year (accessed against the sub-county's 1-year action plan) Changes should be made as necessary, but only after Council discussion and consultations with the general public The RC should approve all changes to the development strategy

A new 3-year plan is then prepared, presumably based on the 3 year plan prepared the previous year If the goals and approaches remain the same and the 1-year action plan well implemented, this will only require adding a new third year to the previous year's 3 year plan If some aspects have changed -- which is usually the case, given crises, disasters, changing circumstances, and other pressing needs -- adjustments can be made as necessary to the new 3-year plan Another 1 year action plan is then prepared based on the new 3-year plan

At the RC2 and RC1 levels, project implementation in the previous year is assessed If the projects were completed (or cancelled), new projects can be designed for the next year If the actions were not completed -- whether by design or delay -- the plans for the coming year will need to consider these on-going efforts (if they continue to be priority actions) New projects can

be designed and initiated if the needed financial and technical resources are available

Town Decision-Making Process In the past, the town decision-making process for development planning has been different than for sub-county decision-making and, because of town circumstances, the specific problems have also been unique (see above) In general, however, the opportunities for pluralism and popular participation in government decision-making inherent in the RC system have not been capitalized on, which has resulted in a closed decision-making process both in the towns and sub-counties Some suggestions have already been made to open the process for greater independent input (see above), all of which are also relevant for improving town decision-making, such as organizing public forums and allowing independent ex-officio participation in the TDC and TEC

On a whole, the relative strength of the extension staff and the relatively small size of towns, means that the technical expertise (including the help of the new district infrastructure/urban planner) is available to prepare good plans and that the extension staff is well informed on priority local problems and opportunities in the town It is important, however, that technical staff have the right conditions and set of incentives to do their jobs well, including longer assignments, better pay and benefits, opportunities for professional growth, etc

The two principal problems to overcome in town decision-making are to limit the political factor and to mobilize independent input To limit/reduce the political influence of development planning and decision-making, it is important to make sure that policy-makers are independent from private special interests and accountable to the whole of their constituency It is particularly important in town decision-making that the process is transparent and open for public review For example, voters should be educated on both the government decentralization efforts (local government rights and responsibilities), and the tasks and responsibilities of the RC Executives and civil service There should be secret balloting for the election of RC Executives (currently, voters stand behind their candidate of choice), and RC decision-making should be more structured, for example, based on a 2/3 or more majority, secret voting, etc (currently, they are no guidelines on how RC's reach decisions)

While sub-county RC2s and RC1s appear to be better organized, involved, and active than their counterparts in towns, most towns do have viable NGOs and other grassroots organizations Many of these NGOs are active on the ground, implementing projects at the village-level in the nearby rural areas, but also have interests in town development Relatively few, however, are involved (or effectively involved) in town planning or other town decision-making Considering the weaknesses of the RC2s and RC1s, it is particularly important to encourage and facilitate the advocacy role of the local NGO community in town decision-making And to encourage more RC2 and RC1 organization and involvement, the town government should consider a financial decentralization effort similar to that in the sub-counties Unlike rural RCs, there have not been developed any guidelines to share town-generated government revenues with the RC2s and RC1s, Kasese Town has never participated in a financial decentralization If financial decentralization is not appropriate at this time, it is even more critical that the RC2s and RC1s

participation in town development decision-making and planning (to ensure local input, equitable town development, etc) For example, it might then be appropriate for additional RC2 and RC1 representation in the TDC and other town committees It is also important that town development plans include more site-specific actions than sub-county/RC3 plans

Town Strategic Planning Process All town/RC3, municipal/RC4, and city/RC5 councils have long prepared development plans In the past wards/RC2 or urban RC1s have not actively participated in town planning, and have not undertaken their own planning (in part, because they have not received any government revenues from the town) Assuming that town financial decentralization will not occur in the immediate future, it is unlikely that urban RC2s and RC1s will prepare their own development plans It is assumed, however, that town government will encourage and facilitate more active RC2 and RC1 participation in town development planning (see above)

The town development planning process will follow the same general guidelines of sub-county planning, but with some important differences

* 5-Year Plans Because of the complexity and expense of urban/infrastructure development, it is proposed that urban centers (and districts) prepare 5-year rolling plans (which theoretically urban councils have always prepared), with 1-year action plans,

* Technical Expertise Most towns have a relatively large extension staff and a good compliment of technical expertise (compared to sub-counties) Town planning has involved, and should continue to involve this experience and expertise in the planning process Similarly, towns should continue to tap into the technical expertise at the district level

* RC2/RC1 Participation RC2 and RC1 participation in town development planning should be both encouraged and facilitated This is particularly important given that these levels do not prepare their own development plans (see above),

* No RC2/RC1 Development Plans Unlike sub-county development planning, it is assumed that RC2s and RC1s will not prepare their own development plans Thus, town development planning will stop after the completion of Step 4 at which time the plans are reviewed/approved by the RC and the implemented It is important that town development plans include site-specific actions to address RC2 and RC1 problems/opportunities,

* Coordination with RC5 Unlike sub-county development plans, town plans need not be approved by the RC5 It is proposed that this be changed and that RC5 approval be required for town development plans This will help ensure coordination with sub-county and district planning In the absence of RC5

approval, it is particularly important that town/district planning be well coordinated to ensure compatibility For example, in addition to town participation in district committees, district representatives should participate in town committees, in particular the TDC, and

* Financial Resources Towns has access to more financial (and technical) resources than sub-counties Thus, town plans will usually involve more activities, although many town development efforts are also more capital-intensive And because town development actions more often require specific technical assistance, towns usually also contract specific work to private companies (less frequent in sub-counties)

REFERENCES (selected)

Behnfeld, H 1990 District/Regional Planning in Uganda Country Study on the Establishment of an Effective Planning Capability at the District/Regional Level Ministry of Planning and Economic Development (MPED)/Ministry of Local Government (MOLG) report (unpublished)

--- 1990 Handbook Project Planning MPED/MOLG report (unpublished)

--- 1990 Training Report District Development Planning/Project Planning - Mbarara District, Uganda MPED/MOLG report (unpublished)

Brett, E A 1993 Providing for the Rural Poor Institutional Decay and Transformation in Uganda Kampala Fountain Publishers

Brusberg, F 1994 Design and Implementation of a District-Based Environmental Management Information System NEAP/USAID report (unpublished)

Friend, J, and A Hickling 1987 Planning Under Pressure The Strategic Choice Approach Oxford Pergamon Press

Government of Uganda 1993 The Local Government (Resistance Councils) Statute, 1993 Statutes Supplement No 8, Statute No 15 Entebbe UPPC

--- 1993 National Environment Management Policy (draft) NEAP Secretariat

--- 1993 Decentralizaing Natural Resource Management in Uganda Draft Guidelines for Environment Management at District and Local Community Levels NEAP Secretariat

--- 1993 Staff Development in the Decentralization Process District Management Study, Ministry of Local Government

--- 1994 The Environment Management Statute, 1994 (draft) Bills Supplement No 6 and Bill No 7 Entebbe UPPC

--- 1994 Decentralization in Uganda The Policy and its Implications (No 2) Kampala Decentralization Secretariat Also published in The New Vision, 1 June 1994

Kamugisha, J R 1993 Management of Natural Resources and Environment in Uganda Policy and Legislation Landmarks, 1890-1990 Regional Soil Conservation Unit/SIDA, Report No 11 Nairobi RSCU/SIDA

McCracken, J A , J N Pretty, and G R Conway 1988 An Introduction to Rapid Rural Appraisal for Agricultural Development London International Institute for Environment and Development

Molnar, A 1989 Community Forestry, Rapid Appraisal A Review Paper Food and Agriculture Organization, Community Forestry Note No 3 Rome FAO

National Environment Secretariat (Kenya), Egerton University (Kenya), and Clark University (USA) 1990 Participatory Rural Appraisal Handbook Washington, D C World Resources Institute (WRI)

National Environment Secretariat (Kenya), Egerton University (Kenya), and Clark University (USA) 1992 Implementing PRA A Handbook to Facilitate Participatory Rural Appraisal Worcester Clark University

Raintree, J B , ed 1987 D & D User's Manual An Introduction to Agroforestry Diagnosis and Design Nairobi International Center for Research in Agroforestry (ICRAF)

Stacey, R D 1992 Managing the Unknowable Strategic Boundaries between Order and Chaos in Organizations San Francisco Jossey-Bass Publishers

Tengnas, B 1993 Guidelines on Agroforestry Extension Planning in Kenya Regional Soil Conservation Unit (RSCU)/SIDA, Technical Report No 3 Nairobi RSCU/SIDA

Tukahirwa, E , ed 1991 Environmental and Natural Resources Management Policy and Law Washington, D C World Resources Institute (WRI) and Kampala Makerere University

Veit, P G 1993 Decentralizing Natural Resource Management Some Issues Regarding Sub-District Environmental Planning and Implementation NEAP/USAID report (unpublished)

Williams, P J , A O'Kting'ati, and P Gilruth 1994 Building Capacity to Manage Forest Resources Tanzania Forestry Action Plan - Perspectives on Implementation, 1990-93, and Possible Future Strategies World Resources Institute (WRI) report (unpublished)

World Bank 1993 Aide-Memoire World Bank Environment Mission Uganda, November 1993 WB report (unpublished)

--- 1994 Aide-Memoire Environment Management Capacity Building Project

Uganda, May 1994 WB report (unpublished)

--- 1994 District Environment Management WB report (unpublished)

ANNEX A THE LOCAL GOVERNMENTS (RESISTANCE COUNCILS) STATUTE, 1993 (STATUTE NO 15)

The Local Governments Statute (LGS) "seeks to transfer political, administrative, financial and planning authority from the center to local governments councils It seeks to promote popular participation, empower local people to make their own decisions and enhance accountability and responsibility It also aims at introducing efficiency and effectiveness in the generation and management of resources, and in delivery of services In the end the local population will be able to get value for money out of their taxes and through their elected representatives make the development process responsive to the needs of the local people (No 2, pp2-3) "

The LGS reorganizes the role of local governments, provides for new responsibilities and powers to local governments, and establishes new relationships with central government (CG), including

* At the district, establish District Service Committees, Local Government Tender Boards, Local Government Accounts Committees, Local Government Finance Commissions, and other committees as necessary,

* Upgrade the post of County Chief to Assistant District Executive Secretary (ADES),

* Terminate the services of Sub-Parish Chiefs,

* Regional line ministry/department offices to be abolished

* Local government councils responsible for all decision-making on matters of local significance (except responsibilities of CG),

* Develop integrated development plans,

* Districts approve budgets based on locally raised revenue,

* Retain and determine the utilization of a minimum of 50 percent revenue collected at the sub-county level,

* Maintain proper books of account (i e , local-level accountability for all resources),

* All local governments have the political authority to establish by-laws as necessary, now approved by district (not CG),

* Local government councils have full powers over their employees (i e , line ministry/department extension staff employed and accountable to district)

Of note, all urban councils (including Town Councils) are autonomous and independent of the District Resistance Council (DRC) The DRC cannot command Urban Council funds, budgets (self-accounting), or employees, and the Urban Councils are not subordinate to the DRCs Thus towns (RC3) and municipalities (RC4) do not report to the district (RC5) in which they are located

This decentralization significantly changes the work of line ministries and department, and their relationship with the extension staff The LGS makes local extension staff accountable to district officials, line ministries will now influence local decision-making and action indirectly through regulations, standards, policies, and legislation Ministries will also advise, inspect and provide some technical support Ministry staff will be reduced to a core of policy advisors, planners and inspectors Communication to the local governments related to policy and management will be addressed to the DES

National policies and legislation should articulate national goals, objectives, and priorities They should be flexible, rather than prescriptive or mandatory of specific actions and projects Local governments must be given the opportunity to develop locally-appropriate policy, by-laws, development plans, and actions In this way local governments can develop site-specific programs to meet both national goals as well as local priorities and needs

It is thus important that local governments are familiar with national policies and legislation, and their implications for local development and actions Ministries should ensure they share their policies with local governments now more so than ever given the new line of authority with extension staff For example, the MOLG has already produced briefing booklets for local governments on the LGS which present the statute and discuss the implications for local government The MOLG also had it printed such overviews in local newspapers, such as The New Vision Other ministries/departments should consider undertaking similar actions

Related, there is also under consideration by the government of Uganda a unified extension service under which each staff will have expertise and responsibilities in a range of sectoral matters A unified extension service may facilitate a multi-disciplinary approach to development, but may also result in less specific technical expertise and assistance Combined with the loss of regions as administrative units in Uganda, these changes may result in extension services reaching lower levels of local government

Regarding decentralized development planning and environmental management, the LGS notes that all RCs should identify local problems, identify solutions, formulate and review development plans, and initiate programs for social, cultural, and economic development (including basic infrastructure, municipal works/services) Public resources should be used for public goods and services More specifically, in addition to administrative costs -- now also including all field services and activities of every decentralized ministry/department -- the LGS (Sixth Schedule) states that the districts and urban councils (including town councils) are responsible for

* Primary education, rural trade and technical schools,

* Medical and health services (i e , dispensaries, health centers, ambulance services, child welfare services),
* The maintenance of water services outside the jurisdiction of National Water and Sewerage Corporation,
* Construction, rehabilitation and maintenance of roads not under the responsibility of central government,
* Local government police and prisons, and
* Urban Authority services

To perform these and other functions all local government councils have been given certain powers, including making by-laws (see above), although only the district, urban (including town), and sub-county can generate government revenue (sub-counties much split the revenues they collect with RC4, RC2s, and RC1s) Only districts and town councils can negotiate for loans from donors

The LGS is most specific about the institutions and operations for planning at the district level (Clauses 19-21) Specifically, the LGS calls for the establishment of a DDC which includes the DRC, DES, and one representative from each county and town/municipal The DDC functions are to

* prepare district development plans,
* monitor implementation of the plan,
* monitor CG funded projects,
* coordinate all development activities,
* ensure information exchange between DRC and all departments,
* report progress to the DRC, and
* guide lower local government on planning issues

The DDC shall have a District Technical Planning Committee (DTPC), including the district population officer, statistician, economist, physical planner, agricultural officer, education officer While the RC5 Chair is the chairman of the DDC, the DES is the chair of the DTPC The DTPC consolidates sectoral plans and draws up district development plans for DDC approval The LGS makes no reference to the District Environmental Officer (DEO) referenced in the Environment Management Bill (see below), although DEOs should also be part of the DTPC

In addition to the DDC there are several other committees at the district level, including the District Health and Environment Committee (DHEC), identified in the LGS The specific functions, responsibilities, and operations are, however, not established in the LGS and as a result are largely left to the districts to decide

ANNEX B THE (DRAFT) ENVIRONMENT MANAGEMENT BILL, 1994 (BILL NO 7)

The draft Environment Management Bill, 1994 (EB) is a comprehensive piece of national legislation on environmental conservation and natural resource management It also furthers the government's decentralization effort by providing for the transfer of some powers and environmental management responsibilities from central to local government The ES proposes the establishment of and provides some guidelines for the functions of District Environmental Committees (DECs), District Environmental Officers (DEOs), and Local Environmental Committees (LEC) (Clause 13, 14 and 15 respectively) In many districts, the DECs may be the District Health and Environment Committees identified in the LGS

Possible DEC functions include

* Coordinate district council activities related to natural resource management (NRM),
* Ensure NRM concerns are integrated into district plans and projects,
* Assist in district by-law formulation related to NRM,
* Promote dissemination of environmental information,
* Coordinate with LECs on issues related to NRM, including advising LECs and receiving any LEC reports,
* Prepare an annual district state of the environment report, and
* Coordinate with NEMA on issues related to NRM

Potential DEO functions include

* Advise DEC on matters related to NRM,
* Liaise with NEMA on matters related to NRM,
* Prepare reports as prescribed by NEMA,
* Promote environmental awareness
* Assist LECs in matters related to NRM,
* Gather/manage information on NRM, and
* Serve as the DEC Secretary

Potential LEC functions include

* Prepare a local environment workplan,
* Conduct public NRM education campaigns,
* Mobilize local people to conserve natural resources, restore degraded environmental resources, and improve their natural environment through self-help,
* Monitor local activities to ensure sound NRM, and
* Report to district authorities activities which (may) have significant environmental impacts

Subsequent sections of the draft EB refer to the DECs, DEOs, and LECs when specific

environmental actions are discussed as prescribed above A separate Clause is devoted to environmental planning at the district level (Clause 17) It requires that DECs prepare a DEAP to be revised every three years or as considered necessary by NEMA The DEAP will

* Conform with the NEAP,
* Be in a form and contain matters as may be prescribed,
* Be binding on district agencies, committees, and persons,
* Be approved by the DRC, and
* Be disseminated to the district public

It is unclear how the DEC, DEO, and LEC fit in with the other parts of local government, how they liaise with each other, or how they fit in with NEMA and other national government bodies (in part because NEMA's position is unclear) In addition, the composition of DEC and LEC are not specified in the EB In essence, it is up to local government to establish these committees, develop their mandates, and work out the modalities of their operation Because decisions regarding environmental policy, legislation, institutions, and actions at the national level will have significant impact on environmental management decentralization (i e , position of NEMA, future of Department of Environment, etc), central government should move quickly on finalizing and implementing national reform Several points however can be made

* Establishment of DECs and DEOs is not required by central government as the center of government is now the district On the other hand, DRCs "shall, on the advice of the (NEMA) Policy Committee, appoint Local Environment Committees" (p 25) Why CG should have more say in the establishment of LECs than DEC or DEO is unclear,

* The EB only provides guidelines on the functions of DECs, DEOs, and LEOs It is clear, however, that EB envisions that DECs and DEOs are to be advisors/coordinators, while LECs are implementors,

* The preparation of DEAPs (and perhaps Local Environment Workplans) outside the context of development planning risks marginalizing environmental issues and actions Rather local government development plans should be encouraged to be sustainable and environmentally sound Prescribing actions (such at DEAPs) through by-laws or other means may also result in confrontations with local people/governments and high costs of enforcement, and

* At the national level, a national environmental authority/council (NEMA) will be established (hopefully) with sufficient authority and capacity to coordinate natural resource management NEMA will not be an implementing agency, rather a policy advising body and a watchdog to identify potential or actual environmental problems (i e , EIA, etc) NEMA will help ensure sound environmental policy/law and appropriate sectoral policies/laws The authority is particularly important in ensuring that state lands and government operations in the rural regions are management in an environmentally sound manner NEMA will also

help legitimize and provide political and legal support to local governments/private interests in sustainable development and resource management

ANNEX D METHODOLOGY

In preparing for this mission, WRI in Washington, D C reviewed relevant documents and meet with USAID, World Bank, UNDP, and others to discuss on-going and proposed activities in environmental management in Uganda, in particular efforts with local governments and communities

Three weeks of work was conducted in Uganda to complete this exercise The first week in country was spent in Kampala meeting with and interviewing individuals and institutions involved in decentralization and natural resource management, including the NEAP Secretariat, Department of Environment, Ministry of Local Government, USAID, World Bank, and UNDP (see Contacts, Schedule of Activities) Time was also spent reviewing relevant documents and reports

Ten days of fieldwork was undertaken in Kasese District Numerous discussion were held with the RC5 Chairman, DES, members of the DDC and DEC, as well as with some of the more active/involved NGOs, including the Red Cross, Appropriate Technology Development Centre, and Habitat for Humanity WRI also spent considerable time with officials of the Kasese Town Council to review urban planning, and in Kyarumba Sub-County (Bukonjo County), Kisinga Sub-County (Bukonjo County), Bughoye Sub-County (Busongora County), and Karusandara Sub-County (Busongora County) regarding rural planning A full day was also spend visiting sites in Kasese District (primarily Kasese Town) which pose environment concerns and problems, including the Kilembe cobalt mines and the Kilembe Cobalt Company Ltd (Kilembe Sub-County, Bukonjo County)

An outline of this report was left with the NEAP Secretariat, USAID, and other groups The draft report was prepared primarily at WRI in Washington, D C

ANNEX G KASESE DISTRICT

Kasese District (3205 sq km, 2724 sq km of land) includes two counties (Busongora, Bukonjo) and 20 sub-counties, including Kasese Town In 1991, Kasese District had a population of 343,600 (Busongora/175,258, Bukonjo/168,343), although many local government officials believe 400,000-450,000 people now live in the District In 1991, the District's population density was 126 people/sq km, up from 102 people/sq km in 1980 Between 1980-91, the district's population grew by only 1 9 percent (153,939 people were between the ages of 15-54 years) In 1991, Kasese Town had 39,892 residents (11 3 percent of the district's population), up from about 500 people in 1972 Kasese Town has 7 RC2s and 25 RC1s

Kasese District has a large altitudinal range from the Rwenzori Mountains to the western edge of the Great Rift Valley Some of the district's soils are very fertile, especially those in the Rwenzori foothills and floodplains Numerous rivers and streams flow from the Rwenzori Mountains and empty into lakes and wetlands, including Lake George and Lake Albert Typical rainfall is 950-1000 mm per annum, with two wet seasons (March-May, September-November) and two dry seasons (january-February, June-July) Most of the district's residents farm, although Kasese Town is primarily a business center for trade between Uganda and Zaire

Although population density is moderate, Kasese District has a serious land shortage problems The District includes relatively large lakes (Lake George, Lake Albert) As much as one-half of its land is controlled by central government (including some of the best land), within two national parks (Rwenzori Mountains National Park, Queen Elizabeth NP), one forest reserve (Mobuku Forest Reserve), as well as land for an airport, petroleum depot, state farms, Kilembe mines, etc In 1988 about 500 acres of QENP were returned to the district

Kasese District is affected by environmental problems and opportunities common in Uganda, including soil erosion, deforestation, overgrazing, steep hillside farming, flooding, drought, and periodic disasters Kasese Town includes five major gullies (3 go through the town center) which cause destruction of houses and property and death (some gullies begin outside the town boundaries due to poor resource management in adjacent sub-counties) In February 1994, Kasese District was rocked by an earthquake and in March-April, by an army worm invasion

In May, a week before the fieldwork was undertaken in Kasese District, a major rainstorm caused several rivers to flood Many farms and houses were damaged or destroyed, and a bridge on the main Kasese-Fort Portal road was washed away, causing serious disruption in travel and the transport of goods (a major cause was blocked caldrons, canals, sewage lines, etc) The District also has two large state-owned industries -- cobalt mine, cement factory -- which have significant environmental impacts, including soil contamination, air pollution, and water pollution (including the waters of Lake George)

ANNEX E SCHEDULE OF ACTIVITIES

5/25-6/1/1994 Kampala

Meetings with NEAP Secretariat, USAID, UNDP, World bank and other relevant institutions

6/1-10/94	Kasese District	
6/1	Meet with World Bank	Travel to Kasese District
6/2	Meeting with Kasese District authorities Meeting with Kasese Town Council authorities Meeting with some NGOs	
6/3	Visits to several environmental sites in and around Kasese town and neighboring sub-counties	
6/4-5	Write up field notes	
6/6	Visit to Kyarumba Sub-County Visit to Kisinga Sub-County	
6/7	Visit to Bughoye Sub-County Visit to Karusandara Sub-County	
6/8	Hima Cement Factory Meeting with Kasese Town Council Meeting with Kasese NGO community	
6/9	Visit Kasese District sub-counties, including Lake Katwe Sub-County	
6/10	Travel to Kampala Debrief USAID, NEAP Secretariat	

6/11-12/1994 Kampala

Debrief USAID, UNDP, World Bank, etc
Prepare outline for report

ANNEX F PRIMARY CONTACTS

Kampala

USAID/APE
- Rob Clausen
- Jim Seyler
- Peter Trenchard
- Leroy Duval
- Ted Hazard
- Jan Laarman (consultant/NRM economist)
- Rex ?

UNDP
- Robert Hall

Consultants
- Paula Williams

NEAP
- Henry Aryamanya Mugisha
- Frank Tuyiatunga/NEIC
- Nightingale Rukuba-Ngaiza
- Martin Odwedo
- Mr Osuban/NEAP Coordinator

WRI/NESDA
- Clement Dorm-Adzobu

Human Rights and Peace Centre (HURIPEC)
- Joe Oloka-Onyango/Director, Faculty of Law, Centre for Basic Research (CBR, local NGO)

Institute of Tropical Forest Conservation
- Jonathan Baranga, Director

World Bank
- Mary Tiffen
- Brian Downing
- Bo Tengnas
- Laurent ??
- Kabann I B Kabananukye/MISR
- Gary Luhman (Washington, D C)
- Nathalie Johnson (Washington, D C)

Makerere University Institute of Environment and Natural Resources
Eldad Tukahirwa/Director (also IUCN country representative)

Kasese District

District Officials
Bamusedde Bwambate/RC5 Chairman
Barnabus Johnson/RC5 Chairman, Chair of DDC, Chair of DEC
Jonathan Bitararbeo/DES
L P Onima/District Forester, Environmental Liasion Officer for NEAP

Red Cross (PVO/NGO)
John Buluku/Director, DEC member

Appropriate Technology Development Centre (NGO)/KANGO
John Baptiste Kisembo/Director, DEC member

Habitat for Humanity (PVO/NGO)
Sam Katikiro/Coordinator

Karusandara Foundation for Rural and Handicapped Development
Ddembe Godfrey/Director
Rodgers Byaruhanga

Kasese Women Development Association
Secretary

YMCA
Secretary

Consultants
Justus T Bwambale, former Regional Forest Officer

Bokonjo County
Kasese Town Council
Bujara Augustine/Kasese Town Clerk
Peter Mawanga/Treasurer
Mukirania Muhesi/Forest Guard

Kyarumba Sub-County
Approximately 30 people, including RC3 Committee, Chief, local leaders and elders

Kisinga Sub-County
Approximately 10 people, including members of the RC3 Committee and local

leaders and elders

Busongora County

Bughoye Sub-County

Approximately 10 people, including RC3 Committee, Chief, local leaders and elders

Karusandara Sub-County

Approximately 5 people, including RC3 Committee, Chief, local leaders and elders

ANNEX I RESOURCE MAPS

Maps are a powerful visual tools for collecting, organizing and analyzing data Maps provide a spatial perspective and highlight differential relationships between various characteristics Base maps of sub-counties and towns (including RC2 and RC1 boundaries) should be prepared by NEIC and provided to DEOs for distribution to RC3s, RC2s, RC1s, chiefs and town clerks The base maps should include topography, human habitats (villages, towns, cities, urban centers), basic infrastructure (roads, railways), and major resources (rivers, lakes)

Each sub-county should prepare at least ten maps Each map focuses on a characteristic which is important for most sub-county development planning One map should be prepared with each of the following sets of data and information

* Infrastructure RC1/RC2 headquarters, schools, churches, boreholes/wells, tarmac/feeder roads, government offices/buildings, health centers/clinics/dispensaries

* Institutions RC1s, RC2s, school groups, church groups, grassroots organizations, external groups, farm or agricultural cooperatives, women's organizations, self-help groups, other traditional groups

* Land Use Perennial/annual crop land, natural forest/plantations/woodlots, pasture, woodland, rivers/lakes/springs, wetlands, village sites (these may be 2-3 maps for different times of the year)

* Land Ownership Mark boundaries of household and family, both customary tenure and national legal tenure Identify state-owned and managed land, including national sub-national land

* Population High/low population densities, ethnic groups, wealth (i e , level of graduated tax)

* Economic Activities Forest (fuelwood, timber, charcoal, beekeeping), agriculture (subsistence, cash cropping), livestock (zero grazing, improved pasture, free range), fishing, hunting (these may be 2-3 maps for different times of the year)

* Disaster Sites (actual, potential) Floods, landslides, locust, army worms, drought, earthquake, bushfires

* Economic Potentials Fertile soils, water (springs, wetlands, rivers), good hunting/fishing sites, commercially valuable trees

* Fragile Sites Poor soils, soil erosion, lack of water, fuelwood problems, degraded forests, tsetse fly sites, degraded pasture, steep slopes, gullies, land files/garbage dumps, sewage, rock quarries/sand lots (marib), toxic waste runoff/dumping, air

pollution (these may be 2-3 maps for different times of the year)

* Development Actions/Projects Government, PVO/NGO, local groups, international donor agencies, etc

Sub-county personnel (SCDC, SCEC, etc) involved in the planning process should help prepare the maps in conjunction with RC2 and RC1 and resident participation This can be achieved either through sub-county workshops or -- preferably -- by visiting the RC1s and RC2s in their jurisdiction Additional maps can be produced to address specific concerns and important problems

Mention has been made of preparing 2-3 maps for certain conditions to show seasonal variations, such as land under agricultural production (seasonal calendars can also be prepared to highlight changing conditions within one year) In addition to preparing maps depicting current conditions (1994), it is often useful to prepare maps of conditions 20 years in the past (1974) as well as 20 years in the future (2014, forecasting) This will highlight and help emphasize changes over time (the cumulative impact of many small incremental changes) and encourage people to consider future conditions given current trends The comparison will also help focus attention on future conditions which can help shape current development plan goals, objectives, and actions And they can be used to identify and prioritize problems and options

The maps should be stored and kept for future use and reference They should also be forwarded to the district officials and then to NEMA for further analysis and storage

ANNEX H COMPARISON CHARTS

Prioritizing or ranking problems, opportunities, alternative solutions, etc can be facilitated through the use of comparison charts Comparison charts help structure the decision-making related to the ranking effort by focusing attention on the criteria that should/should not be important in establishing priorities It can also highlight criteria that have significant impact, but perhaps should not be so influential (such as the political economy, etc) The decision-making process for ranking items helps create local awareness of the evaluation criteria, and can develop an agreed upon set of priorities

The selection and agreement of the best/appropriate criteria for ranking is as important as the ranking exercise itself Input should be encouraged by all concerned and affected by the final ranking and its implications To ensure the development plan is sustainable, the set of criteria should include criteria for environmental soundness, equity, financial viability, socially acceptable, etc In addition, the list may include up-front capital costs, time to completion, etc

In ranking the options, it is often easiest to value all options against the same criteria before moving to the next criteria Exact measures are usually not needed, only how the various options rank relative to the others (except when the differences between options are large and dramatic, for example, in up-front costs) Similarly, certain criteria may be more important than others in ranking In such case it might be important to established weighs for each criteria

Experience suggests, however, that it is most important for the comparison charts to be simple and understandable, than exact and precise Thus, the values for all criteria of each option should not be totaled and compared with the other totals to establish the ranking There will always be criteria that influence ranking which can not easily be addressed or incorporated in the chart A simple voting procedure to establish final rankings after long discussion is preferred The comparison chart is important primarily because it puts some structure in the ranking exercise and facilitates group discussion about the criteria and the alternative options In so doing can also help limit the influence of powerful individuals and special interest groups

ANNEX J SEASONAL CALENDARS

Seasonal calendars are used primarily to highlight changes in conditions and activities -- agricultural activities, labor availability, land use, etc -- within a 12 month period (see Resource Maps) Experience suggests, however, they can also be useful in organizing important information related to project implementation/action plan Such information might include required resources, responsible groups/individual, and projected time period A separate calendar can be prepared for each activity or project

DEOs should distribute simple/empty calendars The bottom axes should include the months of the year The calendar need not begin with January if another month is considered the start of an important annual cycle (i e , agricultural season, fiscal year, etc) It is important, however, to be consistent with the bottom axes to allow for overlaying and analysis This will help ensure that the local resources, including labor and management, are not overburdened at any particular time of the year The important information should simply be written on the calendar when it is expected to be undertaken The calendars should be posted so that all interest people can see the expected progress of the years development actions It can also help remind individuals/groups of their committed responsibilities