ED 113

**Economic Development Institute
of The World Bank**

EDI-13

The Role of Community Participation in Development Planning and Project Management

Michael Bamberger

AN EDI POLICY SEMINAR REPORT • NUMBER 13

FILE COPY

Policy Seminar Reports numbers 1 through 7 are available from the Economic Development Institute of the World Bank, 1818 H Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20433, attention: Ms. Edith A. Pena.

1 *Transport Policies in Francophone Sub-Saharan Africa: Issues and Options.* Hernán Levy. EDI Catalog no. 705/016.

1F *Les politiques de transport en Afrique francophone au sud du Sahara: Problèmes et choix.* Hernán Levy. EDI Catalog no. 705/016.

2 *Food Policy Seminar.* J. Price Gittinger. EDI Catalog no. 505/003.

3 *Agricultural Policy and Its Relationship to Food Policy in Sub-Saharan Africa.* Sakwa Bunyasi. EDI Catalog no. 070/001.

3F *La politique agricole et ses rapports avec la politique alimentaire en Afrique subsaharienne.* Sakwa Bunyasi. EDI Catalog no. 070/001.

4 *Development Policy Analysis.* David G. Davies. EDI Catalog no. 420/043.

5 *Management Training and Research for African Development.* J. Price Gittinger. EDI Catalog no. 430/008.

5F *La formation et la recherche en gestion pour le développement de l'Afrique.* J. Price Gittinger. EDI Catalog no. 430/008.

6 *Land and Water Resources Management.* Jacques J. Kozub, Norman Meyers, and Emmanuel D'Silva. EDI Catalog no. 070/003.

7 *Export Policies and Administration.* Randi B. Greenblatt with Joaquin A. Cottani and Domingo F. Cavallo. EDI Catalog no. 400/047.

The following titles may be purchased from the Publications Sales Unit, World Bank, 1818 H Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20433.

8 *The Political Economy of Reform in Sub-Saharan Africa.* Ravi Gulhati.

9 *Transport Policy Issues in Sub-Saharan Africa.* Hernán Levy and Patrick O. Malone.

10 *Políticas de Transporte en América Latina.* Hernán Levy.

11 *Managing Financial Adjustment in Middle-Income Countries.* Alan Roe and Paul A. Popiel.

12 *Financing Higher Education in Francophone West Africa.* Angela Ransom.

The Role of Community Participation in Development Planning and Project Management

Report of a Workshop on Community Participation
held in Washington D.C.,
September 22-25, 1986

Michael Bamberger

The Economic Development Institute (EDI) was established by the World Bank in 1955 to train officials concerned with development planning, policymaking, investment analysis, and project implementation in member developing countries. At present the substance of the EDI's work emphasizes macroeconomic and sectoral economic policy analysis. Through a variety of courses, seminars, and workshops, most of which are given overseas in cooperation with local institutions, the EDI seeks to sharpen analytical skills used in policy analysis and to broaden understanding of the experience of individual countries with economic development. In addition to furthering the EDI's pedagogical objectives, Policy Seminars provide forums for policymakers, academics, and Bank staff to exchange views on current development issues, proposals, and practices. Although the EDI's publications are designed to support its training activities, many are of interest to a much broader audience. EDI materials, including any findings, interpretations, and conclusions, are entirely those of the authors and should not be attributed in any manner to the World Bank, to its affiliated organizations, or to members of its Board of Executive Directors or the countries they represent.

Because of the informality of this series and to make the publication available with the least possible delay, the typescript has not been prepared and edited as fully as would be the case with a more formal document, and the World Bank accepts no responsibility for errors.

The backlist of publications by the World Bank is shown in the annual *Index of Publications*, which is available from Publications Sales Unit, The World Bank, 1818 H Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20433, U.S.A., or from Publications, Banque mondiale, 66, avenue d'Iéna, 75116 Paris, France.

Michael Bamberger is a senior training officer in the Coordination and Development Administration Division, Economic Development Institute, the World Bank.

Foreword

This document is one of a series reporting on policy seminars organized by the Economic Development Institute of the World Bank. Policy seminars provide a forum for an informal exchange of ideas and experiences among policymakers from different countries, leading experts in development, and World Bank staff with respect to major issues of development policy.

Policy seminar reports focus on issues raised during seminars that may be of interest to a wider audience. They are not intended to be comprehensive proceedings. However, they seek to convey the essence of the discussion that took place and to bring out any principal areas of agreement or disagreement that emerged amongst those participating.

Christopher R. Willoughby
Director
Economic Development Institute
of The World Bank

Contents

Executive Summary

The EDI has been concerned for some time that most of its training programs pay little attention to the social aspects of development. Courses and seminars reflect the economic, financial, and technical approaches of the World Bank, and little attention is given to issues such as the involvement of intended beneficiaries in the planning and implementation of projects, applications of social analysis in development planning, and gender issues in development planning and project management.

Several factors have contributed to an increasing recognition of the need to address social aspects of development. First is the accumulating evidence about the effects that beneficiary participation in project design and management have on the efficiency of implementation, cost recovery, and project sustainability. Second is the limited capacity of national and local government agencies to manage effectively the increasing number of development projects and programs. Third is the belief that development planners have a moral obligation to "listen to the people," both to understand their needs and to assess how their lives are actually being affected by donor-sponsored projects and policies. A final factor is the concern over gender issues. Women are not able to make their full contribution or receive their full share of benefits unless projects are designed to take into account the special needs and potentials of women.

To address these concerns an international workshop on community participation was organized in Washington from September 22 to 25, 1986, to help the EDI define how to incorporate community participation material into training activities. The workshop was attended by participants from government and nongovernment organizations in Asia, Africa, and Latin America and the Caribbean working in the areas of urban development, rural development, and population and health; representatives of international organizations; and Bank staff from the Water and Urban Development, Population, Health and Nutrition, and Agriculture and Rural Development departments. Twenty-one papers were prepared for the workshop and were subsequently compiled in a two-volume set of readings.

The most important outcome for the EDI was the surprisingly general consensus on the key role that the EDI can play in promoting community participation. As part of the World Bank, the EDI is considered to enjoy a number of unique advantages. In addition to its access to World Bank experience, information, and lecturers, the EDI also has access to senior government officials and is able to "legitimize" issues.

Community Participation Defined

There was broad acceptance of the definition proposed by Samuel Paul:

> "In the context of development, *community participation* refers to an active process whereby beneficiaries influence the direction and execution of development projects rather than merely receive a share of project benefits."

Participants emphasized, however, that community participation should be seen as an evolutionary process in which activities at the project level can create the conditions for an increased popular participation in development programs at the local, regional, or national levels.

There is a need to distinguish between beneficiary involvement in the planning and implementation of externally initiated projects (community participation); external assistance in strengthening or creating local organizations (local organizational development); and the spontaneous activities of local organizations (indigenous local participation).

There was also a broad agreement on Paul's five proposed community participation objectives, namely, project cost sharing, increasing project efficiency, increasing project effectiveness, building beneficiary capacity, and empowerment. One of the most controversial issues is whether efficiency and empowerment should be considered as complementary or conflicting objectives. The approach to community participation will be determined by the answer given to this question. The prioritization of community participation objectives is determined by what are perceived to be the overall goals of development: is it to improve the economic conditions of the poor or to bring about a more just society?

The definition of community participation must also consider the organizations and groups involved, the project implementation methods, the stages of the project in which beneficiaries are involved, the scope of the program, who participates, and the intensity of participation.

What Do We Know about the Benefits and Costs of Community Participation?

Active community participation in project planning and implementation may improve project design through the use of local knowledge; increase project acceptability; produce a more equitable distribution of benefits; promote local resource mobilization; and help ensure project sustainability.

Community participation may also entail the following costs: delays in project start-up; necessary staff increases; and pressure to raise the level or range of services. Participatory approaches may also be more risky than bureaucratic/technical management as there is a danger of the cooption of the project by certain groups, the creation of conflicts, or losses of efficiency due to inexperience with the participatory approaches.

Do We Know How to Implement Participatory Approaches Successfully?

There is considerable agreement on the social factors that should be taken into account, but social analysis has not been institutionalized in the way that economic, financial, and technical analysis has. Thus while there is convincing evidence of the problems that can arise if the community organization and local power structure are not well understood, there is much less guidance on exactly how social analysis should be conducted or interpreted to avoid these problems.

There is extensive documentation on strategies for promoting community participation and on the factors affecting the degree and success of participatory approaches. Many of the greatest benefits of community participation occur once a project is operational and must be sustained. Considerable experience exists in the rural development sector on the role of popular participation in the design of sustainable projects. There is less experience in other sectors such as urban development, promotion of small-scale enterprises, and health services, but there is sufficient

experience to produce guidelines for each sector. There is little systematic information on ways to involve beneficiaries in the monitoring and evaluation of projects.

Beyond the Project Cycle

The workshop expressed the concern that the project approach frequently constrains local-level participation as the timebound nature of projects and the administrative need to define objectives and budgets before implementation begins reduce the scope for involving beneficiaries in the design and implementation. While none of the above are immutable and considerable flexibility has been built into some projects, these are significant potential constraints. The potential for local level participation and local institution-building may be enhanced when a sectoral or program approach is adopted.

The Treatment of Community Participation in Recent EDI Training Programs

A review of recent EDI training programs showed that community participation almost never appeared as a central theme in EDI courses or seminars. There are several reasons for this. The EDI reflects the World Bank emphasis on economic and technical aspects of project appraisal and management; most EDI staff are trained in economics, finance, and technical fields rather than sociology; the project cycle framework makes it difficult to give a full treatment to community participation; and the course participants, who also come from economic, financial, and technical backgrounds, are often reluctant to devote time to "soft" social issues.

The Potential Role of the EDI

Despite the EDI's limited experience with community participation, workshop participants were suprisingly unanimous with respect to the key role that it could potentially play in promoting community participation. This stems from (a) the unique access that the EDI has to senior government officials around the world; (b) access to World Bank staff and information; (c) the EDI's extensive experience in training of senior and middle-level government officials in macroeconomic and project-level courses and seminars; and (d) the EDI's technical expertise in the fields of project analysis and sectoral and national planning, which permits it to present participatory approaches within a broad macroeconomic and development framework.

Several possible roles were proposed for the EDI: sensitizing of government officials to community participation issues; developing a conceptual framework acceptable to planners, policymakers, and managers as well as to community participation practitioners; promoting research and documentation; supporting regional training and research institutions; disseminating international experience; promoting dialogue and cooperation between the main actors in the development process; developing training materials and programs; and integrating gender issues into mainstream development planning and management.

A number of areas were identified where participatory issues could be introduced into EDI training. Within project cycle training some of the areas include the influence of social factors on project design, implementation, and sustainability; participatory approaches to project analysis and design; participatory organizational styles; designing sustainable projects; ensuring accessibility to all sectors of the target population; and constraints imposed by the project approach on community

participation. Participatory issues, for example, the social impacts of structural adjustment and macroeconomic policies, can also be introduced into macroeconomic and sector policy training. The EDI's new emphasis on development management also offers scope for discussing the contribution of community participation to effective decentralization policies.

Proposed Strategies for the EDI

It was proposed that the EDI should organize a series of regional seminars to strengthen contacts with regional training and research institutions and to develop regional training material and training activities; develop and test community participation training materials; and coordinate with other international and national organizations involved in this field.

1
Introduction

For some time, EDI staff have been concerned that most of EDI's training programs pay very little attention to the social aspects of development. Courses and seminars reflect the World Bank's economic, financial, and technical approaches (critics would say biases), with very little systematic attention to issues such as the involvement of intended beneficiaries in the planning and implementation of projects, the incorporation of social analysis into national development planning, and the consideration of gender issues in development policy and project management. A recent study that reviewed the content of EDI training activities during the past two years documented the limited treatment of these social issues:

> The fact that Community Participation rarely appears as a main topic provides an indication of the main emphasis of most EDI courses. The main message of many courses seems to be on how to provide an economic and administrative environment which gives incentives to farmers, business people etc, to produce more, and more efficiently....In most courses, the methodology which is presented in the analysis of the project cycle suggests that there is relatively little community involvement in the selection of projects (courses mainly emphasize economic, financial and technical issues in project selection and design). The extent and way in which participation is discussed will depend on the attitude of the course director, or the interest of the participants, and there is no standard approach (Shields and Bamberger 1986).

Most training activities are directed to mid-level or senior government officials, with the emphasis on top down planning and the creation of economic incentives so that the sectors or populations at which programs or projects are directed will "respond rationally" and behave as the World Bank and government planners believe they should. In addition to the economic and technical orientation of the offerings, a further constraint is that most project-level training is organized within the framework of the project cycle. The project framework[1] limits the possibilities for discussing community participation as many of the key ways in which communities can be involved occur before project planners have defined the scope and objectives of a project (that is, the community would be involved in the initial decisions on resource allocation and type of projects) or after the project is completed (evolution of community organizations, sustainability of benefits).

---

1. Conventional projects have a defined timeframe that begins at the time of appraisal and ends when project implementation is complete, a budget whose line items are defined before implementation begins, and clearly defined (and usually) quantitative objectives. All of these make involving local organizations in project preparation difficult in any significant way. While the Bank and other donors are not rigidly bound to this conventional project framework, it does provide a serious constraint to community participation in many cases.

Emerging Concerns

Increasing recognition within EDI and the rest of the World Bank of the need to address the social aspects of development has resulted from a number of factors. First, evidence about the relationship between beneficiary involvement in project design and management, the efficiency of implementation, cost recovery, and project sustainability is accumulating (Operations Evaluation Department 1985). While by no means conclusive, available evidence makes a strong case for a more systematic examination of the role of beneficiaries at the project and sectoral levels. Samuel Paul (1987, table 1) has documented the increasing recognition of the importance of community participation in Bank projects. He found that 48 percent of recent Bank projects in the urban, rural, and population/health areas included community participation in their design as a way to increase project efficiency.

Second, development experts are increasingly becoming aware of the limitations on the capacity of national and local government agencies to manage effectively the rapidly growing number of development projects and programs. Irrespective of political philosophies as to what the role of the state ought to be, functions clearly need to be decentralized from national to local government agencies and from them to community organizations. In most developing cities, the informal sector produces more low-income housing than the formal sector, and the informal sector is frequently the main provider of many services, such as transport and education, and of a wide range of consumer goods. If development is not to stagnate, governments have no option but to provide the private sector, nongovernment organizations (NGOs), and community organizations with greater roles.

Third, development planners are increasingly recognizing that they have a moral obligation to "listen to the people," both to understand the needs of the populations that development is intended to benefit, and to assess how their lives are actually being affected (Baum and Tolbert 1985; Salmen 1985; Conable 1987). This concern is taken further by those who believe that an objective of development is empowerment of underprivileged populations by giving them control over the resources and decisions affecting their lives. Empowerment has been of much less concern in World Bank circles that in some other international organizations such as UNICEF and ILO, and certainly much less so than for most NGOs.

A final factor is the growing concern about gender issues. The evidence that women will not be able to contribute fully or to receive their full share of the benefits of many kinds of projects unless the projects are specifically designed to take into account the special needs and potentials of women in a particular culture and socioeconomic environment is extensive (Moser 1987; Arunachalam 1987; Shorey-Bryan 1987). Workshop participants cited examples of agricultural projects that had to be redesigned after several years because women, who managed half or more of the farms, were not able to use loans without the provision of technical assistance and childcare centers and help in opening up new marketing channels. They give similar examples from urban and health projects.

The Workshop

To help address these concerns, EDI organized an international workshop on community participation in Washington from September 22-25, 1986. The workshop's purpose was to bring together an experienced group of community participation practitioners to help EDI define how it should introduce material on community participation into its training programs. The intention was for this diverse group to help EDI identify those areas in which it might have a comparative

advantage and where its access to senior government officials, its economic and managerial focus, and its linkages to the World Bank would permit it to bring new resources and a new perspective to these issues.

Michael Bamberger (EDI) directed the workshop, which was codirected by Samuel Paul (Projects Policy Department, World Bank) and coordinated by Elisabeth Shields (EDI). It was attended by 13 participants from government and nongovernmental organizations in Asia, Africa, and Latin America and the Caribbean working in the fields of urban development, rural development, and population and health; by 9 representatives of international organizations (see Annex A), and by representatives of the World Bank's Water and Urban Development Department; Population, Health and Nutrition Department; and Agriculture and Rural Development Department who, together with Samuel Paul, formed a steering committee that had helped to plan the workshop. Three consultants who had prepared reviews of community participation experience in agriculture and rural development, urban development, and population and health also attended.[2]

The workshop's objectives were to
- learn from participants' experience in the application of community participation approaches;
- assess how far experiences and approaches differ by sector and by region, and to consider whether any approaches or guidelines are widely applicable;[3]
- assess the lessons that the World Bank can draw from the experiences of other organizations and to consider the appropriate roles for the Bank in promoting and using participatory approaches;
- suggest ways in which issues relating to community participation should be incorporated into EDI training activities;
- recommend types of training materials required and how they should be developed and used.

The workshop was organized as follows (see Annex B for program):
- presentation and discussion of three sectoral review papers by consultants (5 hours),
- presentation and discussion of review papers on Bank and EDI approaches to community participation (3 hours),
- presentations by participants on their programs (5 hours),
- small group discussions (4 hours),
- panel discussions (3 hours),
- general discussion sessions (5 hours).

An important subtheme of the workshop was the issue of gender and how the special needs and potentials of women should be incorporated into a participatory development strategy. Several participants were selected because of their work on women in development issues, and the workshop's organizers also tried to ensure balanced sex ratios among participants from each region.

---

2. Norman Uphoff (Cornell) prepared the review of agriculture and rural development; Caroline Moser (Development Planning Unit, University of London) prepared the urban review, and Patricia Martin (consultant) prepared the population and health review. These review papers are included in *Readings in Community Participation: Papers Presented at an International Workshop* (Washington, D.C.: EDI, 1987) and are also listed separately in the EDI Training Materials Catalog.

3. Due to time constraints the workshop could not devote much time to this issue, but it is addressed in Caroline Moser's review paper on urban development.

A total of 21 papers (listed in Annex C) were prepared for the workshop and subsequently distributed in a two-volume set of readings.

On the first day, many participants expressed their surprise that EDI would organize a workshop on community participation as they did not believe that the Bank was concerned with these issues. At the end of the workshop, however, a number of participants expressed their satisfaction that EDI was making a serious commitment to participatory development. An important consequence of the workshop may have been to establish positive contacts with a wide range of U.N., international, NGO, and government agencies whose cooperation EDI will probably need in the design and implementation of its activities in this field.

The specific recommendations and conclusions of the workshop will be reported throughout this document. Perhaps the most important general conclusion for EDI was the surprisingly general consensus on the key role that EDI can play in promoting community participation. As part of the World Bank, EDI enjoys a number of unique advantages. In addition to its access to World Bank experience, information, and staff, EDI also has access to senior government officials and is able to "legitimize" issues. People also perceive EDI as having considerably more training resources than most other organizations.

During the design of the workshop, the question arose of whether to address issues relating to decentralized development. While this is an extremely important and closely related topic, the organizers decided not to overburden the scope of the workshop and to exclude this topic. It will be taken up in other EDI training activities.

2
Community Participation Defined

The different resource persons and workshop participants had a number of ideas about the definition of community participation. Caroline Moser, after describing the evolution of the concept of community participation during the last two decades, stressed the importance of not confusing community participation with community development (Moser 1987, Section 1). Various other participants agreed with Moser that community development, a concept popular in the 1960s, is now considered in some countries to have colonialist overtones and has become discredited. Participants generally accepted Paul's definition: "In the context of development, Community Participation refers to an active process whereby beneficiaries influence the direction and execution of development projects rather than merely receive a share of project benefits" (Paul 1987).

While Paul's definition focuses on the level of the individual project, community participation is an evolutionary process in which activities at the project or micro-level can create the conditions for increased popular participation in the planning and implementation of development programs at the local, regional, or national levels. Organizations vary considerably with respect to the degree of importance they attach to the evolutionary nature of community participation. The objectives and organization of project-level activities are quite different from those of programs at the national or regional levels, and the level or scope of the activity must be taken into consideration when defining objectives.

Three quite distinct kinds of local participation can be distinguished:

- beneficiary involvement in the planning and implementation of externally initiated projects, or *community participation*;
- external help to strengthen or create local organizations, but without reference to a particular project, or *local organizational development*;
- spontaneous activities of local organizations that have not resulted from outside assistance, or *indigenous local participation*.

The first two are externally promoted participatory approaches used by governments, donors, or NGOs, while the third is the kind of social organization that has evolved independently of (or despite) outside interventions. While the proposed terminology is not entirely adequate, the distinction between these three kinds of activities is very important.

The participants also generally agreed with Paul's five proposed objectives to which community participation might contribute, namely:

- *sharing project costs*—participants are asked to contribute money or labor (occasionally goods) during the project's implementation or operational stages;
- *increasing project efficiency*—beneficiary consultation during project planning or beneficiary involvement in the management of project implementation or operation;
- *increasing project effectiveness*—greater beneficiary involvement to help ensure that the project achieves its objectives and that benefits go to the intended groups;
- *building beneficiary capacity*—either through ensuring that participants are actively involved in project planning and implementation (for example, through the formation of self-help house construction groups), or through formal or informal training and consciousness

raising activities (Rahman 1987). This is a longer-term evolutionary objective that often envisages the integration of local level organizations to form higher-level district, or even national level, organizations (Abed 1987);

- *increasing empowerment*—defined as seeking to increase the control of the underprivileged sectors of society over the resources and decisions affecting their lives and their participation in the benefits produced by the society in which they live. Empowerment is often poorly defined either as a process or as a goal; and, although it is relatively simple to define for the planning and execution of a single, small-scale project its meaning and the steps to its achievement are much less clear with respect to large-scale programs.

While these five objectives adequately reflect those pursued by governments, donors and NGOs through externally funded projects, (the community participation approach) they do not adequately describe the objectives of local organizational development where there is no specific project focus.

Agencies vary considerably in the relative priorities they assign to each objective. While many donor agencies may focus mainly on efficiency and cost sharing, other agencies more concerned with equity or with increasing local control over resources may emphasize empowerment and capacity building.

Dom Mendes de Almeida reminded workshop participants that the basic questions about development do not concern efficiency, but what kind of society we are hoping to achieve. Are we hoping to raise the economic level of poor families so that they can benefit from the fruits of an unjust and exploitative society, or is the purpose of development to achieve social justice through changing society's basic values and the way in which society is organized? If social justice is the objective of development, then participatory approaches should be considered educational. If, however, the objective of development is defined in terms of economic development, then participatory approaches would be assessed in terms of their contribution to project efficiency.

One of the most controversial issues in this field is whether efficiency and empowerment are complementary or conflicting objectives. Several workshop participants expressed the widely held view that an organization must decide which of these two primary objectives to pursue. They classified the World Bank and most bilateral and multilateral donor agencies as organizations that use participatory approaches exclusively in pursuit of efficiency objectives.

An alternative view is that efficiency and empowerment objectives are complementary stages in a long-term evolutionary strategy. Advocates of this approach argue that empowerment is a longer-term objective that first requires the strengthening of community institutions, which is best achieved through the organization of small and then increasingly larger projects. If this approach is valid, tracing an increasing degree of community empowerment with each successive project should be possible.

A complete definition of community participation must also take the following into consideration:

- *The agents or organizational groups used* (or what Paul calls the "instruments"). These can include field workers of the project agency, paid or voluntary community workers, groups created for a specific purpose (self-help house construction groups or water user groups), or existing multipurpose community organizations. Distinguishing between existing ("traditional") groups and those created specially for the project may also be useful. Uphoff suggested that distinctions be made between organized group and individual participation and between public and private organizations.

- *The medium or methods used.* These can include formal leadership training programs, learning by doing through the implementation of a project, consciousness raising, or the use of

"animateurs" through which communities are helped to understand their own needs and to identify possible solutions.

   • *The stages of the project in which beneficiaries are involved.* Uphoff suggests distinguishing between participation in decision making; in implementation; in social, political, cultural, and other benefits; and in the evaluation of the activity and its outcomes.

   • *The program's level or scope.* A broad distinction can be made between micro-level projects, micro-level programs (involving several projects), district-level activities, and regional and national-level activities.

   • *The participants.* Moser shared the view that special attention should be paid to the participation of women, partly because gender issues have been largely overlooked, and partly because the sexual division of labor and consumption means that the participation of women is likely to be qualitatively different from that of men:

> Women, as much as men have the right and duty to participate in the execution of projects which profoundly affect their lives. Since women, as wives and mothers, accept primary responsibility for child bearing and rearing, they are most affected by housing and settlement projects. They should, therefore, be involved in the planning and decision-making as well as in the implementation and management of projects which relate to their lives (Moser 1987).

This view was reiterated by Jaya Arunachalam with reference to the Indian context and by Norma Shorey-Bryan for the Caribbean (Arunachalam 1987; Shorey-Bryan 1987). Issues also arise as to whether the project is being coopted by powerful economic, political, or cultural groups to the exclusion of certain groups of intended project beneficiaries. Lawrence Salmen cited several examples where project organizers were unaware that large segments of the target population were effectively excluded from participation in the project and access to its benefits (Salmen 1987).

   • *The intensity of participation.* Paul suggested that ascending levels of intensity could be classified as information sharing, consultation, decision making, and initiative taking. Other indicators could also include the number of people involved and the duration or regularity of their involvement.

3
The State of the Art: What Do We Know about the Organization and Impacts of Participatory Approaches?

Before discussing the EDI's potential role in promoting community participation, we must ask two key questions. First, how much do we know about the potential benefits and potential costs of adopting participatory approaches and about the probability of benefits being achieved or costs being incurred in a particular project environment? Stated in operational terms, do we know enough to be able to advise a manager if and when to incorporate participatory approaches into the planning and implementation stages of a project? Second, do we know how to successfully implement participatory approaches? This section assesses the conclusions of the workshop consultants and participants about these two questions.

Potential Benefits and Costs of Community Participation

If target populations will respond "rationally" to the right economic signals, surely the formula for successful projects is to "get the prices right" and to ensure that projects are technically sound. If these conditions are fulfilled, why should policymakers, planners, and project managers be concerned about involving beneficiaries in project design and implementation? Will the protracted process of community consultations not simply interrupt the smooth flow of the project cycle, creating unnecessary delays, perhaps raising costs, leading to the danger of the manager losing control of the project and probably leading to demands for additional services for which there is no budgetary provision?

The participants identified a number of reasons, listed below, why wise and prudent development planners and managers should be concerned to ensure that beneficiaries are adequately consulted and involved from the beginning of the project.

•   Involvement of the community at an early stage is likely to improve design by ensuring that full advantage is taken of local technology and knowledge of climatological and topographical conditions, and ensuring that the project is fully adapted to the social organization of production. Participants cited many examples of the drastic consequences of not consulting beneficiaries: bridges collapsed, irrigation channels could not accommodate the monsoon floods (in a few cases the channels were actually filled in again by the farmers and rerouted) (Uphoff 1987), expected labor was not available during religious or community festivals, and certain house designs or sanitary systems were not acceptable to particular groups. Baum and Tolbert (1985) and Cernea (1985) provide ample additional documentation on the consequences of excluding people with local knowledge from the project design.

•   Community involvement can ensure a project's social acceptability and can increase the likelihood of beneficiaries participating in the project. Moser gave examples of squatter upgrading projects in politically volatile areas where it would have been impossible for the project to have been implemented without the systematic efforts to involve major community groups through consultation and planning meetings from the very beginning of the project. Where this social

acceptance is not achieved projects may never begin, participation levels may be much lower than expected, or services may not be used.

•   Community participation may help ensure the more equitable distribution of benefits and may ensure that politically or economically weak groups may have access to the project services and benefits. It was pointed out, however, that participation can be a two-edged sword in this respect as there is a danger of the project being coopted by the politically powerful with the result that certain groups have much less access than they would have had were the project to have been administered without any community involvement.

•   Resource mobilization is much easier when beneficiaries are committed to a project and actively involved in its design and implementation. The community resources may be provided in the form of labor, materials, or money. Cost recovery rates are often much higher when the community is actively involved. Extensive evidence from irrigation and housing projects indicates that if users are not involved in project design they are very unlikely to agree to pay user charges. The willingness of a community to provide labor or other resources during project implementation is also closely associated with their feeling of involvement in the project.

•   Community participation is usually an essential condition for the sustainability of irrigation projects. Uphoff cites examples of the differences in maintenance and cost recovery rates between projects where the community was and was not involved at the design and implementation stages. A USAID study of water supply projects (1982) found that in all cases where users covered O and M costs, the schemes were still working (Uphoff 1987). There is less systematic evidence from other sectors, but both Moser and Martin felt that participation was probably an equally important determinant of the sustainability of housing and health projects.

•   Although little documented evidence is available, experience suggests that at least some of the community institutions developed during project implementation will continue to produce further benefits once the project is completed.

Many discussions of community participation imply that if only politicians, planners, and managers could be made aware of the benefits of participatory approaches, they would all be anxious to use them. Unfortunately, the active involvement of beneficiaries in project planning or implementation is likely to involve costs (some of them difficult to foresee or calculate) and risks (some of them very large). Some of the potential costs include the following:

•   Project start-up may be delayed by negotiations with beneficiaries. The time factor may be significant when many different groups must be consulted, however, no information is available as to how much of the lost time may be recovered because of faster and smoother implementation as a result of community support and involvement.

•   Studies by USAID cited in the workshop found that participatory approaches frequently increased the number of managerial and administrative staff required (Goddard and Cotter 1987). In addition to the financial cost, this can become a significant burden for senior management as organized community groups will not be content to meet only with junior project officers.

•   Well organized communities are able to exert pressure to raise the level or widen the range of services beyond those originally planned, with consequent increases in project costs. Often the cost of these additional services cannot be included in the project loan and must be borne directly by the local or national government. Whether this is considered as a cost or a benefit will depend upon the perspective taken, but it is certainly a cost to the administrative agency that must find the additional funds.

Participatory approaches may also be more risky than bureaucratically managed projects.

- A constant concern of planners and managers is loss of control of the project. If beneficiaries do not want the services offered or would rather have other services, they may fail to cooperate or even actively oppose the project. The risk of this happening is obviously much less if beneficiaries were never consulted or informed about the project (in which case the project will probably have been constructed and inaugurated before anyone even knows about it or has been able to protest). In politically active areas, an opposition party may seek to use the community organizations to wrest control of the project from the implementing agency.

- The project may be coopted by a powerful economic, social, or political group so that most of the benefits do not reach large sections of the intended target population. Examples cited in the workshop included benefits of a squatter upgrading project that went only to homeowners and not to tenants; a project to distribute irrigation water that was controlled by certain ethnic groups; agricultural projects in which almost all credits went to male rather than female farmers.

- Informing beneficiaries about a project will increase their frustration or dissatisfaction if the project is delayed or delivers less services than planned. As the start and completion of projects may be unpredictably delayed for reasons beyond the control of project management, managers are understandably reluctant to raise expectations and then be blamed for delays or changes they cannot control.

- In politically volatile areas, the attempt to involve community organizations may create conflicts that either paralyze the project or create much wider problems.

- Finally, the community participation methodology is much less well known and predictable than traditional technical/bureaucratic approaches. Managers are therefore risking project delays, reduced quality, increased costs, or benefits not reaching the target group.

Successful Implementation of Participatory Approaches

Assuming that planners and managers are convinced of the potential benefits of participatory approaches, the question arises as to whether the tools for participatory approaches are sufficiently developed for use by planners and project officers, very few of whom are trained social scientists. Various workshop participants referred to these tools as "social technology," but we will retain the term "tools," as other participants felt that social technology was too mechanistic and implied that participatory approaches could be considered as a science when they are really an art. This section deals with participants' conclusions about the state of knowledge of the participatory tools available for use at different stages of the project cycle.

Participatory Approaches to Project Identification and Planning. A number of World Bank operational manual statements acknowledge the need to take social factors into consideration in project identification and planning, and there is considerable agreement as to the factors that should be taken into account in social analysis (Baum and Tolbert 1985; Cernea 1985, especially chapters 1, 12, 13). Some of these social factors are
- sociocultural and demographic characteristics of the intended beneficiaries,
- social organization of productive activities,
- cultural acceptability of projects and project organization,
- methods of eliciting participation (commitment),
- project accessibility to different sociocultural groups,
- gender issues in design and implementation.

During the workshop, participants gave examples where even seasoned staff had designed projects based on assumptions about the community that later proved to be incorrect. For example, the Second Integrated Rural Development Project in Jamaica had assumed that most farms were either managed by women or were jointly managed by a man and a woman. Consequently, no provision was made for the special credit, technical assistance, and supporting services (such as daycare centers and help to break into marketing networks largely dominated by men) that women needed to be able to use credit successfully. Due to this oversight, the project had to be substantially redesigned after about two years to provide services for women farmers (Women and Development Unit 1985).

Despite the recognition of their importance, the analysis of social factors has not been institutionalized in the way that the analysis of economic, financial, and technical factors has been. While the previously cited works by Cernea, Baum and Tolbert, and Salmen indicate the factors likely to influence project outcomes, guidelines on how to collect and analyze data on these factors are still needed. Also most of the examples cited are of the problems that arise when these factors are not taken into account. Little information is available about how to use social analysis to avoid these problems. Clearly, more research on completed projects is needed to understand the relationships between forms of community organization (for example) and project outcomes. In his workshop review paper, Uphoff cited some of the research now being conducted on this topic.

Participatory Approaches to Project Implementation. Strategies for promoting community participation and the factors affecting the degree and success of participatory approaches are extensively documented. The following factors are widely acknowledged as increasing the potential for successful beneficiary participation in project implementation:

- the degree of government commitment and political support for participatory approaches;
- the degree of homogeneity of the target population—the more diverse the population, the harder to introduce participation;
- the existence of traditional forms of community cooperation;
- the perceived need for the project;
- the perceived technical complexity of the project—the more technical the project, the more willing beneficiaries are likely to be to leave design decisions in the hands of government technicians;
- the form of financing—whether projects are financed by loans or by nonrepayable grants will affect community participation, however, experts disagree about which form of financing is most likely to stimulate participation;
- the level of education—some evidence suggests that the level of education is related to community participation, but the form of the relationship appears to vary from one project to another.

Workshop participants proposed the following guidelines for promoting participation:

- projects should be designed flexibly to accommodate existing local organizations and changes in organization and objectives as projects evolve as opposed to the low participation strategy in which outside consultants and experts design an inflexible blue print. Feedback is required to assess the effectiveness of different kinds of organization. Some of the options that should be tested and experimented with include formal versus informal organizations, existing versus new organizations, and small versus large organizations;
- projects should make maximum use of indigenous technologies and materials;

- catalysts (animators, promoters) should be used to help strengthen community organization and participation;
- a multiple tiered approach is needed to ensure participation at all levels of the project organization from the community level up to high-level government;
- bureaucratic reorientation through training and other methods is needed so that bureaucrats will be able to work with local groups rather than seeing them as a threat;
- participatory approaches are intimately linked to decentralized development, thus achievement of significant community involvement, especially for large projects, depends on a willingness to delegate authority to local government;
- the use of paraprofessionals is often an effective way to increase access to services and to reduce the gap between beneficiaries and government and hence to increase participation;
- implementation procedures must be designed to ensure participation of particular sectors of the community such as women and other groups that are economically or politically weak;
- training for community groups and local government agencies is essential to develop both skills and attitudes;
- a concerted effort must be made to identify and promote community leaders.

Designing Sustainable Projects. Many of the benefits of community participation only occur once a project is operational and when it must be sustained. Where the main priority is to ensure the completion of the physical infrastructure or the delivery of a service (such as vaccination or approval of credits), the involvement of beneficiaries may seem to produce unnecessary delays and raise costs. There are often a number of trade-offs (Honadle and Vansant [1985, p.8] call them "contradictions") between the design and organization for efficient implementation and the requirements for project sustainability, for example:

- an *ad hoc* organizational structure may be effective for implementation as it avoids many bottlenecks, but will usually prove ineffective for sustaining projects;
- projects can be designed more rapidly if community involvement is kept to a minimum, but beneficiaries may refuse to cooperate or help finance the maintenance of projects on whose design they were not consulted;
- a centralized management structure may ensure more efficient implementation, but may not produce sufficient local support to ensure sustainability.

Considerable experience exists in the rural development sector on the role of popular participation in the design of sustainable projects, and a number of writers such as Uphoff (1986) and Honadle and Vansant (1985) have produced guidelines. The recommendations focus on topics such as

- making initial diagnostic studies;
- identifying and eliminating financial, organizational, and policy constraints;
- introducing institutional strategies to reorient existing institutions to make them more responsive to beneficiary participation;
- strengthening local organizations and promoting local leadership;
- implementing decentralized development;
- using appropriate technology;
- moving from project-based to program-based approaches.

There is less experience in and documentation of other sectors such as urban development, promotion of small-scale enterprises, and health, but sufficient experience to be able to produce guidelines is probably available in each of these sectors.

Participatory Evaluation. A potentially important area is the involvement of intended beneficiaries in the monitoring of project implementation and the evaluation of project impacts. While little systematic documentation on this point exists, various workshop participants stressed the significant improvements that can be achieved in implementation and the equitable distribution of project benefits when the community is aware of the levels of resources that have been approved, how they will be used, and the intended outcomes and impacts.

Beyond the Project Cycle

The workshop shared the concerns of many authors that the project approach will frequently constrain local level participation in the following ways:
*   Projects are "time-bound" with definite starting and completion dates. The need to prepare a project for approval within a certain financial year makes it difficult to engage in potentially long, drawn-out community consultations. Similarly, the need to complete the project by a certain deadline may also discourage project officers from involving local organizations in implementation where this may cause delays.
*   The project cycle usually ends with the completion of the physical infrastructure (this is when the project completion report is prepared), and consequently most of the project objectives are defined in terms of short-run and numerically quantifiable indicators. Institution building or long-term issues of sustainability of services and benefits tend not to be included.
*   Donor agencies usually require that project design, outputs, and budgetary categories are precisely defined at the time of project approval to facilitate supervision and to ensure that the project's original objectives are achieved. This makes it more difficult to build in the flexibility required to adapt the project to the requirements and organizational patterns of the local communities.
*   Donor agencies frequently require the use of international consultants and international procurement procedures, which can restrict the use of local designs, technology, and labor.

The potential for local-level participation and local institution building is greatly enhanced when a sectoral or program approach is adopted. The sectoral approach makes it easier to focus on service delivery, institutional development, and local resource mobilization and to ensure that services are accessible to all sectors of the population. Consequently, the World Bank's move toward a country focus and within that to sectoral approaches, provides a framework within which facilitating the promotion of local-level participation at all stages of identification, design, implementation, and sustainability should be easier.

4
The Treatment of Community Participation
in EDI Training Activities

Workshop participants reviewed the treatment of community participation in a sample of EDI training programs held between July 1984 and June 1986 (Shields and Bamberger 1986), in those areas more amenable to participatory approaches: agriculture, rural development, and rural credit; water, urban development, health, and population; industry and financial management; education; and development management. The data on which the discussion was based was gathered primarily from course programs and final course reports. This reliance on written materials may have produced some underrepresentation as the subject of community participation often arises during discussion sessions even when not scheduled in the program. However, if community participation only enters through the back door, as it were, this is indicative of its low priority.

The treatment of community participation in recent EDI training programs is summarized below.

AGRICULTURE. Community participation was not included as a main topic in any of the 20 training activities reviewed, including policy seminars and training at the sectoral and project levels, although project-level courses did cover participation issues to some extent, and issues relating to community participation often arose in discussions.

The underlying assumptions of most of the courses were first, that farmers act rationally and that output will increase if they are given appropriate economic incentives; and second, that improving project management and correcting administrative factors militating against the effective execution of projects is essential. In some courses, particularly those on agricultural credit, how to motivate intended beneficiaries to participate in the projects or to apply for credit was one of the issues raised. There was little reference to the participation of beneficiaries in project planning or management, and participative issues were mainly concerned with motivating beneficiaries to participate in a project whose objectives and organization had already been determined.

URBAN, WATER, POPULATION, AND HEALTH. The 24 activities examined had no modules on community participation specifically, but the need for participation was a central theme of health and population activities. Assumptions about the role of communities were different for each of the topics. Water supply and sanitation activities concentrated on service delivery to individual households, with extensive discussion of how to encourage participation. The population seminars addressed decisions made at the household level, but recognized the influence of communities, through culture and social structure, on such decisions. Although population seminars did not seem to address community participation in project design, they consistently addressed the role of women in development. The health seminars focused on community-based primary health care, including community participation in managing community health workers. For both health and population, participation meant getting information to communities so that families would have the opportunity to recognize health needs and decide on appropriate action. Urban activities have been shifting toward municipal management and away from urban housing (which had included a discussion of self-help housing and neighborhood associations). The discussion of participation currently concentrates on project design and implementation, where the importance of beneficiary preferences is stressed.

INDUSTRY AND TRADE. The 12 activities discussed covered six substantive areas: development banking, industrial projects, public enterprise, small-scale industry, entrepreneurship, and technology transfer. In some of these areas, development banking, for example, community participation is not an important issue. In activities where this was not the case, participation was treated extensively even though it did not appear on the course program.

DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION. The activities examined focused either on the project cycle (economic and financial analysis, project implementation, etc.) or on public investment. Issues relating to community participation did not appear on the agenda of either type of course (although some discussion of participation-related issues in the project cycle courses often took place). The courses assumed that projects are selected on the basis of their economic, financial, and technical feasibility. The interests and needs of intended beneficiaries would be addressed through market studies, but there was rarely any mention of involving beneficiaries in the selection or design of projects.

The workshop identified a number of factors that explain the limited attention paid to community participation in EDI activities.

- EDI tends to reflect the World Bank emphasis on the economic and technical aspects of project appraisal and management. Like the World Bank, EDI has paid only scant attention to the role of beneficiaries in project preparation and implementation.

- Most EDI staff come from the Bank and have the same range of professional backgrounds, with their strengths in the areas of economics, finance, and technical fields. Very few EDI staff have professional training in sociology, anthropology, or political science, and most have had very little experience with participatory approaches or social analysis.

- The conceptual framework of the project cycle makes giving a full treatment to community participation difficult. The project cycle emphasizes the achievement of clearly defined physical and financial goals within a prescribed time period. There is little possibility for discussion of community control over resources (as loans are negotiated between government and international donors) and the project cycle ends with the completion of the physical infrastructure, giving equally little opportunity to discuss long-term community and institutional development.

- The course participants, who also come from economic, financial, and technical backgrounds, are often reluctant to devote time to "soft" social issues.

Participatory issues are, however, likely to receive considerably greater attention in the future for a number of reasons. First, EDI staff are working on addressing social sector issues in all training activities. Two initiatives that have been taken in this direction are the organization of the workshop described here and the setting up of an EDI task force on women in development. Second, one of EDI's priorities is to develop a training program on development management. This involves, among other things, an examination of political and administrative factors that affect project performance and an assessment of ways to make development administration more responsive to the needs of the populations that projects and programs are intended to serve. Third, a number of seminar and course modules have been organized on project and program monitoring and evaluation that include discussion of how to assess project impact on the target population, and how to assess the interrelationships between a project and the sociopolitical environment in which it operates.

5
EDI's Role

Despite its limited experience with community participation, workshop participants were surprisingly unanimous with respect to the key role that EDI might play in promoting community participation.

EDI's Potential Role in Community Participation

Participants thought that EDI had a number of comparative advantages that place it in a unique position to promote community participation. This stems from EDI's (a) access to senior government officials around the world; (b) access to World Bank staff and data; (c) extensive experience in training senior and mid-level government officials in macroeconomic and project-level courses and seminars; and (d) technical expertise in project analysis and sectoral and national planning that permits EDI to discuss participatory approaches within a broad macroeconomic and development framework. Most of the organizations with extensive community participation experience do not enjoy these advantages, nor do they have the same understanding of how policymakers, planners, and project managers think and behave.

These advantages are offset by EDI's limited experience with participatory approaches and by the limited direct involvement in participatory issues of most participants in its programs. EDI must establish close cooperative arrangements with organizations that have this grass roots experience, thereby creating a bridge between community participation practitioners and the senior government officials who must be convinced to use these approaches. Within this context, participants identified a number of possible roles for EDI as described below.

  • *Sensitizing participants and their sponsors to the issues.* EDI can help "legitimize" community participation by introducing it into its activities. This will demonstrate the importance of this topic to participants and their sponsoring agencies, and may stimulate further discussion and follow-up within the agencies.

  • *Developing a conceptual framework that is acceptable to planners, policymakers, managers, and community participation practitioners.* Much of the discussion on community participation uses a vocabulary and conceptual framework that economists, planners, and project managers find hard to understand, and to which they consequently react negatively. Terms such as "empowerment," "participation," "stakeholders," "sensitization," "animateur," and "people's power" are likely to create the impression that community participation is either vague or politically threatening. EDI's familiarity with the vocabulary and conceptual approaches of planners, policymakers, and managers means that it could make a major contribution by presenting the basic issues, approaches, and findings of community participation to them within a familiar framework, for example, by
    − showing how to estimate the impact of participatory approaches on project costs and on the implementation timetable;
    − showing how to estimate the impact of participatory approaches on the stream of project costs and benefits relating to cost recovery, maintenance and sustainability of the project, distribution of benefits, and so on;

- including participatory management styles as options in the discussion of project organization and management;
- discussing the uncertainties related to participatory approaches in sensitivity and risk analysis;
- assessing the contribution of participatory approaches to project sustainability.

The conceptual framework should also help EDI participants understand some of the limitations of a project approach, and should show how community participation becomes more important when program or sectoral approaches are used.

• *Promoting research and documentation.* Research to assess and quantify the benefits and costs of participatory approaches systematically in different sectors and contexts is urgently needed. Very few good studies are available and much of the evidence is anecdotal. Selecting a sample of projects that have been operational for a number of years, developing indicators of the intensity and types of participation, and relating these to estimates of costs and benefits should be possible. Quantitative analysis should be combined with in-depth case studies of a small sample of projects to understand the dynamics of participatory approaches and how they produced their impacts. A systematic study of this kind is probably beyond EDI's resources and should be conducted in cooperation with other Bank divisions or outside organizations. Producing systematic documentation of how to use participatory approaches at the local, regional, and national levels is also necessary. This can be done through a combination of in-depth case studies and comparative analysis of a number of similar projects. The production of this kind of material falls directly within the province of EDI and could be conducted in cooperation with a number of EDI's partner institutions.

• *Supporting national and regional training and research institutions.* EDI could identify a number of regional institutions involved in social and participatory training and research and could provide the same kinds of institutional development assistance that it is giving to institutions in other subject areas.

• *Disseminating international experience.* This can be done by including material in the EDI training materials catalog, preparing bibliographies (as was done for women in development), including modules in training courses, and helping partner institutions to disseminate relevant information.

• *Promoting dialogue and cooperation between the main actors in the development process.* EDI has considerable experience in organizing seminars and workshops in which senior government officials involved in development are brought together for frank and open discussions. One approach that has proved effective is to prepare case studies on which the discussions can focus. In a discussion of community participation the range of actors would be broader than for many EDI seminars as it should include representatives of community organizations; national and international NGOs; local, regional, and national government agencies; political parties and religious organizations; and international donor agencies.

• *Developing training material and training programs.* This is EDI's main area of expertise and is discussed below.

• *Integrating gender issues into mainstream development planning and management.* Gender issues are an integral part of a community participation strategy. Experience has shown that women

will not be successfully integrated into the management and benefits of development projects and programs unless specific provision is made for their needs and potential.

Strengthening the Coverage of Community Participation in EDI's Current Training Activities

This section discusses some of the general areas in which participatory issues could be introduced.

Project Planning and Management Courses. Most project courses pay very scant attention to social factors and to beneficiary involvement in project planning and implementation. The following are some of the areas where social and participatory issues should be introduced.

a. The influence of social factors on project design, implementation, and sustainability. Most courses either do not cover these issues at all, or provide only one general lecture. Extensive literature on this subject is available, but it is also important to ensure that examples are drawn from the particular countries and sectors covered by the course. To illustrate the possibly drastic effects of neglecting social factors, examples must be dramatic and convincing.[4] Participants can also be asked to provide their own examples.

b. Operational procedures for incorporation of social analysis (social impact analysis) into the project appraisal process. Explaining to participants, most of whom will have no social science research experience, how to carry out and use social analysis is essential. Guidelines must be prepared and case studies developed to illustrate the methods participants can use, and exercises should be developed to give practical experience. Ideally, the exercises should be conducted in the field, although this will not be possible in most courses. Some of the issues to be treated include
- identifying social factors that might affect the project;
- analyzing community organizations and leadership structures, assessing how different groups are likely to respond to the project, and evaluating the potential costs and benefits of different organizational systems;
- ensuring that the views of all potential beneficiary groups are obtained;
- employing research methods for data collection;
- interpretating the data and incorporating it into project design;
- incorporating data from social analysis into economic analysis and the estimation of rates of return;
- organizing the social analysis (decisions as to whether to conduct the analysis in-house or to contract consultants, guidelines on the selection and supervision of consultants, budget and timetable).

c. Participatory approaches to project analysis and design. While beneficiaries' views are often sought during project preparation, systematic involvement or consultation with beneficiaries or local organizations during project analysis and design is rare. The potential advantages and disadvantages of participatory planning should be discussed with examples or case studies to illustrate both the positive and negative sides. Discussion of administrative difficulties involved in participatory

4. We have cited examples earlier of bridges that collapsed, village construction projects that were never completed because the villages refused to provide labor and materials for a project on which they had not been consulted, dramatic differences in maintenance and sustainability of projects which did and did not involve the community, and so on.

approaches is important, for example, problems caused by delays in completion of the appraisal and the need to build more flexibility into the budget so that beneficiaries can influence the allocation of certain budget line items.

d.   Participatory organizational styles. Course Participants would consider alternative ways to incorporate community organizations into the project organization, and would assess the advantages of doing so and problems that might arise. Some of the issues to cover might include.

* institutional development and leadership training to create permanent local institutions to ensure the project's long-term sustainability and to develop future projects;
* mechanisms to ensure two-way communication between project management and the different sectors of the beneficiary population;
* specific areas or activities in which local organizations can be involved.

e. Designing sustainable projects. The organizational and design issues for ensuring successful *project implementation* are different from those for ensuring *sustainable projects*. The role of local organizations becomes much more important with respect to the latter. Some of the issues to be covered include linkages between beneficiary involvement in project planning and design and their willingness to assume responsibilities for maintenance, cost recovery, and continued delivery of services; and methods for involving beneficiaries in project operation and sustainability.

f. Ensuring the participation in and accessibility of the project to all sectors of the beneficiary population. Project organization and access to benefits is frequently monopolized by certain groups. The module should discuss the role of beneficiary participation in ensuring the project continues to be accessible to all sectors.

g.   Constraints imposed by the project approach on community participation. Participants in all project courses should be made aware of the constraints that the time-bound nature of projects, their emphasis on the completion of quantitative targets, and their limited attention to operations and maintenance can place on the involvement of beneficiaries. They should be made aware that many community participation practitioners consider the project approach to be a serious barrier to genuine community involvement.

The Social Implications of Macroeconomic and Sector Policies. Educators tend to assume that while social issues such as community participation and women in development should be discussed at the project level, they do not have a place in courses and seminars on macroeconomic and sector issues. Although community participation obviously fits less easily into these kinds of high-level discussions, a number of participatory issues should be addressed, for example, the social impacts of structural adjustment and macroeconomic policies. Until now the social impacts have been assessed mainly by economists, who have sought to develop quantitative indicators so that impacts can be "monetized" or otherwise assimilated into the conceptual framework of macroeconomics. This frequently leads to a very superficial treatment of the issues. Current economic approaches suffer from two weaknesses. First, discussion of how to assess or monitor the impact of programs at local levels and how to understand why they do or do not work as expected is limited. Second, discussion of how to involve the affected populations in the identification, design, or implementation of policies is nonexistent. Economists implicitly assume that the population will "act rationally" once the correct economic incentives and market signals are in place, and consequently that they do not need to consult the population on the wisdom of the policies or to seek their involvement. Participatory concepts and approaches could be introduced in the following areas:

* creating mechanisms to ensure that the affected population groups will be consulted during the design of structural adjustment loans and other macroeconomic policies—this is somewhat

analogous to beneficiary consultation during project design although much more complex and politically difficult;

  • developing mechanisms for involving local organizations in the implementation and monitoring of macroeconomic policies, for example, to obtain feedback on how small farmers have responded to the different kinds of incentives built into the projects and what impacts the changed economic environment has had;

  • exploring mechanisms for involving communities and local organizations in the design and implementation of programs to promote domestic resource mobilization;

  • broadening the range of participants invited to senior policy seminars so as to involve, for example, representatives of labor unions, NGOs, other kinds of private organizations; and teachers.

Development Management. Development management training programs have not so far addressed community participation as a priority issue, but participatory issues will probably be incorporated in some of the future activities. The following are some likely areas.

a. Decentralization of development planning and management is a central issue in many parts of the world. Many countries have found that devolution of planning, budgeting, and management responsibility to local-level organizations does not automatically ensure an adequate representation of the local community's opinions. Government officers are accustomed to receiving orders from above and are often reluctant to consult with local communities in their district. Traditional community leaders also wish to maintain their power and are often reluctant to permit involvement of local communities in decisions about resource allocation. This suggests a need to assess appropriate management and administrative strategies for ensuring adequate representation of the views of local communities, an issue that is becoming important in many countries that are moving toward decentralization.

b.   Assessment of the role of local organizations and NGOs, the extent of and methods for incorporating them into government programs, and the extent to which they should operate independently.

c. Means by which government and donors should work with NGOs. What kinds of financial incentives or support should the government give them? What roles can they be given in the selection, appraisal, management, and evaluation of projects? What kinds of technical assistance do they require? Can NGOs be integrated into government programs without weakening the NGOs or alienating them from their constituencies.

6
Proposed Strategy

EDI's financial and human resources will inevitably be limited, thus EDI must identify a minimum set of activities that will be sufficient to stimulate concern about community participation and to encourage the initiation of further activities.

Regional Seminars on Community Participation

EDI should plan a series of regional seminars or workshops to establish relations with interested organizations in each region, to understand the regional context, and to develop material and modules that can be used in standard regional courses. A prototypical training strategy in each region could involve the following:

a. Identification of a partner institution with experience and interest in this field and with a regional capability or mandate. Ideally the institution should have experience in general project planning and management training to give legitimacy to its programs on community participation.

b. Organization of a training activity that should comprise two components: a case writing workshop and a seminar. Cases would be prepared to illustrate projects that have successfully included participatory approaches and to assess the attitudes and experiences of the major stakeholders with the participatory approaches. Some of the cases would cover donor financed projects while others would focus on local level projects that did not involve donors (or possibly even government). The seminar would involve training institutions, government planners and managers, NGOs, and possibly donors. The objectives would be to assess participatory experiences in the region and to consider the appropriate role of local-level organizations, NGOs, local and national government agencies, and international organizations in the promotion of participatory approaches. The seminar would also propose follow-up training programs and the development of training material.

c. Organization of follow-up activities to develop modules for incorporation into ongoing training programs or to develop special training programs.

Developing Modules for Regular EDI Training Activities

The previous section lists some of the areas in which issues relating to community participation could be introduced into regular EDI training programs. The cooperation of interested divisions and project officers should be sought to develop and test modules on some of these topics for inclusion in regular training programs. Ideally modules should be developed in cooperation with a number of different divisions so as to assess how generally applicable these issues are to EDI. The following is a recommended list of priority modules, together with the suggested sectors that could be involved in their development and testing. Once tested, the modules could be adapted for use in other sectors.

a. Social analysis—this should include at least one session about the influence of social factors on project design, implementation, and sustainability (agriculture, rural development or urban development).

b. Designing sustainable projects (education, urban, water supply, health or rural development).

c. The social impacts of structural adjustment and macroeconomic and financial policies (national economic management or finance and industry).

d. Decentralized development and community participation (development management).

The costs of developing these modules should be shared between the course budget and a special authorization. In this way divisions would have an incentive to cooperate as they would have access to additional technical and financial resources.

Strategies for Developing Teaching Materials

EDI should resist the opportunity to reinvent the wheel. A great deal of case study and training material exists and many experienced lecturers are available. Some of the existing materials will have to be adapted to meet EDI's training needs. The following are some of the ways in which EDI could develop teaching material:

• Request participants in EDI seminars and workshops to prepare papers on their organizations' experiences with community participation. The Washington workshop successfully used this approach—participants produced 16 very informative papers. However, to use this approach effectively,

- ensure that participants are given sufficient advance notice so that they have time to prepare papers (in practice this is often difficult);
- provide detailed guidelines on the content and organization of the papers;
- have an editor attend the workshop to work with the participants;
- encourage participants to revise the papers afterwards;
- have a clear publication strategy—for maximum benefit all papers should be compiled into an unedited book of readings that can be distributed quickly (perhaps with an introductory chapter), the best papers should be included in the EDI training material catalog; a more formal document may be prepared for review and publication.

• Commission resource persons to prepare review papers that are presented and discussed in a workshop. The papers should then be revised to incorporate suggestions from the seminar and from reviewers. Sufficient time and resources should be budgeted both for a detailed discussion of the papers and for incorporating the comments and examples.

• Commission case studies on interesting projects. EDI will have to work closely with the persons preparing the cases and provide clear guidelines on content, structure, and use. Staff will have to avoid the danger of commissioning cases without a clear teaching objective in mind.

• Prepare case studies to be used in community participation seminars. Ideally, EDI would organize a case writing workshop at least six months prior to the seminar to permit sufficient time for case preparation and review. The cases would then form one of the focal points of the seminars with a day or more assigned to each case. The cases would be revised following the seminar and put in a form suitable for future use.

• Take the lead in promoting research proposals that could be jointly sponsored with other World Bank divisions or outside agencies. Resources would also be required to convert the research findings into teaching materials. Some of the topics might be

- estimation of the costs and benefits of participatory approaches;
- analysis of the perspectives and experiences of different stakeholders on the costs and benefits of participatory approaches;
- comparison of successful participatory experiences to develop guidelines on project design and organization.

• Commission some of the organizations that have specialized in this field to prepare and test training materials for EDI.

Once material has been developed, participants, partner institutions, and EDI staff must test and evaluate it. Where possible, having the material evaluated by outside experts would also be helpful. A number of NGOs would be willing to cooperate in this.

Coordination with Other Organizations

Community participation is clearly a field in which EDI is a relative newcomer and where it has a great deal to learn from other organizations. An essential component of its community participation strategy should therefore be to develop relationships with organizations knowledgeable in this field, for example:

• UN organizations such as ILO, UNICEF, Habitat, and IFAD—many of these organizations have expressed interest in helping select countries and sectors that would be receptive to training activities and in cooperating in the design, delivery, and possibly financing of an activity. Some would also be interested in helping develop new training materials. They might also be willing to form part of a consultative committee to advise EDI in this area.

• Other international donor agencies such as the regional development banks and a number of the bilateral agencies—they could help in ways similar to the UN and also possibly provide cofinancing.

• International and national NGOs—these are some of the main repositories of knowledge and experience in this field, but EDI has very limited contacts with them. One of their main contributions could be to offer both a national and a local-level perspective and to force EDI not to think only in terms of internationally financed projects implemented through national governments. Many of these organizations could also help to design and deliver training courses, to prepare training material, and to design any research projects.

• Universities and other research organizations—many universities have extensive research and training experience in this field and much documentation that could help EDI.

All these institutions are well placed to prepare review papers and to help in the design of any research projects. Many organizations also have considerable teaching experience and could make available their training materials.

Annex A
List of Participants

Mr. Fazle H. Abed
Executive Director
Bangladesh Rural Advancement Committee
  (BRAC)
66, Mahakhali
Dhaka 12
BANGLADESH

Dom Luciano Mendes de Almeida
General Secretary
National Conference of Brazilian Bishops
SE-SUL-801 B
Brasilia 70.000
BRAZIL

Mr. Ibrahim B. Nebie
Director of Training and Organization of
  Farmers
Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock
P.O. Box 360
Ouagadougou
BURKINA FASO

Dr. Xan Xuegui
Deputy Director
Department of Health and Epidemic
  Prevention
Ministry of Public Health
Beijing
CHINA

Ms. Nancy L. Nicalo
Assistant for Development
Church World Service
National Council of Churches
475 Riverside Drive
New York, N.Y. 10115
U.S.A.

Mr. Ole Therkildsen
Research Fellow
Centre for Development Research
9 Ny Kongensgade
Copehagen, 1472
DENMARK

Mr. Jose Roberto Samayoa
Coordinador de Asistencia Técnica en
  Planeamiento
Unidad de Innovación y Apoyo Técnico
Banco Ecuatoriano de la Vivienda
1731 10 de agosto
P.O. Box 7052
Quito
ECUADOR

Mrs. Jaya Arunachalam
President
National Union of Working Women
55 Bhima Sena Garden
Madras 600004
INDIA

Mr. Johan Silas
Senior Lecturer
Institute of Technology Surabaya
Laboratory for Housing and Human
  Settlements
12 Jalan Cokroaminoto
Surabaya 60264
INDONESIA

27

Mr. Muhammad A. Rahman
Employment and Development
International Labour Office
4 Route de Morrillons
P.O. Box 500
Ch 1211 Geneva 22
SWITZERLAND

Dr. Stephen N. Mbandi
Director, Buea Campus
Pan African Institute for Development
P.O. Box 133
Buea
CAMEROON

Mrs. Hidaya Saad Al-Khairy
Director
Population Affairs Directorate
Urban Development Department
P.O. Box 927198
Amman
JORDAN

Mr. Leopold Gahamanyi
Director of Research
Agricultural Research Institute of Rwanda
P.O. Box 138
Butare,
RWANDA

Ms. Mueni Monica Mutuku
Assistant Director
 (Community Development)
Housing Development Department
Nairobi City Council
P.O. Box 42047
Nairobi
KENYA

Ms. Christinia M. K. Nsekela
Executive Secretary
Family Planning Association of Tanzania
 (UMATI)
Samora Ave./ Zanaki St.
P.O. Box 1372
Dar-es-Salaam
TANZANIA

Mr. Manuel Contijoch Escontria
Coordinator
PRODERITH
IMTA - SARH
106 Privada de la Selva
Cuernavaca, Morelos
MEXICO

Mr. Robert T. van der Hoff
Human Settlements Officer/Training Officer
Research and Development Division
UNCHS - HABITAT
P.O. Box 30030
Nairobi
KENYA

Mr. Mario E. Martin
Unit Chief
Infrastructure and Services
Department of Social Affairs
Organization of American States
1889 F Street
Washington, D.C. 20006-4499
U.S.A.

Ms. Ana Maria Brasileiro
Project Officer
UNICEF
21 Ruan Mexico/9°
Rio de Janeiro 20.000
BRAZIL

Ms. Mary Hollnsteiner Racelis
Regional Director
Eastern and Southern Africa Regional Office
UNICEF
P.O. Box 44145
Nairobi
KENYA

Ms. Paula O. Goddard
Deputy Director
Centre for Development Information and
  Evaluation
Bureau for Program and Policy
  Coordination
United States Agency for International
  Development (USAID)
Room 215 A, 5.A.18
Washington, D.C. 20523
U.S.A.

Ms. Norma Shorey-Bryan
Director
Women and Development Unit (WAND)
University of the West Indies
Pinelands
St. Michael
BARBADOS

Annex B
Workshop Timetable

Monday, September 22

| 9:00 - 9:30 a.m. | Topic: | Opening session |
| | Speaker: | Mr. Christopher Willoughby |

| 9:30 - 9:45 a.m. | Topic: | EDI's objectives in organizing the workshop |
| | Speaker: | Mr. Michael Bamberger |

| 9:45 - 10:15 a.m. | Topic: | Evolution of the concept of community participation and the experience of the World Bank |
| | Speaker: | Mr. Samuel Paul |

| 10:30 - 11:30 a.m. | Discussion: | The discussion covered both Mr. Paul's paper and also participants' views on some of the key issues to be covered in the workshop |

| 11:30 - 12:00 noon | Topic: | Administrative arrangements for workshop |
| | Speaker: | Ms. Annie Ronco |

| 2:00 - 3:30 p.m. | Topic: | Approaches to community participation in population and health: presentation and discussion |
| | Speaker: | Ms. Patricia Martin |

| 3:45 - 5:00 p.m. | Topic: | Presentations by participants on the community participation strategies adopted in their programs |
| | Speakers: | Two participants to be selected |

Tuesday, September 23

| 9:00 - 10:15 a.m. | Topic: | Approaches to community participation in urban development programs: presentation and discussion |
| | Speaker: | Ms. Caroline Moser |

| 10:30 - 12:00 noon | Topic: | Approaches to community participation in agriculture and rural development: presentation and discussion |
| | Speaker: | Mr. Norman Uphoff |

2:00 - 4:00 p.m.   Topic: Small group discussions of factors affecting the success of
                                community participation

4:00 - 4:30 p.m.   Topic: Reports on the small group discussions

4:30 - 5:00 p.m.   Topic: Presentation on community participation strategies
                     Speaker: To be selected by participants

Wednesday, September 24

9:00 - 10:15 a.m.   Topic: The role of EDI in promoting community participation:
                                experience and issues—presentation and discussion
                     Speakers: Elisabeth Shields and Michael Bamberger

10:30 - 12:00 noon   Topic: Training strategies for community participation
                                Presentations by three participants followed by discussion
                     Speakers: To be selected by participants

2:00 - 3:30 p.m.   Topic: Small group discussions on community participation
                                training strategies at the level of community, project
                                staff, and program managers and policymakers

3:45 - 4:30 p.m.   Topic: Report on small group discussions on training
                                strategies

4:30 - 5:00 p.m.   Topic: Presentation by participant on community development
                                strategies
                     Speaker: To be selected by participants

Thursday, September 25

9:00 - 10:15 a.m.   Topic: Community participation and project accessibility to the
                                intended beneficiaries: presentation and discussion
                     Speaker: Mr. Lawrence Salmen

10:30 - 12:00 noon   Topic: Panel discussion on the role of international organizations in
                                the promotion of community participation
                     Panel: Three-four panelists to be selected by participants

2:00 - 3:30 p.m.   Topic: Guidelines for EDI and other international organizations in
                                the promotion of community participation: discussion

3:45 - 5:00 p.m.   Topic: Workshop evaluation

Annex C

Contents of "Readings in Community Participation: Papers Presented at the EDI Workshop"

Section 3:   Community Participation Experience in Urban Development Programs

Section 4:   Community Participation Experience in Agriculture and Rural Development

References

Abed, F. H. 1987. "Scaling up in Bangladesh Rural Advancement Committee." In *Readings in Community Participation*. Washington, D.C.: EDI. Chapter 17.

Arunachalam, Jaya. 1987. "Case Study of National Union of Working Women—An Indian Experiment." In *Readings in Community Participation* . Washington, D.C.: EDI. Chapter 3.

Baum, Warren, and Stokes Tolbert. 1985. *Investing in Development*. New York: Oxford University Press. Chapter 22.

Cernea, Michael (ed.). 1985. *Putting People First*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Conable, Barber. 1987. Address to the Board of Governors of the World Bank. September 29.

Goddard, Paula, and Jim Cotter. 1987. "The United States Agency for International Development Community Participation Experiences." In *Readings in Community Participation*. Washington, D.C.: EDI. Chapter 4.

Honadle, George, and Jerry Vansant. 1985. *Implementation for Sustainability: Lessons from Integrated Rural Development*. West Hartford: Kumarian Press.

Moser, Caroline. 1987. "Approaches to Community Participation in Third World Cities." In *Readings in Community Participation*. Washington, D.C.: EDI. Chapter 11.

Operations Evaluation Department. 1985. *Sustainability of Projects: First Review of Experiences*. Washington, D.C.: World Bank.

Paul, Samuel. 1987. "Community Participation in Development Projects: The World Bank Experience." In *Readings in Community Participation*. Washington, D.C.: EDI. Chapter 2.

Rahman, Anisur. 1987. "Participation of the Rural Poor in Development: Approach and Experience in an ILO Effort." In *Readings in Community Participation*. Washington, D.C.: EDI. Chapter 20.

Salmen, Lawrence. 1987. *Listen to the People*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Shields, Elisabeth, and Michael Bamberger. 1986. *Treatment of Community Participation in Recent EDI Training Activities*. Washington, D.C.: EDI. September (processed).

Shorey-Bryan, Norma. 1987. "The Process of Facilitating Community Participation – The WAND Experience." In *Readings in Community Participation*. Washington, D.C.: EDI. Chapter 6.

Uphoff, Norman. 1986. *Local Institutional Development: An Analytical Sourcebook with Cases.* West Hartford: Kumarian Press.

Uphoff, Norman. 1987. "Approaches to Community Participation in Agriculture and Rural Development." In *Readings in Community Participation*. Washington, D.C.: EDI Chapter 16.

Women and Development Unit. 1987. *Planning for Women in Rural Development.* St. Michael, Barbados: University of the West Indies. Chapter III.

The World Bank

WORLD BANK PUBLICATIONS OF RELATED INTEREST

Listen to the People: Participant-Observer Evaluation of Development Projects.
Lawrence F. Salmen. Oxford University Press.

Community Participation in Development Projects: The World Bank Experience.
Samuel Paul. World Bank Discussion Paper 6.

Putting People First: Sociological Variables in Rural Development.
Michael M. Cernea, editor. Oxford University Press.

Action-Planning Workshops for Development Management: Guidelines.
Jerry M. Silverman, Merlyn Kettering, and Terry D. Schmidt.
World Bank Technical Paper 56.

Water for Rural Communities: Helping People Help Themselves.
John Briscoe and David de Ferranti.

Cover design by Susan Foster

Bamberger

The Role of Community Participation in Development Planning and Project Management

The World Bank