



Food and Agriculture Organization
of the United Nations

Participatory Land Use Development in the Municipalities of Bosnia and Herzegovina

Guidelines



FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS

PROJECT GCP/BIH/002/ITA

INVENTORY OF THE POST-WAR SITUATION OF LAND RESOURCES IN
BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA

**PARTICIPATORY LAND USE
DEVELOPMENT IN THE
MUNICIPALITIES OF
BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA**

GUIDELINES

**Riccardo Biancalani
Chief Technical Advisor**

with

Douglas Brown

Paul DeWit

Sylvia Clementi

Melisa Ljuša

December, 2004



Acknowledgements:

A considerable amount of work was invested in the present publication. In addition to the authors (Douglas Brown [Editor], Paul DeWit [International Land Use Planning Specialist], Sylvia Clementi [International Social Territorial Pact Specialist], Melisa Ljuša [Regional Coordinator] and Riccardo Biancalani [Chief Technical Advisor]) all the staff of FAO in Bosnia and Herzegovina contributed to the project. Their names are: Stojanka Miljković, Slavenka Pudar and Slađana Ratković, Regional Coordinators; Nina Turčilo for the local language version; Vladimir Ćirko, project secretary and Amela Kozić for the administrative support.

Significant inputs for the collection and processing of the natural and socio-economic data were provided by Esad Bukalo of the Agropedology Institute of Sarajevo, Tihomir Predić of the Agricultural Institute of Banja Luka, Marijo Leko of the Agronomic Institute of Mostar and their staff.

Hamid Čustović of the University of Sarajevo revised the text and the local language version.

The Ministry of Agriculture, Water Management and Forestry of the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina, the Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Water Management of the Republika Srpska, the Municipalities of Sanski Most, Prnjavor, Stolac, Srebrenica, Milići and Bratunac gave their support.

This work would not have been possible without the contribution of Koos Dijkshoorn, Harrij Van Velthuisen, Michael Broten, Denny Kalensky and Walter De Oliveira, FAO consultants.

From the FAO in Rome, Freddy Nachtergaele (AGL), Stefan Schlingloff, Raimund Jehle, Nedžad Ajanović (REU) and Paolo Groppo (SDA) provided support and advice.

Finally, the work could not have been carried out without the financial assistance provided by the Government of Italy under the project GCP/BIH/002/ITA.

Table of Contents

List of Figures	iii
List of Tables.....	iii
Preface	iv
Introduction: Participatory Land Use Development (PLUD)	1
Land use.....	1
Land Use Development.....	3
Participatory Land Use Development.....	4
Chapter 1. Initiation: The Process Begins	7
Chapter 2. The Land Use Development Practitioner.....	9
Chapter 3. Preparation: Building the Negotiation Platform	13
Stakeholders	14
The Municipality Administration-The Key Stakeholder	14
Identifying Other Stakeholders.....	14
Stakeholder Analysis	15
Why do Stakeholder Analysis?	22
Stakeholder Sensitization	23
Technical team.....	24
Logistics.....	25
Work program	26
Initial Economic-Ecological Zoning.....	26
Outcome: The Stakeholder Complex and the Negotiation Platform.....	32
Chapter 4. The Territorial Pact: Matching Assets and Visions	33
The Opening Workshop	34
Composition of the Working Groups.....	37
Objectives of the Working Groups	39
Asset Mapping	39
Visioning	41
The Territorial Pact.....	42
Chapter 5. The Development Portfolio: Planning for Action.....	45
The Working Groups	45
The General Assessment Workshop	50

Chapter 6. Implementation: Achieving Results.....	51
Project Focal Point	51
Technical Support	51
Logical Framework Analysis	51
Funding Sources	55
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	56
Chapter 7. Programme Monitoring and Evaluation: The Feedback Loop	61
Chapter 8. Conclusion: A Self Sustaining Participatory Land Use Development Process.....	63
Bibliography	65

List of Figures

Figure 1: The Variables That Determine Land Use.....	1
Figure 2: Land Use Development Model.....	3
Figure 3: The Participatory Land Use Planning Model.....	4
Figure 4: The Initiation of the Process	7
Figure 5: The Land Use Development Practitioner	9
Figure 6: Preparation	13
Figure 7: Plot of Power/Interest Relationships	17
Figure 8: Stakeholder Analysis	18
Figure 9: The Territorial Pact	33
Figure 10: The Development Portfolio	45
Figure 11: The Steps in Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation	58
Figure 12: Programme Monitoring and Evaluation.....	61
Figure 13: Operational Participatory Land Use Development.....	63

List of Tables

Table 1: Stakeholder Power/Interest Data Table	17
Table 2: Power / Interest Cross Tabulation.....	18
Table 3: Stakeholder relationships with the main problem and each other.....	19
Table 4: Expected impacts of process	20
Table 5: Stakeholder power analysis	21
Table 6: Types of Information Useful for Initial EEZ.....	27
Table 7: Data Sources Useful for Developing Ecologic-Economic Zones (EEZ)	35
Table 8: Contrasting the Needs vs. Assets approach to community enhancement...40	
Table 9: What goes into a project proposal.....	49
Table 10: Logical Framework Matrix	54
Table 11: What's Different About Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation?.....	57

Preface

The methodology presented in this volume was developed as a product of the Inventory of Post-War Situation of Land Resources in Bosnia and Herzegovina project (GCP/BIH/002/ITA). The project has been funded by Cooperazione Italiana and implemented by the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) of the United Nations.

Project operations began in the year 2000. The initial objective was to create an inventory that reflects the current state of the land resources of Bosnia and Herzegovina (BiH). In addition to the actual inventory, an important component of this objective was strengthening the institutional capacity of BiH to independently monitor the land resources of the country. To this end the project has developed methodologies appropriate to local circumstances, supplied analytical equipment and provided training to local personnel.

In the year 2002, building on the project's achievements, the scope of operations was expanded. The focus was enlarged from its original concentration on the technical institutions to include local administrations dealing with land resources management. The project's goal in this second phase was to develop and implementing a methodology aimed at improving the capacity of local administrative units to deal with land resources management. The municipality level was chosen as the target for intervention in this project. This change in focus was expected to achieve three objectives:

- ⇒ Development and dissemination of an operational land evaluation system as a technical basis to support land use decision making at various levels;
- ⇒ Strengthening the capacity for land resources management at country, entity and municipality level; and
- ⇒ Provision of tested methodologies for action-oriented land resources management at the local level to guide rural investment and development.

This volume is one of the products the project generated to meet these expanded expectations. At the time this volume was published these guidelines had been successfully employed in six municipalities of Bosnia and Herzegovina. The experience in each of these municipalities has been unique, but that was an expected result in light of the first three goals listed in the previous paragraph. However, the most important outcome of all is that the process is continuing in all six of these municipalities.

Introduction: Participatory Land Use Development (PLUD)

The phrase “Participatory Land Use Development” contains three distinct concepts: land use, development and participation. This introductory section examines each of these concepts individually and concludes by weaving them into a coherent whole with the intention of providing a solid foundation on which to build the description of the methodology that follows.

Land use

Among the most fundamental of human behaviours is the occupation and employment of a territory to gain a livelihood. Land use is the term that describes the patterns in the landscape that emerge from these activities. More formally, as the FAO describes it:

“land use is characterized by the arrangements, activities and inputs by people to produce, change or maintain a certain land cover type. Land use defined in this way establishes a direct link between land cover and the actions of people in their environment.”¹

A variety of other definitions of the term land use can be found in the relevant literature, but the common central theme is the concept of human intervention in the processes that shape the land.




Figure 1: The Variables That Determine Land Use

Human Intervention is inevitably a complex topic, involving the systematic interaction of intricate variables. The diagram shown in Figure 1 illustrates one possible

¹ FAO and UNEP. 1999. *The Future of Our Land: Facing The Challenge*, Rome. p. 7

articulation of this complexity as it relates to land use². This model depicts land use as a function of four interrelated variables: legislation, social norms, markets and landscape, each of which is the focus of different disciplinary experts.

While its position in no way indicates any special importance, the variable at the top of the model is legislation. Legislation refers to the web of laws, regulations and policies that societies enact to control and direct the activities of their members. A wide variety of laws that effect the way land is used emerge from local, regional, state and international government organizations. Evaluation of their impact on land use involves the expertise of the political scientist and the lawyer.

A second variable in the model is labelled markets. The term market, as used here, is meant to include economic activity in its broadest sense, of all scales (local, regional, state and international) and all types (commodity, equity, financial). They all have an influence on land use. Thus, the discipline of economics has a role to play in the analysis of the arrangements humans create by interacting with the land.

A third variable is described as social norms, which refers to the attitudes, customs, education and practices of the inhabitants. Differences in any or all of these social factors can produce markedly different usage patterns on areas with similar landscapes. Exploration of these influences calls for the skills of the sociologist and anthropologist.

The final model variable is the physical landscape itself. This variable is meant to represent all of the tangible elements upon which the resident humans act, including natural phenomena like soils, geology, climate, vegetation, wildlife and hydrology, as well as culturally derived physical elements like roads, irrigation canals, power grids, pipelines, buildings and other infrastructure. Here is found the realm of the natural scientists and technologists, consisting of such experts as the agronomists, biologists, cartographers, foresters, hydrologists and engineers.

The image that emerges from this model is one of dynamic equilibrium. Each of these variables interacts with all of the others to generate a particular land use pattern in a given territory. Most importantly, changes in land use should not be viewed as being made directly, but can only derive from manipulating one or more of the variables that work together to form the land use pattern. Given the wide variety of knowledge required to fully understand the system as a whole, it is unlikely that one can intercede with complete confidence of achieving any particular outcome. In addition, the complex interrelationships between the variables cause extreme difficulty in precisely predicting the total effect that disturbing the equilibrium might produce. Thus, the probability is high that the law of unintended consequences will be fully operational during any attempt to manipulate such a system. The end result of this uncertainty is that intervention into the land use system inevitably involves an evolutionary approach in which modifications that work are retained and those that do not are discarded.

² This model is derived from the approach to natural resource management developed by the Department of Resource Development at Michigan State University. Many other formulations that illustrate the inherent complexity are possible. The main advantage of this particular model is the editor's familiarity with it. There was considerable discussion between the editor and the FAO consultants on the exact terminology to employ in this model, but in the end there was agreement that this formulation adequately represents the concept of complexity in the formation of land use patterns.

Land Use Development

Despite the inherent difficulties described above, human optimism persists and we continue in our attempts at arranging the world in a manner that we find more suitable. Implicit in the phrase “development of the land use” is the concept of Land Use Planning, which has been defined by the FAO as:

“a systematic and iterative procedure carried out in order to create an enabling environment for sustainable development of land resources which meets people’s needs and demands. It assesses the physical, socio-economic, institutional and legal potentials and constraints with respect to an optimal and sustainable use of land resources and empowers people to make decisions about how to allocate those resources.”³

Figure 2 contains an illustration of the land use development model which expands the land use model presented in Figure 1. The box on the left side of the arrow represents the initial state of the variables determining the use of the land, as described above. On the right side of the arrow is a box representing the outcome of the development process. Note that each of the variables in the outcome box is changed. The development process does not necessarily seek to change all of the variables, but given the dynamic equilibrium of the system, changes in one variable frequently cause compensating changes in all of the others. The arrow connecting the two boxes represents the planning procedure which is the primary topic of discussion in these guidelines.




Figure 2: Land Use Development Model

The definition of land use planning cited above contains several key concepts that deserve further consideration. The first is the term “development.” This word assumes that there will be change. For this reason the planning process is represented as an arrow in Figure 2 and the variables in the outcome are represented as “revised,” altered,” “changed,” and “modified.” Development also implies that the change is in a “positive” direction, leading to the description of the outcome as “Improved Land Use.”

The definition establishes some goals that the process is to achieve, including sustainability, optimization and meeting peoples needs and demands. These three ideas are closely linked. Sustainable systems operate indefinitely without wearing out or exhausting the resources upon which they depend. Optimal systems produce outputs of the highest possible quality at the highest possible rate and at the lowest

³ FAO and UNEP. 1999: p.14

possible cost. People’s needs and demands are seemingly endless. It is easily discernable that there is considerable tension and potential for conflict to be found in the interplay among these three goals.

In addition, the process is described as systematic and iterative. This has at least two major implications. First, systematic application requires the participants have some basic level of skill at executing the procedures. Second, an ongoing, iterative procedure demands at least a minimum investment of time and interest by the individuals concerned.

Finally, this definition speaks to how the procedure is to operate. It is to assess the variables, create an enabling environment and empower the people to make decisions about how to allocate their resources to achieve the goals that emerge. It is this last set of characteristics that leads us into the final part of this introductory section: participation.

Participatory Land Use Development

The debate concerning how best to get human’s to cooperate dates back to the origin of the species, if not before. There are, in fact, theories postulating that species *Homo sapiens* originated from this very need for social cooperation. The number of systems that have been devised to engender cooperation is seemingly endless. They include, among others, such concepts as feudalism, dictatorship, democracy, theocracy, socialism and tribalism. Over the millennia millions of people have died, vast libraries of literature have been written and rivers of treasure have been expended in the conduct of this debate. At this moment in history, in which the cold war ended with the apparent triumph of the free market/democracy archetype over the central planning by elite experts paradigm, there seems to be a general consensus emerging that the best way to achieve cooperation is to seek active participation by the greatest number of individuals who have an interest in any given issue. In short, the concept of participatory democracy is currently in ascendancy.

In the land use development context this means placing the people who are concerned with a particular territory at the centre of the decision making process regarding the use of the resources in that territory. Such people are referred to as stakeholders. The concept of stakeholder is central to the PLUD concept and is defined by the FAO as:

“anyone or any institution who has interests in, or is affected by, an issue or activity or transaction and, therefore, has a natural right to participate in decisions relating to it.”⁴




Figure 3: The Participatory Land Use Planning Model

⁴ FAO and UNEP. 1999: p.19

The modification to the Land Use Development model introduced by this concept is shown in Figure 3. The box labelled stakeholder now replaces the arrow in the previous diagram, indicating the central role this element has in the participatory process. An arrow leading from the initial state to the stakeholder, labelled information, represents the need empower stakeholders to analyze the existing situation. The other arrow, labelled implementation, symbolizes the need to enable the stakeholder to make the necessary changes in the system. This formulation puts the focus on the stakeholder rather than on the land use or the land use planner. It endeavours to use the stakeholders' intimate knowledge and experience of their own territory to reveal their needs and desires. Once their wishes are determined, the process moves on to assist them in reaching goals that they define for themselves.

The intention of involving the stakeholders as the key element of the process is that they will feel that they own it and become committed to using it to achieve results. The expectation is that stakeholder commitment to the process leads to:

- ⇒ A decentralization of policy;
- ⇒ An increased participation of civil society in order to establish common interests;
- ⇒ A greater autonomy in the management at local level of the resources for land administration; and
- ⇒ A redistribution of resources toward sustainable local development.⁵

This is not a new concept. In the sixth century B.C. the Chinese philosopher Lau Tsu wrote "Go and meet your people, live and stay with them, love them, work with them. Begin with what they have, plan and develop from what they know, and in the end, when the work is over, they will say: 'We did it ourselves.'"

Putting the stakeholder in the central role does not eliminate the need for the experts. On the contrary, the role of the professional expert under this model is probably weightier than ever. Instead of merely doing technical studies and analyzing data to arrive at neat solutions, the expert now has to make complex issues clearly understandable to a wide variety of stakeholders with diverse backgrounds, guide them through a consensus building process and assist them in the mechanics of attaining the goals that they eventually formulate. This is a much less well defined and more difficult task than sitting in an office or laboratory making maps or analyzing soil samples. In the model this role is located primarily in the arrows in Figure 3 and is discussed at length in the main body of this manual.

The FAO has formulated a list of seven key factors that are associated with successful Participatory Land Use Development:⁶

- ⇒ There must be a clear formulation of the objectives and problems to be solved.
- ⇒ All of the stakeholders and their differing objectives must be recognized.
- ⇒ An adequate enabling environment and regulatory policy is required.
- ⇒ Effective institutions must exist.
- ⇒ There must be a platform for negotiations.
- ⇒ An accessible and efficient knowledge base is necessary.
- ⇒ There must be a set of planning procedures.

A major role of the expert is to ensure that all of these factors are in place and functioning as they should. The balance of this volume describes the methodology

⁵ **FAO**. January, 2004. *Participatory and Negotiated Territorial Planning: Methodological Guidelines for a Territorial Approach*, Draft for Comments, by Clementi, Sylvia and Federica Ravera. Rome: p. 8

⁶ **FAO and UNEP**. 1999: p. 19

that the project has developed to achieve this result in the Municipalities of Bosnia and Herzegovina and provide guidelines to assist those who wish to employ these techniques.

Case Studies

The Inventory of the Post-War Situation of Land Resources in Bosnia and Herzegovina has been developing the PLUD methodology in pilot municipalities since January, 2002. The initial efforts were made in the municipalities of Stolac, Sanski Most, and Prnjavor. More recently the municipalities of Srebrenica, Bratunac and Milići were added to the list. Throughout this manual examples from these pilot projects will be used to illustrate the concepts discussed in the text. These examples are labeled as case studies and appear in grey text boxes like this one with the dashed borders. The full reports of the PLUD activities in the pilot municipalities can be found on the companion CD included with this document.

Key Concepts

Certain concepts that have been deemed to be of special importance or in need of extra emphasis are highlighted throughout this document by placing them in tan colour text boxes like this one with the solid borders.

Chapter 1. Initiation: The Process Begins

*He has half the deed done
who has made a beginning
- Horace*

Land is finite. Human populations are increasing without obvious limit. These two related facts create a variety of conflicts. The relationship between land and humans is far from simple and direct, but it exists on many levels. Humans make demands on the land, the fulfilment of which are essential to their welfare. If and when these demands exceed the ability of the land to produce the results are disagreeable, unpleasant, or even catastrophic. The consequence can be degradation of the land and/or conflict between claimants for the resources the land provides. As human populations grow such undesirable results tend to become increasingly common.

Since there is little scope for increasing the available land area and little indication that human populations will stop growing in the immediate future, the only hope to minimize the aforementioned undesirable results is to more efficiently exploit the resources the available land produces. More efficient exploitation implies a rational, organized intervention into the system, or, in other words, land use development. Thus, land use development can be said to begin when an event, person, organization or other agency creates awareness that the existing situation is sub-optimal and generates the power necessary to initiate a process leading to change in that situation.




Figure 4: The Initiation of the Process

PLUD doesn't just happen, it is initiated. Someone then manages a process over time and allows others involved more or less control over what happens. Figure 4 represents the initiation of the process as an arrow at the top left of the model. The arrow is open ended to signify that the source of the motivation for land use planning is often external to the process itself. This is not always the case, however, because it is possible that one of the stakeholders or the experts involved in the process may provide the initiative.


The PLUD methodology presented in this manual is targeted at the municipalities of BiH. It follows that in the majority of cases the process initiator will probably be the municipality administration. Municipality government officials might be motivated to start such a process for any of a variety of reasons. A mandate from a higher administrative level (Canton, Entity, State), a response to the expressed wishes of

the inhabitants of the municipality, a reaction to pressure from an NGO, or an internal desire to promote the involvement of their constituents in land use development projects are but a few of many possible motivational forces that could get the municipality started with a PLUD process.

Although in the long term the municipality is most the most likely initiator of the process, this is not the only possible scenario. Other groups, public or private, could also take the initiative. Perhaps the most obvious example is the current FAO project under which this methodology was developed. The FAO started the process in six municipalities in order to develop and test it. Another example would be the intervention of civil society groups either from within or outside the municipality. As awareness grows that such a thing is possible, it is hoped that an individual, group or coalition of groups could perceive of needs to be filled in the municipality and take the initiative to set the process in motion. Regardless of the source of the initiation, however, the methodology described here envisions the existing municipality administrative structure as the principal organ for the implementation of the process.

Case Study: Initiation of the Process in the Pilot Municipalities

The PLUD activities were initiated in the pilot municipalities as an expansion of the objectives of the Inventory of the Post-War Situation of Land Resources in Bosnia and Herzegovina project. The objectives of this project during its first two years of operation were to strengthen the institutional capacity for developing the kinds of information needed for land use management in BiH. Once having developed this capacity, the next logical step was create a linkage to the institutional structures that have a need for such information. The municipal governments were selected as the most appropriate administrative level at which to develop this linkage. After a careful screening process three municipalities-- Stolac, Sanski Most and Prnjavor were selected as an appropriate starting point. After working with the three initial municipalities for approximately one year the project expanded its operations into three additional municipalities to apply and test the lessons that had been learned while working with the first group. Included in this second group were the municipalities of Srebrenica, Bratunac and Milići.



Chapter 2. The Land Use Development Practitioner

*To lead the people,
walk behind them
- Lao Tzu*

Nothing happens if nobody does anything. It follows, then, that for something to happen there must be a “somebody” to do it. This is just as true of land use development as it is of any other area of human enterprise. An individual, group, institution or coalition of groups is required to take action to mobilize the stakeholders and create at least the minimum critical mass of interest, expertise and resources required to get the land use planning process to a self sustaining level of operation. In this manual we refer to such an entity as a Land Use Development Practitioner.⁷ Referring back to the previous discussion about the initiation of the process, this component is the “someone [who] then manages a process over time,” and is essential in “generating the power necessary to initiate a process” as described in the previous chapter.




Figure 5: The Land Use Development Practitioner

The element representing the land use development practitioner appears in the model, as shown in Figure 5, as a direct result of the initiation activities introduced above. It is placed at a higher level than the other elements in the model to indicate that, while the practitioner plays an essential supporting function, it is not at the core of the process. The principal task of the practitioner can be thought of as creating and maintaining the stage upon which the other actors can perform their roles.

The term Land Use Development Practitioner is meant to include the broadest possible range of institutional arrangements. Since every situation in which this methodology will be applied will be unique, the intention of selecting this term was to avoid being prescriptive as to the nature of the individual or group that will fulfil this function. It is the function that is important, not the exact nature of the organization or individual that performs the function. It is possible to envision many different suitable permutations of this role. The land use development practitioner could be an individual or group of people within the Municipality administration itself, a resident or

⁷ This term was derived from **Wilcox, David**. 1994. *The Guide to Effective Participation*. Partnerships Online (Available: <http://www.partnerships.org.uk/guide/index.htm>)

group of residents of the Municipality, a national or international NGO, or any combination of the above.

Whatever the exact nature of the land use development practitioner, the responsibility is enormous, with tasks that include:

- ⇒ identifying the stakeholders;
- ⇒ collecting the baseline information needed to get the process started;
- ⇒ sensitizing the participants to the nature of the process;
- ⇒ facilitating the negotiations;
- ⇒ providing logistical support;
- ⇒ coordinating the activities of the various institutions; and
- ⇒ attending to a myriad of other details as they arise.

As is readily evident from this list of tasks, the land use development practitioner is expected to possess a very wide range of skills, both personal and technical. The need to maintain relationships with a very wide range of different stakeholder groups relevant to the process make social skills among the most important qualifications. Such groups include individual citizens, expert service providers, local governments (Municipality, Canton and Entity), public services, interest groups and NGO's. The people in these groups will have a wide variety of attitudes and come from diverse cultural, social and educational backgrounds. The practitioner must be able to gain and hold credibility with them all to achieve a full measure of success. Qualities such as patience, empathy, diplomacy and compassion are important.

A second group of skills revolve around communications abilities. These skills are closely related to the social skills in that the ability to truly exchange information is essential to maintain mutual respect. But they also go further.

Effective writing abilities are essential for planning, organizing and maintaining a record of the process. Much that occurs in the process needs to be documented so that the internal organization has a solid frame of reference for what has been agreed and accomplished, as well as to provide substance to outsiders such as funding agencies and regulators.

Case Study: The Regional Coordinators

In the Inventory of Post-War Situation of Land Resources in Bosnia and Herzegovina project the Land Use Development Practitioner function has been performed by the regional coordinators. The regional coordinator's experience has, in many ways, been the heart of the project and is the fundamental source for much of the information that is contained in these methodological guidelines.

The project started with one regional coordinator working in each of the three initial pilot municipalities. One of the regional coordinators left the project after about a year, and her duties were reassigned to one of the others.

Only one regional coordinator was assigned to the last three pilot municipalities when they were added to the project. These three municipalities were adjacent to one another and the other two regional coordinators were available to assist when needed. In addition, a stronger commitment was required of the officials in these three municipalities in terms of providing resources and personnel for project activities. This change was made as an experiment to help determine the optimal workload distribution between the municipality administration and the regional coordinator.

Effective presentation skills are called for in every phase of the process. A great deal of information on the background and functional mechanics must be presented in a manner that is comprehensible to dissimilar participants. It is a difficult challenge to strike the proper balance between presenting too little information and presenting so much material that everything is rigidly defined and there is no room for stakeholder participation.

Adequate written documentation is the basis for learning from both successes and mistakes.

Another essential skill area is management. The practitioner must be able to organize people and resources. Getting people to work together requires planning and logistics. People need to be notified of the tasks that are expected of them, meeting rooms need to be made available, people have to be transported, the requisite supplies must be acquired and all must be where it is needed, when it is needed. The practitioner must also have the management skills necessary to create and lead a working team in conducting the process.

A wide variety of interdisciplinary technical skills is also essential. Since land use is a spatial phenomenon, the ability to work with maps and remote sensing imagery is critical. Of equal importance is the ability to understand and analyze statistical information. Field techniques, such as Rapid Rural Appraisal (RRA) and Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA), are important tools to be employed. Traditional library research skills certainly have an important part to play in the collection, evaluation and compilation of information useful to the process. But more important than any individual skill is a well rounded background that allows practitioners to be able to interact with and derive useful information from all of the different kinds of experts identified in the introduction to these guidelines and provide a conduit that permits the stakeholders to gain access to the resources they can provide.

One area of technical skills that deserve special mention is the art of facilitation. Since a very significant part of the process involves negotiations of one sort or another, the ability to effectively facilitate meetings is critical. A huge body of literature concerning the art of facilitation exists. It is essential that the land use development practitioner be familiar with and skilled at the techniques it provides. No other skill set is more critical for success.

Last, but not least, is the ability to be creative and flexible. No two groups are the same. No two problems yield to identical solutions. Each situation must be addressed anew, using a different combination of tools, resources and techniques. It is impossible to devise a step by step list of procedures for the practitioner to follow. The importance of creativity and flexibility is that they allow the practitioner to do whatever it is that needs to be done to accomplish the job, without regard to the way it was done elsewhere or at another time. It is the outcome that is important, not the means by which it is achieved. That is why this is a book of guidelines, not rules.

Chapter 3. Preparation: Building the Negotiation Platform

*Before everything else,
getting ready is the secret to success
- Henry Ford*

We now turn to a description of the practitioner's activities. The first among these, in both time and importance, is to prepare all of the elements that are needed for the process to succeed, including the people, institutions and materials. In Figure 6 the development model has been modified to reflect this role.




Figure 6: Preparation

At this stage, the double headed arrow labelled “Preparation and Support” signifies the practitioner’s activities directed at learning about the stakeholders characteristics, as well as actions taken to inform the stakeholders about the process. The two heads on the arrow are intended to signify the interactive, repetitive nature of this activity. At this stage of the process the actors become acquainted with one another and the practitioner, learn how the process works and discover what role they are to play. Meanwhile, the practitioner uses this phase as an opportunity to identify the stakeholder constituencies in the municipality, determine the dynamics of their interactions with one another and, above all, build a relationship of mutual credibility, trust and respect.

At the same time, the practitioner develops an understanding of the existing status of the municipality. This activity is represented by the arrow labelled “Information” pointing to the practitioner in Figure 6. The more comprehensive the practitioners’ knowledge is of every aspect of the municipality, the better prepared they will be to establish a proper negotiating framework and assist the stakeholders in its use.

It is also at this stage when the practitioner makes contact with external partners, or as they will be referred to in this document, service providers. These are people or institutions that can provide the technical expertise that the stakeholders will need or find useful as they work their way through the process. Examples of service providers include research and academic institutions, private consultancy firms, government agencies, international organizations and non-government organizations (NGOs). Such service providers have to be identified, contacted and linked to the

stakeholders. The information arrow pointing to the stakeholder element in Figure 6 represents this linkage.

The result of all of these activities is a group of motivated stakeholders, informed about the process; linked to the necessary expertise; and equipped with the requisite knowledge, attitudes, materials and facilities to carry out their task. This is the negotiating platform referred to in the chapter title. Let us now turn to a more detailed examination of how to achieve this result.

Stakeholders

The Municipality Administration-The Key Stakeholder

One of the primary purposes of developing this methodology is to strengthen the capacity of the municipality administrative structure to manage the land resources for which it has responsibility. It therefore follows that the municipality administration has a very prominent position in the list of stakeholders of the process. Among the most important goals of the practitioner is getting the participatory methodology institutionalized in the operational procedures of the municipality administration. Since it is these administrators who are responsible for the long term application of this methodology, success is possible only if the practitioner can convince them of the utility and value of the methodology in addressing the problems which they are faced in their work. Achieving this goal requires a thorough understanding of the organizational structure and the individuals who make it up. Attaining this knowledge is among the practitioner's top priorities. Devising strategies to integrate the participatory development methodology into the operations of the municipally depends on the use of such knowledge.

At this point one general rule becomes critical:

All further activities of the practitioner must be undertaken in partnership with the responsible person or people in the municipality administration, keeping in mind the ultimate goal of empowering the municipality administration to assume the practitioner's role in its future activities.

This point is important because the objective is not simply to create a one time development project, but to establish a continuing capacity in the administration to use the methodology into the indefinite future. This purpose can only be realized if the practitioner's activities are exercised both to achieve the development outcome and to transfer the skills used in the process to the parties in the administration who will have the responsibility in the future. Both are important: the former because a successful development effort is the most convincing argument to motivate the municipal authorities; the later because without the skills transfer the methodology will quickly die out when the practitioner leaves the scene.

Identifying Other Stakeholders⁸

Aside from the municipality administration, there are some numbers of other stakeholders who must be involved in the process. The practitioner must attempt to

⁸ Most of the material in this and the next section, Stakeholder Analysis, has been derived from **International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED)**. June 2001. *Power Tools Series: Stakeholder Power Analysis* (Available: www.iied.org/forestry/tools or www.livelihoods.org)

identify and include them in the process. Not all stakeholders are readily apparent. Finding them is an ongoing and open task, and there is always a risk that some will be missed. A variety of approaches should be taken in their identification to minimize the prospect of overlooking potential stakeholders, including:

- ⇒ identification by staff of key agencies and other knowledgeable individuals;
- ⇒ identification through written records and population data;
- ⇒ stakeholder self-selection in response to publicity of the process; and
- ⇒ identification by other stakeholders.

No matter which of the approaches to identifying the relevant stakeholders listed above is used, there are some key questions that should be asked when deciding who needs to be included in the negotiations:

- ⇒ Who are potential beneficiaries of the process?
- ⇒ Who might be adversely affected by process outcomes?
- ⇒ Who has existing rights?
- ⇒ Who is likely to be voiceless?
- ⇒ Who is likely to resent change and mobilize resistance against it?"
- ⇒ Who is responsible for intended plans?
- ⇒ Who has money, skills or key information?
- ⇒ Whose behaviour has to change for success?

There are two key characteristics to keep in mind when identifying individuals who are to represent stakeholder groups: identity and accountability. **Identity** refers to the degree that the individual shares the views of the group that they represent.

Accountability is the degree to which the individual is responsive to the wishes of the group. The practitioner must insure that the representatives conform to the group in both of these facets if the group's participation in the process is to be relevant.

Stakeholder Analysis

It is not enough to merely identify the stakeholders. It is also important to know something about them. Stakeholder analysis concerns the inventory and scrutiny of:

- ⇒ stakeholders characteristics, such as interest, power, control over resources, knowledge and information, how they are organized or represented and limitations for participation;
- ⇒ their relationships with others; and
- ⇒ their influence and motivation towards decision making, including expectations, likely gains and willingness to participate and invest resources.

Some of the aspects about the stakeholders that may prove interesting and useful to know include:

- ⇒ the basics (men/women, rich/poor, young/old);
- ⇒ location (rural/urban, local/distant);
- ⇒ ownership (landowners/landless, managers, staff, trade unions, cooperatives);
- ⇒ function (producers/consumers, traders/suppliers/competitors, regulators, policy makers, activists, opinion-formers);
- ⇒ scale (small, medium or large scale; local, regional, state, international); and
- ⇒ time (past, present, future activities).

With this knowledge about the stakeholders the practitioner can begin to investigate their interests, qualities and circumstances. Some questions that might be relevant are:

- ⇒ What are the stakeholders' experiences or expectations with the process?
- ⇒ What benefits and costs will there be for the stakeholder?
- ⇒ What stakeholder interests conflict with the goals of the process?
- ⇒ What resources is the stakeholder willing to mobilize to forward the process?
- ⇒ What level of participation is the stakeholder likely to sustain?⁹

Further useful information on the stakeholders can be generated through the analysis of their relative power and interest.¹⁰ These two variables are defined as follows:

power is the ability a stakeholder has to facilitate or impede the achievement of an activity's objectives and **interest** is the degree to which the stakeholder is willing to participate in the process.

The following questions could be useful in assessing the power and interest of the stakeholders:

- ⇒ Who is dependent on whom?
- ⇒ Which stakeholders are organized? How can that organization be influenced or built upon?
- ⇒ Who has control over resources?
- ⇒ Who has control over information?
- ⇒ Which problems, affecting which stakeholders, are the priorities to address or alleviate?
- ⇒ Which stakeholders' needs, interests and expectations should be given priority attention with respect to the process?

A variety of techniques are available to analyze these variables,¹¹ but one useful procedure involves subjectively assigning a score of 1 to 5 to each stakeholder's power and interest based on the answers to the questions above and any other relevant criteria. Table 1 shows an example of this technique, where the first column lists the stakeholders and the second and third columns are their scores for power and interest, respectively. These scores can then be plotted on a two dimensional graph, as shown in **Figure 7**, to provide a consolidated view of the stakeholder power/interest relationships. There is one important caveat, however. The practitioner should never forget that this is a very subjective procedure and the use of numeric methods does not make it any less so.

⁹ For an excellent discussion of levels of stakeholder participation see **Wilcox, David**. 1994.

¹⁰ Other sources refer to Power as "Influence" and Interest as "Potential."

¹¹ **Wilcox, David**. 1994: pp. 2.3-2.11

**Case Study:
Stakeholder Power/Interest Analysis
Of Stolac Municipality**

Table 1:
Stakeholder Power/Interest Data Table

Stakeholder	Power	Interest
Zadruga «Agriplod»	1	1
Zadruga «Dubrave»	2	3
UG «Privrednik»	1	1
Udruženje pčelara	4	1
Vinarija «Stolački podrumi»	2	5
Duhanska stanica	4	5
Preduzeće «Šume Herceg-Bosne»	1	1
Centar za mlade «Modra rijeka»	1	3
NVO «Dažd»	2	3
NVO «Novo vrijeme»	2	3
Koorporacija «Hutovo blato Park prirode»	1	1
Lovačko društvo «Kamenjarka»	3	3
Veterinarska stanica	4	4
Civilna zaštita	3	1
Komunalno preduzeće	3	1
Udruženje Srba povratnika	4	4
Poljoprivredni proizvođači	1	1




Figure 7: Plot of Power/Interest Relationships

Table 2 presents a matrix that can be used to interpret the power relations revealed in the plot of power/interest relationships. The information in the cells describes how each type of stakeholder relates to the process.

Table 2:
Power / Interest Cross Tabulation

	Low Power	High Power
High Interest	Stakeholders in this segment may prove helpful if they can be empowered.	Natural allies of the process.
Low Interest	Stakeholders will have little impact on the process	Stakeholders may become dangerous to the process if alienated or very supportive of the process if they can be induced to participate.

Once the stakeholders have been classified in the Power/Interest Matrix the practitioner should try to develop strategies that encourage movement of all who fall into either the low power or low interest categories into the high interest/power cell. Figure 8 illustrates this concept. For example, empowerment strategies could be applied to those stakeholders with high interest but little power or influence.¹²




Figure 8: Stakeholder Analysis¹³

The results of all these different analytic procedures must be summarized in a form where everyone's interests and issues can be easily compared. Table 3, Table 4 and Table 5 are examples of table formats that might be usefully adapted to organize the collected stakeholder information concerning interests, power, influence and involvement. Other different or additional information can be included in such tables to meet the needs of particular circumstances, but the general concept is to get

¹² United Nations Centre for Human Settlements (Habitat). 2001. *Tools to support participatory Urban Decision Making*, UN-HABITAT: Section 2.2: Stakeholder Analysis (Available: <http://www.unhabitat.org/cdrom/governance/html/st.htm>)

¹³ United Nations Centre for Human Settlements (Habitat). 2001: Section 2.2: Stakeholder Analysis

**Case Study:
Summarized Stakeholder Analysis Tables from Stolac Municipality**

Note that only the first four stakeholders shown in Table 1 have been included in these tables to give an example of the way the tables are used.

Table 3:
Stakeholder relationships with the main problem and each other

Stakeholder	How affected by the process	Capacity/ motivation to participate in addressing the process	Relationship with other stakeholders (e.g. partnership or conflict)
Co-operative «Agroplod»	Extremely high interest in participatory process, they are looking forward to the implementation of project	Requirements for baseline data, as well as possibility for better cooperation with municipality and improvement of existing collaboration with local and international organizations, possibility for joint projects	Good relationship with municipality, excellent relationship with all local and international organizations, conflict with Co-operative «Dubrave»
Co-operative «Dubrave»	The interest is indicated but only if Regional Coordinator invites them	Requirements for baseline data	Good relationship with international organizations, well enough relationship with international organizations, conflict with Co-operative «Agroplod»
Entrepreneur Association «Privrednik»	Extremely high interest in participatory process, they are looking forward to the implementation of project	Requirements for baseline data, as well as possibility for better cooperation with municipality and improvement of existing collaboration with local and international organizations, possibility for joint projects	Good relationship with municipality, excellent relationship with all local as well as with international organizations
Beekeepers Association	Extremely high interest in participatory process	Collaboration with international organizations to acquire equipment	Good relationship with all stakeholders, excellent collaboration with Co-operative «Agriplod»

Table 4:
Expected impacts of process

Stakeholder	Main objectives of stakeholder	Positive impacts/benefits	Negative impacts/costs	Net impact
Co-operative «Agroplod»	Collaboration with and strengthening of organizations through implementation of joint project	The Reconstruction of the irrigation channel	No negative impact	Great and positive with implementation of concrete projects and better collaboration with all stakeholders
Co-operative «Dubrave»		Revitalisation of orchards and vineyards	Waste time	Without concrete results
Entrepreneur Association «Privrednik»	Collaboration with and strengthening of organizations through implementation of joint project	Better collaboration NGOs and municipality	No negative impact	Great and positive, better collaboration municipality with stakeholders, implementation of project
Beekeepers Association	Collaboration with and strengthening of organizations	Supply of equipment	No negative impact	Positive

Table 5:
Stakeholder power analysis

Stakeholder	Main interest	Power	Potential	Relationships with others	Net impact	Options / ways forward
Co-operative «Agroplod»	Revitalisation of land resources through intensification of production, and reconstruction of the irrigation channel	Extremely High power	Co-operative has great potential, considering that available infrastructure	Excellent relationship with everybody, good with municipality, conflict with Co-operative «Dubrave»	Good communication and collaboration with organisation in neighbouring municipalities and wider	To improve working activities financial support is necessary, as well as supply of equipment, and better understanding of municipality, they wish to maintain the participatory process
Co-operative «Dubrave»	Revitalisation of resources in Dubrave	Medium high power	Good potential	Excellent relationship with international organisations, conflict with «Agroplod»	Good collaboration with organisations in neighbouring municipalities	Financial support is necessary, getting old cooperative building, supply of equipment, no wish to participate in process.
Entrepreneur Association «Privrednik»	The small business development	Extremely high power	Extraordinary potential, particularly young staff, the members volunteers	Excellent relationship with everybody	Good communication and collaboration with organisation in neighbouring municipalities	Necessary funds for the implementation of projects, better understanding of municipality for projects, strengthening the capacity, they wish to maintain process
Beekeepers Association	Development of beekeeping and supply of equipment	Low	poor	Excellent relationship with everybody, specially with «Agriplodom»		Necessary funds and equipment, they wish to maintain process

the characteristics of the stakeholders collated into a compact, easily comparable format that facilitate evaluation and reveal relationships that can be developed into appropriate strategies for moving the process forward.

As the practitioner develops strategies and techniques to advance the process some questions that might be useful to pose with regard to the data in the summary tables include:

- ⇒ What are the roles or responses of the stakeholder that must be assumed if progress is to be made?
- ⇒ Are these roles plausible and realistic?
- ⇒ Are there negative responses which can be expected, given the interests of the stakeholder?
- ⇒ If such responses occur, what impact would they have?
- ⇒ How probable are these negative responses, and are they major risks?
- ⇒ In summary, which plausible assumptions about stakeholders support or threaten the process?

Why do Stakeholder Analysis?

The stakeholder analysis is among the most important outcomes of the participatory development methodology. The purpose of introducing this methodology to the municipality administrators is to improve their connection to the full range of citizens' interests within their jurisdictions and to base their development decisions on a broad spectrum of public opinion rather than on the narrow preoccupations of a few powerful or influential voices. Thus, the stakeholder analysis is at the very core of the participatory process. By merely undertaking the exercise the practitioner has already taken a large step towards the goal of broadening the horizons of municipality administrators as they perform their tasks.

But the value of the stakeholder analysis does not stop there. It is the foundation upon which the rest of the process will be built. The strategies the practitioner devises to move the process forward depend on how well the interests, relationships and characteristics of the stakeholders are understood. To summarize, this analysis is used in the design and management of the land use development process to identify:

- ⇒ the interests of all stakeholders who may affect or be affected by the process;
- ⇒ potential conflicts and risks that could jeopardize the process;
- ⇒ opportunities and relationships to build upon in implementing the process to help make it a success';
- ⇒ the groups that should be encouraged to participate in different stages of the activity cycle; and
- ⇒ ways to improve the process and reduce, or hopefully remove, negative impacts on vulnerable and disadvantaged groups.

One concluding note about the stakeholder analysis is that it is important to carefully document the methods used, the data generated and the outcomes of the activities. Such records are vital benchmarks. As the participatory process proceeds stakeholders change in number, identity, attitudes and interests. Indeed, this is one of the outcomes that the process is attempting to achieve. Careful and complete documentation of the process and its results is essential to monitor, evaluate and guide the changes that occur over time.

Clearly, stakeholder analysis serves a diversity of purposes. There is no one “right” way to do it. In some circumstances the practitioner may wish to conduct the analysis and use the results for planning and organization. In others the stakeholder analysis might usefully be conducted as a participatory exercise in a stakeholder workshop using group facilitation techniques. Such an exercise is often valuable to clarify the group’s self understanding and revealing relationships that might otherwise remain hidden. As always in the participatory land use development process the choice of tools and how to use them is more of an art than a science. The practitioner needs to exercise skill, experience and judgment in making the selection.

Stakeholder Sensitization

Once having identified and analyzed the characteristics of the stakeholders, the next step is to get them involved in the process. People will not participate in a participatory process unless they see some gain in doing so. Thus the practitioner’s first goal is to demonstrate to the stakeholders that there is something to gain. Failure to do so makes all other activities pointless.

Once again, special attention must be given to the municipality administration. These are the people who will keep the participatory process alive and functioning into the future. They will only do it if they can be convinced that the process will provide them with concrete benefits. There are no firm rules as to what these benefits will be in any given situation. This information has to be gleaned from the stakeholder analysis, and strategies formulated for persuading the people concerned that the value of these benefits is real and attainable. They also have to be informed in very explicit terms what is going to be required of them to attain these benefits. Basic human nature rebels at launching any new venture without understanding the costs involved.

The objective in regards to the other stakeholders is very similar, if not quite so crucial. If some small number of stakeholders decline to participate it would not be fatal to the process, as it would be in the case with the municipality administration. The minimum requirement is some critical mass of stakeholders to get the process moving. Holdouts may well be persuaded to join in at a later time—especially if the process is able to demonstrate some success.

There is an extremely rich variety of techniques available to the practitioner for use in sensitizing the stakeholders. Workshops, one on one discussions, semi-structured group discussions, Rapid Rural Appraisal (RRA), Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA), Participatory Learning and Action (PLA) are just a few in a long list of possibilities.¹⁴ The exact combination of tools chosen very much depends on the particular circumstances of the municipality and the individuals concerned. As with the municipality staff, the objective is to convince people that there are benefits to be attained and inform them of how these benefits can be achieved. The only hard and fast rule is to keep that objective firmly in mind. All else is flexible.

¹⁴**Chambers, Robert.** 2002. *Relaxed and Participatory Appraisal: Notes on Practical Approaches and Methods for Participants in PRA/PLA-Related Familiarization Workshops*, Brighton, UK. (Available: <http://www.ids.ac.uk/ids/particip/research/pranotes02.pdf>) contains a concise and extremely useful set of guidelines for the use of these types of tools. **Department for International Development (DFID).** 2002. *Tools for Development: A Handbook for Those Engaged in Development Activity*, Version 15: p. 2.3. (Available: <http://www.dfid.gov.uk/FOI/tools/>) also contains a quite comprehensive and detailed description of participatory development tools.

Technical team

A second major intention of the FAO project is addressed in this section of these guidelines: strengthening the linkage between the municipalities and the technical institutions. The premise of this objective is that a great deal of expertise and information is available for the municipalities to tap into, both at higher government levels (Canton, Entity, State and International) and in the private and non-profit sphere. Educational and research institutions, government agencies, private consulting firms, development projects and non-governmental organizations have a wide range of skills, experience and data which could be useful to the municipalities in a variety of ways, but specifically in the land use development arena.

Case Study:
Technical Team Conducting Field Investigations in Milići Municipality to Verify the Accuracy of the Land Use/Land Cover Mapping from Landsat Satellite Imagery.



The land use development practitioner, as part of the preparation process, has the responsibility of identifying institutions that have the appropriate resources and coupling them with the members of municipality staff who have technical responsibilities. The goal is to give the municipality access to a network of resources or service providers to which it can turn for information, assistance and technical

advice. This linkage is the principal source of information for the stakeholders as represented by the information arrow in Figure 6 pointing to the Stakeholders box. It is primarily the municipality's responsibility to collect, process and present technical information to the stakeholders as the process advances. It is the job of the practitioner to ensure that the municipality staff is in all respects capable of doing so.

Note, however, the use of the word *primarily*. Not exclusively! Other stakeholders also have access to useful and important information. Nobody knows as much about a place as the people who live there. Also, there probably are stakeholders who already have existing links to service providers. It is incumbent on the practitioner to find out who has these types of information and linkages, as well as find the means to incorporate them into the process.

Finally, the practitioner needs to make use of the technical service providers to gather the base line information required in the preparation phase. The information arrow pointing to the practitioner box in Figure 6 represents this connection. The data requirements for the preparation stage are more fully discussed below in the section that discusses the Initial Economic-Ecological Zoning (EEZ).

The term “Information” has been extensively used in the preceding paragraphs. This word is often used very loosely. It is worth the effort to examine it a little more closely. One functional definition of information that serves well in this instance is “any material that people use to make decisions.” To be useful in making decisions, material must be: 1) available, 2) comprehensible and 3) relevant. Clearly, not all material meets these criteria for all of the stakeholders in a diverse group. Material that is information to some is meaningless to others. The practitioner, using the information gleaned from the stakeholder analysis, bears a heavy responsibility to ensure that the material delivered by the service providers meets the three criteria of information for the stakeholders who are expected to make use of it.

Logistics

Among the more mundane, but no less important tasks of the land use development practitioner are the logistical arrangements. All of the activities require a place in which they can be conducted. The most obvious is the need for a venue for each public meeting. The practitioner must make sure that the site chosen for the meeting is adequate for the purpose and the needs of the participants. People who are uncomfortable, unable to see or hear, too hot, or too cold will be, at best, not participating fully and, at worst, actively disruptive. Another consideration is that the meeting be held in a location that is not considered to be hostile territory for any of the participants. The nature of the facility is obviously related to the purpose of the meeting and the characteristics of the participants, but it is essential that the practitioner give it proper attention. The practitioner must be sure to adequately inspect the meeting location in advance to insure its suitability.

The same considerations apply to the equipment to be used in a meeting. It must be set up and tested before the participants arrive. Electrical audio-visual equipment is notoriously prone to technical problems and requires special attention. Projection equipment often requires a darkened room. Adequate electric supply frequently poses problems. Then there is the question of what backup arrangements are available if the electric power should fail entirely. Modern technological tools can be very effective in conveying a message if properly employed, but can make the person

using them look very bad if they fail. Be judicious in their use and, above all, be prepared in advance. White boards, chalk boards and flip charts are less prone to failure and should, at a minimum, be available for backup.

Arranging supplies for the participatory activities is another of the practitioner's responsibilities: paper, pencils, flip charts, markers, tape, sticky notes, etc. The exact list of supplies depends on the activity, but be sure to include them in the planning. Also, it is much better to have too many than not enough.

All of these logistical arrangements may sound like nothing more than common sense, and they are. That is what makes it so surprising to observe how often they break down. Apparently small deficiencies can have a large impact. As was discussed in Chapter 2, one of the practitioner's most important assets is credibility. That credibility can be severely damaged by inadequate logistical arrangements.

In addition to meeting facilities, the practitioner needs a place to work. While the impacts of inadequacies in this area are not as serious as for public meeting facilities, there are some basic requirements. The practitioner's office should be safe, accessible and comfortable so that stakeholders not are reluctant to visit. They should be large enough to store all of the necessary materials and the records that the process generates. Finally, the office should be adequately equipped with working surfaces (tables or desks) to work with the large maps that are the fundamental tools of land use development.

Work programme

As was mentioned above, a vital skill set for the practitioner is management ability. A plan of activities must be developed during the preparation phase to give the process coherence. The plan should be flexible. Of course, it is subject to revision as the negotiation process evolves, but a comprehensive written plan helps all of the participants understand the full scope of activities and how they fit in.

An important function of the work programme is to assign responsibilities. Much is expected of the practitioners but they cannot do everything. Responsibilities have to be allocated to other stakeholders. This not only shares the burden, but helps create a sense of ownership in the process. Partitioning responsibilities in the written plan formalizes the sharing of responsibilities and serves to inform everybody of their role.

Finally, the plan provides a schedule of activities. Once again, flexibility is important, but it is necessary to have a timeline to coordinate activities that are dependant on one another and to act as a spur to get participants moving. Without deadlines, procrastination is almost inevitable.

Initial Economic-Ecological Zoning

The final component of the preparation phase is the Initial Economic-Ecological Zoning (EEZ), which is specific to land use development as opposed to other types of community development. The initial EEZ is a tool to aggregate available data and information in a simple, easily understandable and readily usable form. The initial EEZ provides a rough, holistic picture of land and natural resource use in the municipality. Often it indicates likely options related to the development potentials of the municipality, but this is not a quality that should be intentionally sought after by the practitioner at this stage.

The intention in creating the initial EEZ is to produce a "straw man," purposely established to be easily contradicted. It is a tool to initiate the participatory process,

providing a framework for the discussion on the development options. As such, it is intended to provide an important catalyst to induce debate. The function of the initial EEZ is to provide the stakeholders with a starting point in their negotiations. It should be crude enough so that the stakeholders are easily able to discover areas where they have disagreements with the way it is constructed so they gain confidence in the fact that they have something to contribute to the process.


Given the purpose of the initial EEZ there are a few general observations which can be made on the criteria for establishing it. The Initial EEZ is a map that should divide the municipality into zones of similar economic-ecologic characteristics. At this stage it is intended to be a highly subjective view of the municipality's reality. The expectation is that it be compiled from readily available data which can be compiled rapidly. Since accuracy and precision are not exceedingly important, the practitioner should not spend a great deal of time looking for any particular data set. Revisions of the model will come later, during the participatory negotiations. Remember, the objective is to develop something that is provocative and creative with the express purpose of stimulating discussion. Table 6 contains a listing of the types of data could prove useful in creating the initial EEZ, if they are readily available.

Table 6:

Types of Information Useful for Initial EEZ

Land resources data:	Climate
	landforms and soils
	land cover
	water resources
Land use related data:	present land use and characteristics
	selected physiological characteristics of crops (as determining ecological requirements)
	land utilization types (LUTs) and production systems (present and potential)
	ecological requirements of LUTs, production systems, land use
Social-economic data:	population distribution
	settlement patterns
	livelihood systems
	access to markets
	costs of production and product prices
	socio-economics of communities
Legal data and information:	relevant government policy documents, laws and regulations related to land
	present system of land allocation & distribution (protected & certified areas)
	land tenure information
	traditional ownership and user rights
	Institutional information: involved institutions and their mandates, resources and infrastructure, ongoing programmes/projects
	links between institutions
	support services (extension, etc.)
General data and information:	Infrastructure
	Accessibility
Source: <i>The Future of Our Land, Facing the Challenge</i> , FAO, Rome, 1999: p. 36	

**Case Study:
Sanski Most Initial Economic Ecological Zones**



**Sanski Most
Economic Ecological Zones**

EEZ	Assets and Problems	Visions, opportunities and action
A1	<p>Road corridor agricultural development area (A1a) with a major extension north of this axis (A1b). The stretch along the main road can be considered as a special planning area (A1a)</p> <p>Landscape and soils: slightly undulating to undulating lands with high quality soils for agricultural production (bonity class 2-1?) Land occupation and farming systems: mainly an agricultural area with an emphasis on cattle raising for milk production; concentration of better off farmers; large patches of pasture land and forest remnants in the northern part; important stretches of agricultural land in the northern part are left fallow or are not being used Population: major population concentration along the main road; less in the northern part Infrastructure: well developed infrastructure along the main road with several villages; northern part ill developed Accessibility: easily accessible along the main-road corridor, but only minor rural roads in the northern part Tenure: medium to small sized land parcels irregularly distributed, mainly privately owned Investment: well developed area with high investment from the private sector</p>	<p>Development of commercial agriculture along the main road corridor and semi – commercial activities in the northern part.</p> <p>Investigate why land is abandoned in A1b</p> <p>Possibilities for diversification of agricultural produce</p> <p>Infrastructure and access roads required in the northern part</p> <p>Is there a problem of land mines?</p>
A2	<p>Agricultural land of the major Sana valley. This unit can be divided into 4 subclasses A2a: northern valley bottom and lower slopes Landscape and soils: alluvial soils with some drainage problems and flooding risks, but with high potential soils when managed (drainage/irrigation) Land occupation and farming systems: mainly an agricultural area of mixed farming; large tracts of abandoned or fallow agricultural land; some patches of forest and pasture lands mainly on the valley slopes Population: some minor villages at the edges of the valley Infrastructure: good provision (close vicinity of Sanski Most) Accessibility: easy access with major roads Tenure: medium to small sized plots with a regular distribution; mixture of private and public land (50/50)</p>	<p>Commercial agriculture</p> <p>Area is not developed according to its potential; why?</p> <p>Possibilities for more intensive agricultural use, including irrigated farming.</p> <p>Need to develop drainage/irrigation</p>

	<p>Investment: average</p> <p>A2b: valley bottom south of Sanski Most Shows roughly the same natural characteristics as the previous subunit, but is more densely populated and used. The major road including infrastructure and settlement development follows the valley bottom. More intensively used (much less abandoned land) with higher population concentrations; mainly private ownership</p> <p>A2c: upper alluvial and lower colluvial lands of the Sana valley. Landscape and soils: slightly undulating landscape with some reasonable soils for agriculture (bonity class 4 and 3) Land occupation and farming systems: mainly big patches of forest remnants and abandoned agricultural land Population; originally dispersed without clear village structure Infrastructure Accessibility; somewhat difficult Tenure: mainly very small dispersed plots; mixture of private and public (probably forest) ownership Investment: very little</p> <p>A2d: southern upper reaches of the Sana river Landscape and soils: slightly undulating to undulating land with good soils (bonity 2-4), locally some more shallow soils on a more undulating landscape Land occupation and farming systems: mainly abandoned agricultural land with extensive pastures and some forest remnants Population: concentrated in some villages along a main rural road (Vrhpolje) Infrastructure: developed along the main road; much less developed in the western part Accessibility: easily accessible, but less in western part Tenure: mainly small plots; mixed private and public ownership (50/50) Investment: poor</p>	<p>system</p> <p>Land privatization and consolidation</p> <p>Commercial agriculture</p> <p>Intensification of agriculture – irrigation/drainage works</p> <p>Services required: extension, credit, Land consolidation</p> <p>Problem area why? Land mines???</p> <p>Major opportunities for the development of fruit production</p> <p>Privatization of land and consolidation</p> <p>Services and investment required</p>
	<p>Abandoned and poorly developed agricultural land on karst Landscape and soils: flat karst plateau with some undulating slopes at the edges giving way to steep slopes and mountain area (unit F2); good potential for agriculture (bonity class 2-3 on flat part, 4 on slopes) Land occupation and farming systems: mainly abandoned agricultural land with abandoned pastures on the edges Population: mainly abandoned; very little return from refugees; in the northwestern part some smaller new settlements Infrastructure: poor Accessibility: good Tenure: difficult to assess but major parts may be public lands Investment: non existent</p>	<p>Major area for poverty reduction and encouragement for resettlement</p> <p>Special study on recovery options, including land ownership, land restitution</p> <p>The new resettlements require some examination in the northern part (access to agricultural land, research on livelihood strategies)</p>
F1	<p>Broadleaved forest situated north of the municipality on undulating slopes (altitude 250-450m). Access through one main road, sparsely populated Tenure: both private and public ownership (50/50)</p>	
F2	<p>Extensive karst forest both broadleaved and pine south of the municipality. Some minor access roads and isolated small patches of clearance. Not inhabited, high altitude (500-1300m). Mainly public tenure but some 20% privately owned</p>	<p>Previous plans consider the area as a potential national park. Major tourism opportunities. In this case the rights of private land owners and resident land users need to be considered. Involvement of private sector in tourism exploitation required. Address tenure situation. Probably new access roads required, as well as infrastructure.</p>
F3	<p>Medium altitude (250-500m) forest on undulating land with flatter patches. Low density and dispersed settlement pattern</p>	
P1	<p>Medium altitude pastures (200-500m) in an undulating landscape with major forest and open? fern cover Little access and mainly abandoned. Historically used as a hunting area Mixed ownership with some 40% state lands</p>	<p>Development as a hunting area requiring a specific management plan.</p> <p>Large tracts of lands have fertile soils and could be considered for agricultural production</p>
P2	<p>A mixture of medium altitude pastures and forests; mainly public ownership Population?</p>	
P3	<p>Slightly undulating to undulating medium altitude pasture lands with mainly low shrub vegetation, forest remnants. Difficult access and low population density (abandoned?) Mixture of private and state ownership (50/50)</p>	
P4	<p>High altitude pastures (400-900m) mainly low vegetation and bushes of low quality. Difficult access and presently being abandoned. Mainly state owned land (65%)</p>	
P5	<p>Slightly undulating medium altitude (300-500m) pastures with</p>	

	reasonable access and some human occupation. Mainly state owned land (65%)	
U1	<p>Main urban area of Sanski Most with peri-urban agricultural areas.</p> <p>Landscape and soils: flat alluvial plains with some drainage problems and flooding risk. High agricultural potential for a wide variety of crops Land occupation and farming systems: intensive mixed agriculture, cereal production, vegetables, some dairy production Population: densely populated Infrastructure: well developed with major private and public investment Accessibility: Easy with access to major market places Tenure: regular laid out medium sized plots; mainly private land</p>	<p>Need to develop and urbanistic plan with major emphasis on peri-urban agriculture</p> <p>Commercial mixed and specialized (dairy, vegetables,) agriculture with high potential for irrigation.</p> <p>Need for infrastructure works (irrigation, drainage works) privatization of remaining state land, land consolidation.</p> <p>Need for agricultural services: credit, agricultural extension, farmers organization.</p>
U2	<p>Western peri-urban area with industrial development and former mine exploitation</p> <p>Landscape and soils: flat valley land on good soils with some drainage and flooding problems Land occupation mixed agriculture with industrial development and some abandoned mine exploitation Population: densely populate Accessibility: situated along the main national road Tenure: mainly privately owned agricultural lands</p>	<p>Mainly an area for industrial development but with possibilities for commercial agriculture Reconsidering the rehabilitation of mine exploitation, but with an environmental impact assessment. Possibilities for intensification of semi-urban agriculture with irrigation. Delivery of necessary services such as extension, credit, farmers organization</p>

In addition to the documentary data listed in Table 6, the practitioner should incorporate information obtained from a municipality reconnaissance into the initial EEZ. There is no substitute for personal contact with the territory in gaining an appreciation of its reality. Field observations serve to complement, confirm and challenge knowledge that is available from documents. The municipality reconnaissance also serves to introduce the practitioner and technical team members to key stakeholders and help make the population aware of the participatory

PRA Tools

- Diagrams
 - Maps
 - Transects
 - Seasonal mapping or seasonal calendar
 - Other diagrams dealing with time trends
 - historical profiles
 - graphic time trends.
 - ecological histories,
 - land use
 - cropping patterns
 - customs and practices
 - trends in fuel use, etc.
 - historical transect
 - Venn diagram
 - Prioritization matrix
 - Flow diagrams for systems and impact analysis
- Case studies
- Field visits
- Participatory methods
 - Traditional practices and beliefs
 - Semi-structured interviews
 - Fruit salad
 - Sequence analysis
 - Brainstorming
 - Role-playing
 - Delphi Technique
 - Transect walks
- Flip charts
- Audio-visual aids
- Flannel boards and diagrams¹

process. Such contact can play an important role in initiation stakeholder participation and generating local responsibility for the development efforts that emerge.

The Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA) technique has a number of different tools which can be employed in the municipality reconnaissance. A partial list of these tools is presented in the text box. Another task to be accomplished during the reconnaissance is to field check the interpretations derived from the remotely sensed imagery. The practitioner should also be aware of the possibility of encountering data and information that is only stored locally and may not be found at the municipality offices or in the capital city: family records, church or mosque records, etc. Such sources could provide useful insights into the local conditions that may otherwise be overlooked. Finally, the practitioner should consider the possibility of using participatory data collection techniques which can be useful in finding out information on the population of a territory in the absence of a reliable census. The outcome of all this activity is what has been called an “optimal ignorance” EEZ model. The term optimal ignorance is meant to imply that the model contains just enough information to be a credible platform for further discussions, but not so much information that there is not obvious room for improvement through participation by the stakeholders. Attaining the proper balance is not easy, but if achieved can produce a powerful tool for advancing the process.

**Case Study:
Semi-structured Interview with a Farmer in Bratunac Municipality**



Outcome: The Stakeholder Complex and the Negotiation Platform

The practitioner has a great deal to accomplish in the preparatory phase of the process and much depends on how well it is done. In summary, the result of these activities is a group of stakeholders (The Stakeholder Complex) who understand the task that is before them and are equipped with the tools that are needed to perform that task (The Negotiation Platform), as well as the inspiration needed to undertake it. It is not easy to get all of these elements perfectly into place. Fortunately, the process can begin with less than perfection. It is meant to be an iterative process that can build on successes and learn from the things that do not work so well. Above all, the practitioner must keep in mind that the goal is to change attitudes. The stakeholders have to be brought from a mentality which starts with the phrase, “**Somebody needs to ...**” to a new way of thinking where the expression, “**We need to ...**” is commonly heard.

One final note is that the practitioner must keep in mind the special status of the municipality administration in the process. As was discussed at the beginning of this chapter, the ultimate goal is to implant the participatory methodology into the operations of the municipality administration. All of the activities discussed in this chapter are proceedings that the municipality will be expected to employ on its own in the future. It is essential to the sustainability of this effort that the practitioner makes every effort to transfer the skills required to perform these activities to the appropriate municipality staff members.

Chapter 4. The Territorial Pact: Matching Assets and Visions

You and I are essentially infinite choice-makers. In every moment of our existence, we are in that field of all possibilities where we have access to an infinity of choices
- Deepak Chopra

Once the stakeholder complex is prepared and the negotiating platform is in place the practitioner can turn attention to the heart of the process: stakeholder consensus building.¹⁵ This phase of the process has two components. The first is reaching a common agreement concerning the nature of the municipality. This agreement is referred to as The Territorial Pact and is the primary focus of this chapter. Second, stakeholder consensus must be achieved regarding the direction for the municipality to move in the future. This is the concept of the development portfolio, which is discussed in Chapter 5.

The diagram in Figure 9 expands the stakeholder element of the model to outline the means by which agreement is to be reached regarding the nature of the municipality. The first step is to divide the stakeholders into working groups. Each of the working groups examines the territory of the Municipality to define what assets it contains. A negotiating process ensues in which each group derives possible visions for the future of the municipality based on the assets it has identified. Finally, a second round of negotiations occurs in which the different visions of the groups are consolidated into a consensus vision of the municipality. The outcome of this negotiating process is the Territorial Pact, with one of its principal components being the Consensus Economic-Ecological Zoning (EEZ).




Figure 9: The Territorial Pact

The purpose of the Consensus EEZ is to classifying the landscape into areas that show approximately the same constraints, potentials and challenges for socio-economic development as it pertains to the use of land and natural resources. The goal is to identify areas where particular land uses may be encouraged through development programmes, services, financial and tax incentives or other

¹⁵ Consensus building refers to a range of processes used to foster dialogue, clarify areas of agreement and disagreement, and resolve controversial issues. The **Resolve**. No date. *Results through consensus* (Available: <http://www.resolve.org/tools.html>) tools web page provides links to detailed information on the consensus building field, specifically, information about definitions, assumptions, and approaches

intercessions. Areas grouped into a zone would be expected to respond similarly to approximately the same kind of interventions.

The Opening Workshop

The first step in this phase of the process is a plenary workshop of all the stakeholders. The purpose of this gathering is:

- ⇒ An introduction of the stakeholders to one another. The workshop provides the opportunity for the stakeholders to learn who all the other participants are in the process.¹⁶
- ⇒ A final clarification of the process. However, this topic should not be the main focus of the meeting as stakeholders should have already been well briefed about the nature of the process in the preparatory stage as was discussed in the stakeholder sensitization section of the previous chapter. This item on the agenda should be reserved for clarifying uncertainties that may have arisen in the minds of the stakeholders. The time in a group meeting is far too limited and valuable to be used to merely present information that could be imparted in some other manner (written material, individual contacts, etc).¹⁷ Topics to be covered are:
 - Objectives of the process; and
 - Procedures to be followed in the process. A written worksheet or summary describing the objectives of the process and the procedures to be followed should be prepared and distributed to provide a basis for the discussion.
- ⇒ Introduction of the Initial EEZ. The stakeholders undertake activities based on the Initial EEZ that familiarize them with the concept of zoning as well as the rationale behind the initial zoning produced by the practitioner. The purpose of this agenda item is to prepare the stakeholders to develop their own version of the EEZ. The practitioner should demonstrate all of the materials that were used to develop the Initial EEZ and present a selection of other materials the stakeholders might find useful to employ in their negotiations to develop a consensus EEZ. Table 7 contains a listing of the standard data set which would be useful to have available for this purpose.
- ⇒ Strengths, Weaknesses Opportunities and Limitations (SWOL) Analysis. This analysis is the principal focus of the meeting. The stakeholders break into small groups and go through the SWOL exercise.¹⁸ The results of the small group analyses are then brought back into the plenary session where they are evaluated to define the major themes that will be the focus of the remainder of the process. These themes are an important input into the next step.
- ⇒ The division of the stakeholders into working groups. The final outcome of the plenary workshop is a division of the stakeholders into working groups based on the stakeholders' main interests. The composition of the working groups depends on the interests of the participants as revealed in the stakeholder

¹⁶ An extensive list of introductory activities can be found at: **Results Through Training**, no date. *Icebreakers*. (Available:

<http://www.resultsthroughtraining.com/downloads/Icebreakers.HTML>) and **People and Planet**, no date. *Meetings>Icebreakers*. (Available:

<http://www.peopleandplanet.org/groups/guide/guide.meetings.icebreakers.php>)

¹⁷ A variety of facilitation techniques that may be useful at this stage can be found at the **FAO**, no date. *Field Tools @ Participation: Search for tools by criteria*. Informal Working Group on Participatory Approaches & Methods. (Available: http://www.fao.org/Participation/ft_findt.jsp)

¹⁸ A large number of resources describing SWOL (also known as SWOT) analysis are available on the internet. The following document provides a good, basic overview: **FAO**, 1990 *The community's toolbox: The idea, methods and tools for participatory assessment, monitoring and evaluation in community forestry*, Rome. (Available:

<http://www.fao.org/docrep/x5307e/x5307e09.htm#tool> 18: strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and limitations (s.w.o.l.) analysis)

analysis, their feedback in the stakeholder sensitization process and their conduct in the plenary workshop. Working groups could be organized by themes (agriculture, business, environment, etc.) or by zones on the initial EEZ. Both methods have been used successfully in the pilot projects.

Table 7:
Data Sources Useful for Developing Ecologic-Economic Zones (EEZ)

Required information	Data Source
Landscape and soil related: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Major soil management classes such as: irrigation, mechanized farming, conservation agriculture, conservation areas • Potential for agricultural production • Needs for soil conservation measures 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Slope percentage and aspect • Erosion risk • Bonity class • Land suitability for four generalised land uses
Land occupation	Present land use map
Farming systems	Matrix of existing farming systems based on: main purpose of farm; farm size; degree of independence; resource endowment Farming systems analysis results for major farming systems
Population and settlement	Settlement distribution map Population density
Infrastructure location and status	Infrastructure map; distribution of infrastructure, status and needs for rehabilitation
Accessibility	Road corridor map
Land tenure	% of private and state land; location of state land (bigger parcel sizes)
Services and Investment	Services available (financial, extension, marketing, farming inputs) ; influence zone of previous projects and programmes; coverage by NGO activities
Enacted and licensed land uses	Map with certified areas, national parks, mine concessions
Water availability	Topographic maps

The opening workshop is vital to establishing an environment of trust, learning and collaboration.¹⁹ This gathering will do much to set the tone of the proceedings that follow. Keep in mind that the objective is to create a participatory process. Therefore, it is highly desirable to structure this meeting with the goal of promoting maximum

¹⁹ DFID, 2002: p. 7.9

participation on the part of the stakeholders, while holding to an absolute minimum, if not eliminating entirely, presentations or lectures by “experts.” Their contribution will come at a later stage of the process.

This is the point where the practitioner’s facilitation skills first come into play. The following is a brief summary of the concept of facilitation:

“Facilitate comes from a word which means “to make easy”. In the context of group work, facilitation is the process wherein a skilled impartial party supports a group to identify and solve problems by improving group members' ability to work together effectively. The facilitator is called upon to help a group improve its performance in relation to a particular task or project. The facilitator is substantively impartial and has no decision-making power.

An effective facilitator teaches and models group process skills. In successful facilitation, the group's dependence on the facilitator decreases as group members acquire process skills. Process refers to how the group works together, how they talk to each other, how they identify and solve problems, how they handle conflict and how they make decisions.

Given any substantive problem, the facilitator's task is two fold: to guide a process which produces solutions and to equip the group to function more autonomously by improving its process.”²⁰

Facilitation is a very broad and specialized discipline with a well developed literature (see boxes on How to Facilitate a Meeting and What Facilitation Is and Is Not).²¹ A detailed discussion of this topic is beyond the scope of this document, but adequate meeting facilitation skills play a major part in a successful outcome of the participatory land use development process. In fact, given the importance of getting the process started on the right track, it may be deemed wise to engage the services of a professional meeting facilitator to conduct this initial meeting.

The circumstances may be such, however, that a neutral facilitator is not available. In this case one of the stakeholders (probably somebody from the municipality administration, since, as the key stakeholder, they are the most closely involved) must fill this role. The person chosen to be the facilitator has to make extraordinary efforts to leave aside their allegiances as a stakeholder and adopt a neutral stance. The most likely scenario is that there will be several participants representing the municipality in the process, one of whom will be called upon to act as the facilitator, while the municipality’s interests will still be represented by the remainder. It will be difficult, but not impossible as long as there is a clear understanding by all of the participants of the role of the facilitator.

²⁰ **The Dispute Resolution Centre**. no date. *What is Facilitation?* The Institute of Conflict Analysis & Management (Available: <http://www.disputeresolution.bc.ca/intervention/facilitation.html>)

²¹ A wide variety of materials is available that deals with the topic of meeting facilitation skills and techniques. A good introduction is found in **The Human Leadership and Development Division of the American Society for Quality, The Association for Quality and Participation, and The International Association of Facilitators**. 2002. *Basic Facilitation Skills*. (Available: http://www.iaf-world.org/Docs/Editors/2002_Basic_Facilitation_Primer.PDF). **DFID**. 2002: Annex 2 also contains a good discussion on the role and function of the facilitator, as well as an extensive bibliography on group facilitation. Another excellent source is **Work Group on Health Promotion and Community Development**. no date. Group Facilitation. *Community Tool Box Web Site*. University of Kansas. Lawrence, Kansas. (Available: http://ctb.ku.edu/tools/en/chapter_1016.htm)

What Facilitation is ...

- Facilitation is what we do, to get the most out of meetings, discussions, workshops, seminars and other group activities.
- Facilitation can make these group processes more successful, more productive and more effective.
- But to do this well, Facilitation should cover:
 - design and organisation of group processes
 - detailed preparation for individual group activities
 - actual running of the group activity
 - detailed follow-up
- All of this requires time, manpower and skills.
- Facilitation therefore should be well-integrated into the work of the process, because it involves much more than just what occurs during a particular meeting or workshop.

... and, What Facilitation Is NOT.

- Facilitation is not just the same as training. In training, we are concerned with the acquisition of new knowledge or information and its sharing and dissemination. In facilitation, we are more concerned with mobilising and sharing the expertise and insights of the group members.
- Facilitation is not easy. Facilitation requires hard work - before, during and after groups activities; it does not come "naturally" but requires preparation and the careful application of methods, guidelines, etc.
- Facilitation is not a new word for just asking questions. Facilitation requires more than asking questions; facilitation is about methodically structuring interactions among members of a group, as well as guiding and building on those interactions to move toward focused and constructive outputs.
- Facilitation is not about endless talk. Unstructured and unfocused discussion can lead to an unproductive - or even counter-productive snowstorm of talk and ideas; facilitation guides and directs energies and ideas into useful channels and toward meaningful results.
- Facilitation is not a bag of tricks. Facilitation involves working with the group members, helping and guiding their interactions and discussions, using well-prepared materials and methods, in a systematic way; there are no "tricks" which can be used to make facilitation happen.²²

Composition of the Working Groups

There are a number of reasons for dividing the stakeholders into working groups. First, smaller groups are more easily managed—easier to get together, arrange

²² **McCallum, Douglas.** 1998. *Facilitation: Training Materials on Facilitation of Discussion Group.* SCP: pp. 8-9. (Available: <http://www.unhabitat.org/cdrom/governance/html/books/facilita.pdf>)

logistics for and facilitate. A group size of between seven to fifteen participants is usually considered appropriate. It is hard to achieve the desired diversity in groups smaller than seven. Groups larger than fifteen become difficult to manage. Note that it is possible for one stakeholder to participate in more than one working group. In fact, it is essential that the key stakeholder, the municipality administration, be represented in all of the working groups.

**Case Study:
The Working Groups in the Opening Workshop at Srebrenica**



Next, since each operates independently, multiple small groups will likely produce a wider variety of ideas, avoiding the problem of “groupthink” wherein there is often an uncritical acceptance or conformity to prevailing points of view. Working in smaller groups also helps to empower weaker stakeholders who would be less likely to venture an opinion in a larger meeting. Finally, since the working groups are organized around some land use theme or spatial zone, there will be a greater focus of interest amongst its members than would be the case in a more general discussion group.

In forming the working groups there are two important parameters to keep in mind. First, the working groups are organized around a land use theme or spatial zone. They are not organized according to institutions, professions or disciplines. This is because land use issues by their very nature are “crosscutting”: they do not neatly fit into traditional bureaucratic categories but in reality cut across departments, institutions, professions, levels of government, etc.

Second, to ensure active participation of all the actors whose cooperation is required the membership of the working group should be as broadly based as possible; drawn from the full range of stakeholder interests, organizations and groups. This point is significant because land use issues affect and are influenced and affected by a wide

variety of different people and groups. The membership of each working group is drawn from all the different stakeholders who:

- ⇒ have expertise or information about;
- ⇒ have responsibilities and authority over; or
- ⇒ are effected by and/or affect

the particular land use theme or spatial zone. The working group should also include representatives from the public sector, the private sector, community groups and the public at large. With such diversity a meaningful consensus can be built based on participation in the decision making process.²³

Objectives of the Working Groups

The overall objective of each working group is to formulate a comprehensive image of the reality of the municipality as it relates to the group's land use theme or spatial zone. Once it has developed an image of the municipality, the working group will go on to develop a consensus point of view on how this image could be improved in the future. The first step in this process is called Asset Mapping, while the second is referred to as Visioning.

Asset Mapping

Community Asset Mapping²⁴ is a capacity-focused community development methodology. This positive approach is proposed as a substitute for the traditional deficits focus on a community's needs and problems. The disadvantage of using a focus on problems to formulate interventions is that such a methodology targets resources to service providers rather than residents, fragments efforts to provide solutions, places reliance on outside resources and outside experts and leads to a maintenance and survival mentality rather than to community development.

Instead of concentrating on what is missing, the Community Asset Mapping process develops policies and activities based on an understanding, or "map," of the community's resources. The asset-based approach does not remove the need for outside resources, but makes their use more effective. The community assets approach:

- ⇒ starts with what is present in the community ;
- ⇒ concentrates on the agenda-building and problem-solving capacity of the residents; and
- ⇒ stresses local determination, investment, creativity and control.

In community asset mapping community members create a map that expresses how they understand a place-based or individual-based issue. It centers on the idea of community re-claiming maps of their home places, rather than relying on geographers or other professionals. This allows localized perspective of a place and its environment to flourish in a creative and informative mapping format.²⁵ The Differences in these two approaches are illustrated in Table 8.

²³ A concise but comprehensive guide to the composition, management and support of working groups can be found in **United Nations Centre for Human Settlements (Habitat) and the United Nations Environment Programme**. 1999. *Establishing and Supporting a Working Group Process*, The SCP Source Book Series: pp. 15-16. (Available: <http://www.unhabitat.org/cdrom/governance/html/books/wgp.pdf>)

²⁴ The seminal work in Community Asset Mapping is **McKnight, John L. and John P. Kretzmann**. 1993. *Building Communities from the Inside Out: A Path Toward Finding and Mobilizing a Community's Assets*. ACTA Publications, Chicago.

²⁵ **Youth Action Effecting Change**. 2003. *Youth Community Asset Mapping Manual, Booklet 1*: p. 13. (Available : http://www.eya.ca/yaec/docs/manual_download/YCAM%20booklet1.pdf)

Table 8:
Contrasting the Needs vs. Assets approach to community enhancement.²⁶

Needs	Assets
Focuses on deficiencies	Focuses on effectiveness
Results in fragmentation of responses to local needs	Builds interdependencies
Makes people consumers of services, builds dependence	Identifies ways that people can give of their talents
Residents have little voice in deciding how to address local concerns	Seeks to empower people

The working groups map the assets of the municipality as they relate to their land use theme or spatial zone. This is a comprehensive mapping exercise that will, in all probability, contain assets that do not have a spatial expression, but merely appear on a list or in a Venn diagram. The assets mapping addresses all four of the variables shown in the initial state element of Figure 9, which are:

- ⇒ Landscape: What are the physical assets? What and where are the different soils, minerals, water resources, forests, mountains, roads, railways, power lines, communications infrastructure, dams, lakes, monuments or any other item that has a physical presence? What are their qualities?
- ⇒ Social Norms: What are the characteristics (habits, customs, skills, education, practices, beliefs, etc.) of the people who inhabit the municipality? Are they uniform or diverse? Are they deep rooted and stable or in a state of flux? What social, cultural and religious institutions exist? How do they occupy their time?
- ⇒ Markets: Where do people buy and sell things? What do they buy and sell? What businesses exist: retail, manufacturing, service, agricultural, financial, etc.? How many people do they employ? Who owns them?
- ⇒ Legislation: What legal or political advantages does the municipality have? Influential politicians, specially protected resources, state subsidies, special tax advantages, etc.?

The community asset mapping exercise is the start of the negotiations that will ultimately produce the territorial pact and the consensus EEZ. The information about the municipality that the land use development practitioner gathered and developed during the preparation phase becomes important at this point. The initial EEZ provides a starting point for the discussions on asset mapping. All of the information sources listed in Table 7 will be available to provide useful information in the process. If more information is needed during the working group discussions the group members will contact the appropriate service provider to obtain it, either directly or through the practitioner. This is the link represented by the information arrow between the initial state and stakeholder elements in Figure 9.

The most important input to this procedure, however, is the knowledge, attitudes and understanding of the municipality that the working group participants bring to the meetings. These are the ingredients of the process that can be obtained from no

²⁶ **Beaulieu, Lionel J.** 2002. *Mapping the Assets of Your Community: A Key component for Building Local Capacity*, Southern Rural Development Center, Mississippi State University: p. 4. (Available: http://srdc.msstate.edu/publications/227/227_asset_mapping.pdf)

other source and will ultimately govern the success of the participatory land use development process.

Visioning

Once the working group has developed a conception of the asset of the municipality as they relate to the particular land use theme or spatial zone the next step is to use that information to formulate a vision statement. A vision is the answer to the question, "What is our preferred future?" As such, a vision is a guiding image of the group's perception of successful outcomes for the municipality's activities. The vision statement is a description, in words, that conjures up a similar picture for each group member of the destination of the group's work together as it pertains to the municipality's prospects. It also describes the group's consensus regarding the direction in which the municipality should be headed in the next ten to fifteen years.²⁷

Ingredients of a vision statement include:

- ⇒ positive, present-tense language;
- ⇒ qualities that provide the reader with a feeling for the region's uniqueness;
- ⇒ inclusiveness of the region's diverse population;
- ⇒ a depiction of the highest standards of excellence and achievement;
- ⇒ a focus on people and quality of life; and
- ⇒ a stated time period.²⁸

As a general rule, all decisions in the visioning process should be by consensus. It does not mean everyone must agree wholeheartedly, but it does mean that every single person must feel that the full range of viewpoints was heard and the decision was legitimate and one the participants can live with. Sessions are structured to maximize the opportunity for general discussion and not let one or two people monopolize the discussion. Once again the facilitation skills of the land use development practitioner are extremely important to the success of this process.

Using the assets identified in the previous step, the working group develops a catalogue of issues that are relevant to their particular land use theme or spatial area. Issues that are commonly addressed in the visioning process include:

- ⇒ farmland development;
- ⇒ forest management and protection;
- ⇒ the environment;
- ⇒ open space;
- ⇒ tourism;
- ⇒ economic development and diversification;
- ⇒ housing affordability;
- ⇒ recreation opportunities;
- ⇒ community image;
- ⇒ changing demographics;
- ⇒ elderly issues and services;
- ⇒ commercial and residential growth;
- ⇒ education and schools;
- ⇒ traffic, congestion, speed; and
- ⇒ regional concerns.²⁹

²⁷ **Alliance for Non-profit Management.** no date. *Frequently Asked Questions.* (Available: http://www.allianceonline.org/FAQ/strategic_planning/what_s_in_vision_statement.faq)

²⁸ **Haines, Anna.** 2001. *Incorporating Visioning into Comprehensive Planning.* (G3752) University of Wisconsin Cooperative Extension: p.2 (Available: <http://cecommerce.uwex.edu/pdfs/G3752.PDF>)

Once consensus has been reached on which issues are important, the group can turn its attention to achieving agreement on how it would like to see these issues develop in the future. The results of these negotiations are the raw material for the vision statement. The vision statement should include several components:

- ⇒ an opening narrative to capture the identity of the municipality.
- ⇒ A map or series of maps which display the objective identity of the municipality. These maps are the revised EEZ, in which the group members take the initial EEZ, prepared by the practitioner and modify it to reflect the local understanding of conditions in the municipality.
- ⇒ descriptions of the future shape of the municipality to reflect the aspirations of the group participants.
- ⇒ a growth narrative with a concrete picture of desired municipality development.³⁰

It must be noted that the visioning exercise could very well cause the group to modify the assets mapping that it accomplished in the previous step. This is to be expected as the negotiation process proceeds. New ideas emerge and there is no reason that previous assumptions cannot be revisited. For this reason there is a double headed arrow connecting the assets and visions elements in Figure 9, indicating that the two steps are an iterative procedure that grows organically, not a step by step programme to be followed by rote.

The process and outcomes of visioning create a number of short and long term benefits, among which are that visioning:

- ⇒ identifies direction and purpose;
- ⇒ alerts stakeholders to needed change;
- ⇒ promotes interest and commitment;
- ⇒ promotes focus;
- ⇒ encourages openness to unique and creative solutions;
- ⇒ encourages and builds confidence;
- ⇒ builds loyalty through involvement (ownership); and
- ⇒ results in efficiency and productivity.

One final warning to the practitioner is that as you engage in the visioning process, be alert to and ready to counter the following vision killers:

- ⇒ tradition;
- ⇒ fear of ridicule;
- ⇒ stereotypes of people, conditions, roles and governing councils;
- ⇒ complacency of some stakeholders;
- ⇒ fatigued leaders;
- ⇒ short-term thinking; and
- ⇒ "naysayers"³¹

The Territorial Pact

After the working groups have reached a consensus vision for each of their land use themes or spatial zones the results of their efforts must be combined into an overall

²⁹ **Maine State Planning Office.** 2003. *Community Visioning Handbook: How to Imagine – and Create – a Better Future*: p. 14 (Available:

<http://www.state.me.us/spo/landuse/docs/visioning/visioning.pdf>)

³⁰ **Maine State Planning Office.** 2003: p. 28

³¹ **National School Boards Association.** 2004. *Creating a Vision*. (Available: <http://www.nsba.org/sbot/toolkit/cav.html>)

vision of the municipality. The negotiations to combine the working group visions take place in a plenary workshop in which each group will present the results of their deliberations. The task of the workshop is to sensitize the stakeholders to the different visions of all the groups, harmonize these visions, identify and resolve any conflicts between them and formulate a single, unified consensus that incorporates them all.

The consensus reached in this workshop is referred to as the Territorial Pact. The Territorial Pact consists of the same components as the individual group vision statements:

- ⇒ an opening narrative to capture the identity of the entire municipality, combining all of the elements identified in the groups.
- ⇒ the consensus EEZ, in which all of the physical, social, ecological, political and economic zones recognized as important by the working groups, the service providers and the practitioner are identified and described. As was discussed in the previous chapter, the EEZ is intended to provide a tool to aggregate available data and information in a simple, easily understandable and readily usable form. The EEZ provides a holistic picture of land and natural resource use in the municipality. To repeat the goal established at the beginning of this chapter, the Consensus EEZ delineates areas where particular land uses may be encouraged through development programmes, services, financial and tax incentives or other intercessions. The EEZ classification partitions the landscape into areas that show approximately the same constraints, potentials and challenges for socio-economic development as it pertains to the use of land and natural resources. Areas grouped into a zone would be expected to respond similarly to approximately the same kind of interventions. The Consensus EEZ often indicates likely options related to the development potentials of the municipality
- ⇒ a synthesis and harmonization of the working groups' descriptions of the future shape of the municipality to reflect the aspirations of all its inhabitants.
- ⇒ An integration of the working groups' growth narratives to develop an overall perspective on the stakeholders' conception of how the municipality should reshape itself in the future.

As was the case with the group visioning process, formulation of the Territorial Pact components should be done by consensus. If there is disagreement or conflicting ideas the working groups may wish to revise their asset maps and/or vision statements. New ideas that arise in the course of the negotiations may lead to a similar result. That is why the link connecting the working group element with the Territorial Pact element in Figure 9 has arrows pointed in both directions. As in all of the previous activities, the negotiations must be conducted as an iterative, organic process rather than a series of fixed steps. Clearly, the conduct of this exercise also depends on the application of the most proficient skills of the facilitator to achieve a successful outcome.

Chapter 5. The Development Portfolio: Planning for Action

*Men often oppose a thing merely because they have had no agency in planning it,
or because it may have been planned by those whom they dislike.*
-Alexander Hamilton

The territorial pact provides the stakeholders with a shared conceptualization of their aspirations for land use in the municipality. The next step in the process is to translate these aspirations into a concrete action plan. The goal of the plan is to establish a combination of activities that transform the municipality's current land use into land use patterns that match the community's vision as expressed in the territorial pact. The product of this activity, as shown in Figure 10, is a development portfolio consisting of a list of well defined project ideas which have been formulated as project proposals for implementation. As part of the portfolio the stakeholders develop a consensus which prioritizes these project proposals. The development portfolio, therefore, establishes the master plan that is used to guide the municipality in its efforts to achieve the vision set forth in the territorial pact.




Figure 10: The Development Portfolio

The Working Groups

Elaboration of the development portfolio begins in the working groups. Each group starts by identifying concrete actions and project ideas to implement territorial pact as it relates to its land use theme or spatial zone. The focus of the discussion centres on the variables that make up the land use as illustrated in the outcomes element of Figure 10: changing the landscape and infrastructure, altering social norms and behaviours, updating legislation and developing markets. The projects are based on strategies that change these elements in a manner intended to achieve the changes in land use envisioned in the Territorial Pact. The strategies devised will likely include:

- ⇒ private investment opportunities;
- ⇒ public works;
- ⇒ infrastructure development;
- ⇒ political advocacy;
- ⇒ farming support activities and services (agricultural extension; credit);
- ⇒ self help actions;
- ⇒ information flows to stakeholders (available land, new technology, farming support, markets, etc); and
- ⇒ community education.

But the emergence of other types of strategies is clearly a possibility. The facilitator bears a heavy responsibility for helping the participants identify them in the workshop sessions.

After an initial round of brainstorming about project ideas, it is useful for the working groups to report the results of their activities to the assembled body of stakeholders in a plenary meeting or workshop. Communicating the working group's activities to those stakeholders who are not participating in the group serves several purposes:

- ⇒ Stakeholders get a chance to voice any concerns, reservations or objections they may have to the working group's preliminary ideas.
- ⇒ Working groups with similar or complimenting ideas have a chance to coordinate their activities.
- ⇒ Working groups get feedback from the stakeholders on the value of their ideas.
- ⇒ Stakeholders may find that they are interested in participating in the work of other groups.
- ⇒ The initial presentation of the ideas may even lead to a reconfiguration of the entire working group structure.

Ideally, this idea interchange takes place after the working groups have developed some concrete ideas, but before they have invested a great deal of time and effort in formalizing the ideas into a final project proposal format. The land use development practitioner is responsible for judging when the proper moment for such an idea exchange between working groups has arrived.

In any event, the working groups do not operate in a vacuum. It is to be expected that there will be stakeholders who participate in more than one working group and who will thereby provide considerable cross-fertilization of ideas between the different groups. The municipality administration, as the key stakeholder, can be expected to play a prominent role in this respect. If the working groups have been properly constituted, using a well developed stakeholder analysis and guided by the vision developed in the Territorial Pact there should be little reason to expect that major discord would crop up at this time. The possibility does exist, however. A formal opportunity for stakeholders to express their opinions at this point in the process could prevent a great deal of wasted effort in subsequent activities. As always, much depends on the sensitivity and judgment of the land use development practitioner in gauging the attitude of the stakeholders.

As indicated by the double headed arrows labelled "Negotiation" in Figure 10, it may be necessary to revise the Territorial Pact or even revisit the assets and visions outcomes as new ideas emerge from the process. Repeating once again, this is not a linear, step-by-step process. Rather, it is an organic, iterative process in which the participants learn by doing. The emergence of new information and the formation of new relationships between the stakeholders may well change the assumptions. Indeed, it is one of the major objectives of the process to achieve such reconfigurations. The practitioner must be aware of this possibility and guide the stakeholders into making the appropriate revisions to any or all of the elements of the negotiation framework as the process develops.

When the projects have been identified and a consensus has been reached that they are relevant, they must be formulated into a standardized form. Standardization is required so that the proposals can be readily compared to other potential projects, proposed both by the group and by the other groups. The box below contains a suggested format for this documentation. Very clearly this is a highly technical document. It is highly probable that the working group will need to enlist the aid of technical experts from outside service providers to produce all of the information called for in the outline. Locating and connecting the working group with the

appropriate expertise is a major responsibility of the land use development practitioner.

Project Proposal Format

1. Cover page

The cover page includes the area concerned (photo), project title, Working Group's name, etc. Make it brief, simple and pleasant.

2. Executive Summary

- Provide a short summary of the goal, purposes and principal expected results of the project.
- List the partners and organizations involved.
- State the estimated duration of the project.
- State the total funding requested from public or private investments, together with the financial contributions expected from partner organizations and other sources.

3. Background

- Provide relevant social, political, economic and/or other information to describe the local context and the development challenges being addressed, i.e., what are the problems or issues to be addressed, and why are they important in the municipality?
- If it is the case, describe how other government and/or donor programmes may support the proposed project.

4. Justification

- Describe the link between the proposed project and the development challenges defined above. How does the project respond to local developmental needs and priorities?
- Describe how the project is in line with the territorial pact, how aware the local population is as to their rights and responsibilities as citizens, their empowerment as citizens (includes power-sharing, participation and influence in decisions) and their satisfaction with local organizations that could assist in improving their lives.

5. Project Description

- Table 9, below illustrates a framework or for presenting your project. Describe each element in narrative form in a project proposal framework. It provides an overview of the project, summarizing and integrating many of the key issues, including the project goal, purposes, resources, results at three levels and risks.
- Benefits to the entire municipality. What positive effects will the project have in the municipality: political, scientific, institutional, commercial, or other?
- Technology Use: Define the "technology" (model or approach) that the project will use or need. Assess the relevance of this technology to the local developmental context.

6. Environmental sustainability

Using the services of a technical expert if necessary, describe the environmental effects of the project, including the environmental effects of malfunctions or accidents that may occur in connection with the project and any cumulative environmental effects that are likely to result from the project in combination with other projects or activities that have been or will be carried out. Include:
The significance of the effects;

- Comments received from the public, if any;
- Measures that are technically and economically feasible and that would mitigate any significant adverse environmental effects;
- Any other relevant matter such as the need for and alternatives to the project;
- Describe how the project will respect the local environment and promote sustainable development.

7. Management Strategy and Structure

- Outline how the project will be managed, including planning (i.e. the preparation of annual work plans), collecting baseline data, monitoring and reporting functions.
- Indicate how the partner organizations and other participants will work together and foster equitable participation in the management of the project

8. Communications Strategy

Describe your strategy in promoting the project to key stakeholders and to a wider audience in the municipality. The strategy should include:

- Goals and objectives
- Audiences and key messages
- Media of communication (print, website, events, radio or television broadcasts, etc.)
- Schedule of events/broadcasts/distribution
- Initiatives for both municipal and external audiences

9. Partners

Briefly describe the origins of the proposal: how the partner organizations came together and how the proposal was developed.

Public Partners:

- Provide a brief profile of the public partners (including addresses, names of the key contact person) and their potential roles.
- Explain why the leading public partner is the most appropriate to implement the proposed project, based on his technical and managerial experience and capacity.
- Explain how the proposed project fits with the mandates, priorities and existing programmes of the leading public partner.

Private Partners:

- Provide a brief profile of the private partners (including addresses and names of the key contact person) and their potential roles.
- Explain why the leading private partner is the most appropriate to implement the proposed project, based on his technical and managerial experience and capacity.
- Explain how the proposed project fits with the mandates, priorities and existing activities of the leading private partner.

10. Future funding needs

If the project will be implemented or will require maintenance beyond the funding requested, explain how the project proposal plans to cover future financial needs. If partial funds are requested from a funding source, explain how and where the project proposal can obtain the remaining funds.

11. Supporting documents

Maps, blueprints, photos, visual aids, etc.

Table 9: What goes into a project proposal			
Municipal area		Project No.	
Project Title		Project Budget	
Partner Organization		Project beneficiaries	
Working group name		Technical expertise required	
NARRATIVE SUMMARY	EXPECTED RESULTS	PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT	ASSUMPTION/RISK INDICATORS
Project Goal : A broad statement of intent which relates this project to the land development portfolio goal.	Future Results (Impacts): The future results are development results that will benefit the target population/society in the future. They are the logical consequences of the outcomes and outputs described below.	Performance Indicators: These performance indicators will provide evidence that the project has made a contribution to the achievement of the expected result. They can be quantitative or qualitative.	Assumptions: the necessary conditions that must exist for the future results to be achieved as expected. Risk Indicators: will measure the status of the assumptions identified above.)
Project Purpose: A project-specific statement of intent that describes what project partners expect to attain by the end of the project. It explains what will be done in development terms. It should also identify intended beneficiaries.	End-of-project Results (Outcomes): The results that partners have committed to achieve by the end of the project. They will normally focus on a partner organization and its target and are the logical consequence of achieving a specified combination of short-term results (outputs) (see below).	Performance Indicators: These performance indicators will provide evidence that the project has achieved the stated medium-term results.	Assumptions: the necessary conditions that must exist for the end-of-project results to behave as expected. Risk Indicators: will measure the status of the assumptions identified above.*
Resources: Resources can be financial, human, or physical and are necessary for carrying out project activities and achieving its intended purpose and goal. They should be divided into resources requested of public and private sides and those being provided by others.	Short-term Results (Outputs): Developmental results that are immediate, visible, concrete and tangible consequences of completed project activities.	Performance Indicators: These performance indicators will provide evidence that the short-term results have been achieved.	Assumptions: the necessary conditions that must exist for the short-term results to behave as expected. Risk Indicators: will measure the status of the assumptions identified above.*

* **High-level of risk** - project managers have little or no control over political, environmental, social risk factors.

Medium/Low-level of risk - project managers have some control over risks factors.

The General Assessment Workshop

The final step to be taken in establishing the development portfolio is a workshop to finalize and formally ratify the projects developed by the working groups. If the working group activities have been conducted properly, the presentation and discussion of the proposals themselves should be little more than a formality since the stakeholders would have had ample opportunity to voice their opinions during the working group sessions. But the formality of a final presentation and ratification of the proposals are symbolically important to give legitimacy to the proceedings.

The second purpose of this workshop is to prioritize the proposals of the different working groups. This task is based on the assumption that there will not be adequate resources available to undertake all of the projects at the same time. The workshop participants must decide which of the projects are the most urgently needed and which can be most appropriately left for later implementation.

Finally, the workshop participants are asked to develop and ratify a draft outline for the development portfolio documentation. This documentation is used as the master planning document for the implementation phase of the process. Its contents are the project proposals and their prioritizations. It is used to guide the activities of the municipality administration and any other implementing agencies as they attempt to improve the municipality's land use.

It is the responsibility of the land use development practitioner and the municipality administration to develop the final land use development portfolio documentation from the workshop draft document. It would be difficult to overstate the importance of properly documenting the land use development portfolio. This documentation is the physical expression of the agreement reached by the stakeholder consensus building process. As such it is the benchmark against which progress will be measured in the implementation phase. This documentation must be clear, complete and unambiguous to minimize dissention and confusion in the project implementation activities.

Chapter 6. Implementation: Achieving Results

*It is not because things are difficult that we do not dare.
It is because we do not dare that things are difficult
- Seneca*

The development portfolio creates the blueprint which now must be turned into concrete results. To this end activities must be defined, responsibilities must be assigned to specific individuals, and schedules must be developed for each project in the portfolio. This is the responsibility of the working group that conceived the project.

Since each project is unique, it is difficult to make many generalizations about the parameters of these activities. Each project requires an organizational and procedural structure that is individually crafted by the responsible working group to address its particular requirements. There are, however, some aspects of the project implementation phase that are common to most situations.

Project Focal Point

Among the most important features of the project implementation structure is the designation of one individual as the contact person to coordinate the activities of everyone involved in the project. Ideally, this person should be technically knowledgeable, respected by the project participants and have good administrative and leadership skills. The contact person is the principle focal point for the project activities. Both project participants and outsiders use the contact person to find out information about the project, pass information relevant to the project activities to all who are concerned and to coordinate their activities.

Technical Support

The final implementation element that is likely to arise in most projects is technical support. As always, depending on their nature, there will be large variation between projects in their need for external technical assistance. The land use development practitioner has a large role to play in this aspect of the process. As was the case in the elaboration of the development portfolio, locating and connecting the working groups with the appropriate service providers continues to be one of the practitioner's major responsibilities.

Logical Framework Analysis

In most situations the working group conducts a logical framework analysis³² to identify all of the elements and activities of the project and to verify that it is logically conceived. In the logical framework analysis the working group develops a problem tree, which is a technique for bringing out an analysis of the causes and effects of

³² A short summary of the logical framework analysis methodology is found in **La Gra, Jerry**. 1990. "Annex 13 - The logical framework." *A commodity systems assessment methodology for problem and project identification*. Inter-American Institute For Cooperation On Agriculture, Postharvest Institute For Perishables, Asean Food Handling Bureau. University of Idaho (Available: <http://www.fao.org/WAIRdocs/x5405e/x5405e0p.htm>) A more comprehensive description of the logical framework analysis methodology is found in **Danida**. 1996. *Logical Framework Approach: A Flexible Tool for Participatory Development*. (Available: <http://danida.netboghandel.dk/ud.asp?url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww%2Eum%2Edk%2FNr%2Frdonlyres%2FA5C92A15%2D6E14%2D4F06%2D80B1%2D96971D31CD04%2F0%2FLogical%5FFramework%5FApproach%2Epdf>)

key problems which the project is planning to address (see Figure 11).³³ The problem tree is then used to develop an objective tree which uses exactly the same structure as the problem tree, but with the problem statements (negatives) turned into objective statements (positives). While the problem tree shows the cause and effect relationship between problems, the objective tree shows the means - end relationship between objectives. This leads directly into developing the project's narrative description in the logical framework matrix.³⁴





Figure 11: Problem Tree Diagram


³³ FAO. 2001. *Agricultural knowledge and information systems in Hagaz, Eritrea*. by Chris Garforth. Sustainable Development Department (SD) (Available: http://www.fao.org/SD/2001/KN1001a4_en.htm)

³⁴ Australian Agency for International Development. 2002. "The Logical Framework Approach." *AusGUIDELines*. p. 11 (Available: <http://www.v2020.org/Toolkit/documents/LFA%20guidelines.pdf>)

Case Study: Improving Milk Production in Prnjavor Problem Tree



Case Study: Improving Milk Production In Prnjavor Objective Tree



The logical framework is a matrix of four columns and four rows providing sixteen squares for a comprehensive description of a project. The logical framework matrix shows both the project's logical structure (the links between the inputs/activities and the objectives to be achieved under certain Assumptions), and its major quantitative data. The logical framework matrix is useful in two ways:

- ⇒ in the planning process the logical framework matrix forces the planner to constantly check whether the project design is plausible and consistent.
- ⇒ in executing the project the logical framework matrix facilitates the communication among all parties on the "why" and the "how" of the project, thus allows for a project monitoring based on common understanding.

The four rows of the logical framework matrix are:

- ⇒ The **Overall Objectives** which sets forth the higher level objective(s) to which the project is expected to contribute.
- ⇒ The **Project Purpose** describes the intended impact or the anticipated benefits as a precisely stated future condition the project is expected to achieve and only contributes to the overall goal.
- ⇒ The **Results** are expressed as objectives which the project management must achieve and sustain.
- ⇒ The **Activities** necessary to achieve the results/outputs.

The four columns of the logical framework matrix consist of:

- ⇒ The **Intervention Logic** which contains a narrative description of the elements of each row.
- ⇒ The **Monitoring Indicators** describe the important characteristics of the objectives and the performance standard expected to be reached in terms of quantity, quality, time frame and location.
- ⇒ The **Means of Verification** indicate where to obtain the data necessary to prove the objectives defined by the indicator has been reached.
- ⇒ The **Important Assumptions** which detail any external factors which may adversely affect the attainment of the stated objectives.

The resulting logical framework matrix is illustrated in Table 10³⁵.

Table 10: : **Logical Framework Matrix**

	Intervention Logic	Monitoring Indicators	Means of Verification	Important Assumptions
Overall Objectives				
Project Purpose				
Results				
Activities				

³⁵ The description of the logical framework process was adapted from **FAO**. 1995. *Proceedings of a Workshop on the Formation of an African Forest Pest Management Network, Muguga, Kenya April 24-28 1995*. Rome. (Available: <http://www.fao.org/docrep/V9741e/v9741e00.htm#Contents>)

Funding Sources

Another nearly universal aspect of project implementation is the need to acquire funding. The identity of potential funding sources will depend on the nature of the project but they could include any combination of the following:

- ⇒ private sector investors;
- ⇒ associations and/or cooperatives;
- ⇒ NGOs;
- ⇒ bilateral and multilateral donors;
- ⇒ local and central governments;
- ⇒ banks and other financial institutions.

Case Study: Logical Framework for Improving Milk Production in Prnjavor				
	Intervention logic	Monitoring indicators	Means of verification	Assumptions
Overall objectives	Number of cow increased and quality kind of cow improved		Survey	Adequate, reliable and sustainable funding.
Project purpose	Reconstruction of the stable	Adequate income for cattle breeder	Survey	Enough fodder and other cow food available
Results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Milk production per one cow increased -Income for milk production per one cow increased - Adequate milk production planning 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adequate stable and quality food for cow have influence on milk production Every data and maps are made available 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Survey and monitoring Reports from the field 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enough food for cow Price for milk adequate Size of cultivable land farm must to respond increasing of milk production
Activities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Supply equipment for the stable 2. Fama analysis(36) 3. Education and expert's visit on the field 4. Maps produced 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1.1. Cost equipment : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Linkage for cow -Water dish -Milk machine -Draining system for dung from stable -Mixer cattle food 2.1. Collecting data related to location of farms 2.2. Farmers possibility for milk production data 2.3. Organize workshop and meeting for farmers 2.4. Collecting farming system data 2.5. Check the field 3.1. Organize education for farmers divided into 4 groups on 4 location 3.2. Organize education during 10 days 3.3. Organize meeting room 3.4. Expert's visit and consultation 4.1. For first phase of the project implementation important maps and dates are : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Potential erosion map -Flood map and risk from flood -Slope map -River map and distance from the river -Road map and distance from the road -Cadastral municipality map -Analysis farming system -Farming system map -Average size of plot 3.2. In the second phase of the project, after invention of reliable and sustainable funding/ money, they want to do the next steps: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Check the field (place planning of the project) and take point with GPS -Make the map with location the points of the parcel -Comparing that map with the other maps 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 150 KM 36 KM 1500 KM - 1686 KM (20 KM per fama) 20 KM (100 KM*10 days)= 1000 100 1100 (2806 KM*36 farms) 101.016,00 KM 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Availability of credit at sustainable interest rate Farmers able to have land tenure situation clear, necessary machine, adequate size of plot, size of farm (capacity 10 cows) and possibility Farmers to support project activities. Local Authorities to support project activities. Institutes motive by incentives.
	TOTAL			

The task facing the participants is to develop an appropriate marketing strategy to sell the project idea. This task consists of two parts. The first step is to identify

funding sources that may be interested in the particular type of project in question. Next, a suitable presentation of the project must be made to the potential funding source.

Each funding source will have its own particular requirements and application formats. Most of the information needed for funding proposals should already have been developed in the project description information contained in the development portfolio and in the logical framework matrix. However, other information may be necessary. A business plan demonstrating how the project will attain profitability is usually essential if the funding source is private investors or a bank loan. Public sector and non-profit organizations often require a cost-benefit analysis before dispensing a grant. In many cases funding sources are willing to assist applicants in preparing the necessary application materials. If not, assistance may be needed from the service providers.

Project Monitoring and Evaluation

Possibly the most critical aspect of the project implementation phase is the monitoring and evaluation process. This is the mechanism that the stakeholders use to maintain control over the project activities and outcomes, even if the actual work is being done by experts or contractors. Attaining this goal of continued stakeholder involvement entails the use of the participatory monitoring and evaluation (pm&e) methodology.

Participatory monitoring and evaluation is defined as “a broad constellation of approaches, methods and techniques ... [used] ... to strengthen programmes, ensure accountability, build local management capacity and foster an environment of partnership and collaborative learning.”³⁶ Pm&e differs considerably from the conventional approach which typically involves outside experts coming in to measure performance against pre-set indicators, using standardised procedures and tools. Pm&e approaches, on the other hand, are characterised by:

- ⇒ a view of monitoring and evaluation as an integral part of the development or change process;
- ⇒ an understanding of monitoring and evaluation as an empowering process, rather than control by an external body;
- ⇒ a recognition of subjectivity in monitoring and evaluation;
- ⇒ a recognition that different groups of men and women have different perceptions, which are equally valid;
- ⇒ a need for negotiation during the process to reach consensus about conclusions and recommendations;
- ⇒ a tendency to use less formal techniques such as unstructured interviews and participant observation;
- ⇒ an emphasis on sociological enquiry rather than economic measurements; and
- ⇒ the evaluator taking on the role of facilitator.³⁷

³⁶ **Sartorius Rolf**. no date. *Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation Systems: Improving the Performance of Poverty Reduction Programs and Building Capacity of Local Partners*. Social Impact: p. 10 (Available: <http://www.socialimpact.com/TNPME.html>)

³⁷ **Rubin, F.** 1995. *Basic guide to evaluation for development workers*, Oxfam: Section 3.4. (Available: <http://www.sadl.uleth.ca/nz/cgi-bin/library?e=d-000-00---0hdl--00-0-0-0prompt-10--4---4-stx--0-1l--1-en-50---20-about-Basic+guide+to+evaluation+for+development+workers--00001-001-0-0utfZz-8-00031-001-1-0utfZz-8-00&a=d&c=hdl&cl=CL2.2&d=HASH0180fe0b2dc3ab86b5fc2edb.4.4>)

Table 11 compares the differences between Participatory and Conventional Monitoring and Evaluation:

Table 11:
What's Different About Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation?³⁸

Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation	Conventional Monitoring and Evaluation
broad range of stakeholders participate	stakeholders often don't participate
focus is on learning	focus is on accountability
flexible design	predetermined design
rapid appraisal methods	formal methods
outsiders are facilitators	outsiders are evaluators
participant focus and ownership of evaluation	funding source focus and ownership of evaluation

It is readily apparent from examination of this table that pm&e is entirely different in both purpose and focus from its conventional counterpart.

Participatory monitoring and evaluation must be integrated into the project development process not left as a task to be accomplished after the project is completed. The following are key considerations:

- ⇒ early consultation with community members and stakeholders about project design: the problem(s) to be addressed, potential courses of action, community resources which can be brought to bear and the role of external support;
- ⇒ participatory research to compile baseline information;
- ⇒ participatory definition and agreement on project concept;
- ⇒ consensus about project objectives and activities; and
- ⇒ establishment of a monitoring and evaluation plan for the project, including roles and responsibilities of community members and project participants.³⁹

The first four items on this list will have already been accomplished in the consensus building phases of the process (see Chapters 4 and 5). All that remains is the last item: establishing the project monitoring and evaluation plan.

³⁸ **USAID**. 1996. *Conducting a participatory evaluation*, USAID Development Information Services (DIS) Clearinghouse / CD-DIS / Development Experience System (DEXS). (Available: http://www.dec.org/pdf_docs/pnabs539.pdf)

³⁹ **UNDP GEF/SGP**. no date. *Monitoring and Evaluation Framework: Second Operational Phase*. (Available: <http://www.gef-sgp.org/jo/documents/Monitoring%20and%20Evaluation%20Framework.rtf>)




Figure 12: The Steps in Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation⁴⁰

Figure 12 illustrates the steps which are frequently included in the participatory monitoring and evaluation process:

- 1) Identify who will participate in the process. The stakeholder analysis which was developed in the preparation and support phase (See Chapter 3) is useful at this point.
 - a. Who is interested?
 - b. Who has the needed skills?
- 2) Determine what the participants want from the process and how they want to go about it. It is important to remember that this is a process that belongs to the stakeholders. Their concerns and interests may not be the same as those of an outside expert.
 - a. Why is the monitoring and evaluation being done?
 - b. When is it done?
- 3) Define the priorities for monitoring and evaluating.
 - a. What is important to the stakeholders?
 - b. What is unimportant?
- 4) Identify the indicators to be measured.

⁴⁰ **Guijt, I. and J. Gaventa.** 1998. *Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation: Learning From Change*. Institute of Development Studies (IDS), UK. (Available: <http://www.ids.ac.uk/ids/bookshop/briefs/Brief12.html>)

- a. If the implementation is going according to plan and meeting the objectives, how will we know?
 - b. What are the key indicators that the project is working as desired?
 - c. How do the key indicators tell us if it is not working?
- 5) Agree on how, when and by whom the information is to be collected.
Consider the full range of PRA tools.

Methods commonly used in participatory monitoring and evaluation

- maps: to show the location and types of changes in the area being monitored.
- Venn diagrams: to show changes in relationships between groups, institutions and individuals.
- flow diagrams: to show direct and indirect impacts of changes and to relate them to causes.
- diaries: to describe changes in the lives of individuals or groups.
- photographs: to depict changes through a sequence of images.
- matrix scoring: to compare people's preferences for a set of options or outcomes.
- network diagrams: to show changes in the type and degree of contact between people and services.⁴¹

- 6) Collect the information
- 7) Analyze the information.
- a. Is the implementation keeping to the time schedule?
 - b. Do adjustments have to be made?
 - c. Are the activities proceeding successfully?
 - d. What is proving to be less than successful?
 - e. Is there new information or are there influencing factors (threats, opportunities) that need to be taken into account?
 - f. Are the assumptions realistic?
 - g. What actions and strategies need to be taken to address the new conditions and reform unsuccessful aspects?
- 8) Agree on how the findings are to be used.
- a. How are the results transmitted to the stakeholders?
 - i. Written reports?
 - ii. Performance review meetings?
 - b. What needs to be changed?
- 9) Determine if there is a need for another round of monitoring and evaluation.
- a. Is the project done?
 - b. If not, at what point should the next round take place?

⁴¹ **Guijt, I. and J. Gaventa.** 1998.

As always, the steps discussed above are suggestions, not rules. Participatory monitoring and evaluation, if properly implemented, has the potential to⁴²:

- ⇒ improve the performance of the project;
- ⇒ enhance the capacity and skills of the stakeholders;
- ⇒ build partnerships and sense of local ownership over the project;
- ⇒ strengthen consensus among stakeholders about project goals/objectives;
- ⇒ provide timely, reliable and valid information;
- ⇒ increase cost-effectiveness of monitoring and evaluation information; and
- ⇒ empower local people to make their own decisions about the future.

However, it is essential to recognize that each situation is unique, with different circumstances, problems and participants. No single set of techniques or methodologies is appropriate in every case. Much depends, therefore, on the skills of the Land Use Development Practitioner whose ability to facilitate the process is critical.

⁴² **Sartorius Rolf.** no date: p. 1

Chapter 7. Programme Monitoring and Evaluation: The Feedback Loop

*Look and you will find it.
What is unsought will go undetected
- Sophocles*

The programme monitoring and evaluation concept is entirely different from the project monitoring and evaluation process discussed in the previous chapter. Project monitoring and evaluation is a short term management technique in which the intention is to ensure that the activities of the project are functioning efficiently and meeting the project objectives. Programme monitoring and evaluation, the subject of this chapter, is a much broader, long term undertaking.

The fact that this topic appears at the end of this volume does not signify that it is unimportant or in any respect an afterthought. In many ways the programme monitoring and evaluation component is at the core of the participatory process. As Figure 13 illustrates, the programme monitoring and evaluation element provides the feedback loop which makes the entire process iterative and evolutionary. In the participatory process the stakeholders learn by doing, but learning can only happen if they make an effort to find out the results of what they have done and determine if these results accomplished the goals that they wished to achieve. Programme Monitoring and Evaluation is that effort. The learning that occurs with every cycle of the process makes the entire procedure better, more efficient and more sustainable as the stakeholders become more knowledgeable, confident in their abilities and trusting of their fellow participants.




Figure 13: Programme Monitoring and Evaluation

The objective of programme monitoring and evaluation is to ensure that the overall outcomes of the process conform to the vision established in the territorial pact. The introduction of this volume described land use as the dynamic equilibrium resulting from the complex interrelationship between four variables: legislation, social norms, landscape, and markets. The projects in the development portfolio will manipulate these variables with the expectation that such manipulation will bring the land use closer to the vision. Simply monitoring and evaluating the project activities, as described in the last chapter, does not provide the information needed to determine if the results of these activities are achieving the desired outcome. A broader, more comprehensive perspective is needed.

Many of the same participatory techniques employed in the project monitoring and evaluation will be useful in the programme monitoring and evaluation. The major difference is in who does the work and what questions they ask during the process. In the project monitoring and evaluation the work was done by a small number of people in the working groups. This step of the process, in contrast, must engage the attention of the entire stakeholder complex because it touches upon and perhaps challenges the basic assumptions of the entire procedure. Every repetition of this step is likely to require some adjustment in the negotiated consensus, and, therefore, needs to involve all of the stakeholders in reworking the consensus.

The questions to be asked in the course of the programme monitoring and evaluation process are broadly based and have a long term focus. As was discussed in the introduction, the participatory land use development process is meant to be evolutionary rather than prescriptive. At this stage the stakeholders get the chance to evaluate the lessons learned during the course of their activities and make appropriate adjustments. The purpose of the questions is to examine the nature of these lessons and incorporate them into the process. Typical questions might include:

- ⇒ Are the projects in the development portfolio achieving the outcomes envisioned in the territorial pact?
- ⇒ Are other projects needed?
- ⇒ Are any projects having a negative impact and, therefore, should be modified or terminated?
- ⇒ Does the territorial pact still represent the stakeholders' objectives for the municipality?
- ⇒ Are there new visions related to the municipality?
- ⇒ Have any of the visions developed for the municipality proven to be defective or in need of modification?
- ⇒ Does the municipality have any assets that were not recognized earlier?
- ⇒ Are there additional stakeholders who need to be included?
- ⇒ Do the working groups need to be reconfigured?

From the questions above one can easily see that the activities in programme monitoring and evaluation more closely resemble the consensus building activities described in chapters 4 and 5 than they do the project monitoring and evaluation activities discussed in the previous chapter. The essential element is the periodic opportunity to reconstitute the consensus, incorporating the knowledge and skills that have been acquired in the interim. Given this opportunity the process can remain vibrant and alive. Without it, the system will quickly fade away.

As always, the individual circumstances of the municipality will vary, but a reasonable expectation is that the process should go through the programme evaluation cycle once every year. More often risks the problem of evaluation overload and stakeholder fatigue. Less frequent execution could allow the process to get off track. Once again the exact timing of this activity will depend on the judgement of the land use development practitioner.

Chapter 8.

Conclusion: A Self Sustaining Participatory Land Use Development Process

No society can long sustain itself unless its members have learned the sensitivities, motivations and skills involved in assisting and caring for other human beings.
-Urie Bronfenbrenner

In the introduction to this volume its purpose is described as providing guidelines for involving the stakeholders of a municipality as the pivotal element of the land use development process. The argument is made that this is a desirable objective because it will encourage the stakeholders to feel that they own the process and will become committed to using it to achieve results. Furthermore, the expectation is that stakeholder commitment in such a process leads to:

- ⇒ a decentralization of policy;
- ⇒ an increased participation of civil society in order to establish common interests;
- ⇒ a greater autonomy in the management at local level of the resources for land administration; and
- ⇒ a redistribution of resources toward sustainable local development.⁴³

The preceding chapters have described at some length a methodology for achieving this objective.




Figure 14: Operational Participatory Land Use Development

The guidelines discussed in this volume were devised to create a self sustaining participatory land use development process. Figure 14 illustrates the elements of such a process and reflects the overall objective of the methodology described above. A comparison of the operational participatory land use development model Figure 14 with the previous instance of the model shown in Figure 13 reveals that the land use practitioner and the preparation and support function have disappeared. This transformation of the model is meant to represent the land use practitioner's most important goal: the internalization of the process administration within the

⁴³ FAO. by Clementi, Sylvia and Federica Ravera. 2004: p. 8

stakeholder complex and the elimination of the need for further outside intervention. When the process reaches this point of development it becomes sustainable. The stakeholders themselves operate and maintain the negotiating platform, implement the projects they have devised, monitor and evaluate the results and maintain whatever contact is needed with the outside service providers. The initial state element also disappears from the model since the initial state of each repetition of the development cycle is the outcome of the previous iteration of the process. In short, Figure 14 is the image of success!

The Land Use Practitioner's Ultimate Objective:

The internalization of the administration of the process within the stakeholder complex and the elimination of the need for further outside intervention.

Bibliography

Alliance for Non-profit Management. no date. *Frequently Asked Questions.* (Available: http://www.allianceonline.org/FAQ/strategic_planning/what_s_in_vision_statementfaq)

Australian Agency for International Development. 2002. "The Logical Framework Approach." *AusGUIDELines.* (Available: <http://www.v2020.org/Toolkit/documents/LFA%20guidelines.pdf>)

Beaulieu, Lionel J. 2002. *Mapping the Assets of Your Community: A Key component for Building Local Capacity,* Southern Rural Development Center, Mississippi State University: (Available: http://srdc.msstate.edu/publications/227/227_asset_mapping.pdf)

Chambers, Robert. 2002. *Relaxed and Participatory Appraisal: Notes on Practical Approaches and Methods for Participants in PRA/PLA-Related Familiarization Workshops,* Brighton, UK. (Available: <http://www.ids.ac.uk/ids/particip/research/pranotes02.pdf>)

Danida. 1996. *Logical Framework Approach: A Flexible Tool for Participatory Development.* (Available: <http://danida.netboghandel.dk/ud.asp?url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww%2Eum%2Edk%2FNR%2Frdonlyres%2FA5C92A15%2D6E14%2D4F06%2D80B1%2D96971D31CD04%2F0%2FLogical%5FFramework%5FApproach%2Epdf>)

Department for International Development (DFID). 2002. *Tools for Development: A Handbook for Those Engaged in Development Activity,* Version 15. (Available: <http://www.dfid.gov.uk/FOI/tools/>)

Dispute Resolution Centre. no date. *What is Facilitation?* The Institute of Conflict Analysis & Management (Available: <http://www.disputeresolution.bc.ca/intervention/facilitation.html>)

FAO. No date. *Field Tools @ Participation: How to facilitate a meeting.* Informal Working Group on Participatory Approaches & Methods (Available: http://www.fao.org/Participation/ft_factl.jsp)

FAO. no date. *Field Tools @ Participation: Search for tools by criteria.* Informal Working Group on Participatory Approaches & Methods. (Available: http://www.fao.org/Participation/ft_findt.jsp)

FAO. 1990. *The community's toolbox: The idea, methods and tools for participatory assessment, monitoring and evaluation in community forestry.* Rome. (Available: <http://www.fao.org/docrep/x5307e/x5307e07.htm>)

FAO. 1990. "SWOL Analysis." *The community's toolbox: The idea, methods and tools for participatory assessment, monitoring and evaluation in community forestry,* Rome. (Available: <http://www.fao.org/docrep/x5307e/x5307e09.htm#tool18>: strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and limitations (s.w.o.l.) analysis)

FAO. 1995. *Proceedings Of A Workshop On The Formation Of An African Forest Pest Management Network, Muguga, Kenya April 24-28 1995.* Rome. (Available: <http://www.fao.org/docrep/V9741e/v9741e00.htm#Contents>)

FAO. 2001. *Agricultural knowledge and information systems in Hagaz, Eritrea.* by Chris Garforth. Sustainable Development Department (SD) (Available: http://www.fao.org/SD/2001/KN1001a4_en.htm)

FAO. 2003. *A Handbook for Trainers on Participatory Local Development* by Jain, S.P. and Wim Polman, Bangkok, Thailand. (Available: <http://www.fao.org/DOCREP/006/AD346E/ad346e0g.htm#bm16>)

FAO. 2004. *Participatory and Negotiated Territorial Planning: Methodological Guidelines for a Territorial Approach, Draft for Comments,* by Sylvia Clementi and Federica Ravera. Rome.

FAO and UNEP. 1999. *The Future of Our Land: Facing The Challenge,* Rome.

Guijt, I. and J. Gaventa. 1998. *Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation: Learning From Change.* Institute of Development Studies (IDS), UK. (Available: <http://www.ids.ac.uk/ids/bookshop/briefs/Brief12.html>)

Haines, Anna. 2001. *Incorporating Visioning into Comprehensive Planning.* (G3752) University of Wisconsin Cooperative Extension. (Available: <http://cecommerce.uwex.edu/pdfs/G3752.PDF>)

Human Leadership and Development Division of the American Society for Quality, The Association for Quality and Participation, and The International Association of Facilitators. 2002. *Basic Facilitation Skills.* (Available: http://www.iaf-world.org/Docs/Editors/2002_Basic_Facilitation_Primer.PDF)

International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED). June 2001. *Power Tools Series: Stakeholder Power Analysis* (Available: www.iied.org/forestry/tools or www.livelihoods.org)

La Gra, Jerry. 1990. "Annex 13 - The logical framework." *A commodity systems assessment methodology for problem and project identification.* Inter-American Institute For Cooperation On Agriculture, Postharvest Institute For Perishables, Asean Food Handling Bureau. University of Idaho(Available: <http://www.fao.org/WAIRdocs/x5405e/x5405e0p.htm>)

Maine State Planning Office. 2003. *Community Visioning Handbook: How to Imagine – and Create – a Better Future.* (Available: <http://www.state.me.us/spo/landuse/docs/visioning/visioning.pdf>)

McCallum, Douglas. 1998. *Facilitation: Training Materials on Facilitation of Discussion Group.* SCP: pp. 8-9. (Available: <http://www.unhabitat.org/cdrom/governance/html/books/facilita.pdf>)

McKnight, John L. and John P. Kretzmann. 1993. *Building Communities from the Inside Out: A Path Toward Finding and Mobilizing a Community's Assets.* ACTA Publications, Chicago.

National School Boards Association. 2004. *Creating a Vision.* (Available: <http://www.nsba.org/sbot/toolkit/cav.html>)

People and Planet. no date. *Meetings>Icebreakers.* (Available: <http://www.peopleandplanet.org/groups/guide/guide.meetings.icebreakers.php>)

Resolve. No date. *Results through consensus* (Available: <http://www.resolve.org/tools.html>)

Results Through Training. no date. *Icebreakers.* (Available: <http://www.resultsthroughtraining.com/downloads/Icebreakers.HTML>)

Rubin, F. 1995. *Basic guide to evaluation for development workers.* Oxfam. (Available: <http://www.sadl.uleth.ca/nz/cgi-bin/library?e=d-000-00---0hdl--00-0-0-0prompt-10---4---4-stx--0-1l--1-en-50---20-about-Basic+guide+to+evaluation+for+development+workers--00001-001-0-0utfZz-8-00031-001-1-0utfZz-8-00&a=d&c=hdl&cl=CL2.2&d=HASH0180fe0b2dc3ab86b5fc2edb.4.4>)

Sartorius Rolf. no date. *Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation Systems: Improving the Performance of Poverty Reduction Programmes and Building Capacity of Local Partners.* Social Impact. (Available: <http://www.socialimpact.com/TNPME.html>)

UNDP GEF/SGP. no date. *Monitoring and Evaluation Framework: Second operational Phase.* (Available: <http://www.gef-sgp.org/jo/documents/Monitoring%20and%20Evaluation%20Framework.rtf>)

United Nations Centre for Human Settlements (Habitat). 2001. *Tools to support participatory Urban Decision Making.* UN-HABITAT

United Nations Centre for Human Settlements (Habitat) and the United Nations Environment Programme. 1999. *Establishing and Supporting a Working Group Process,* The SCP Source Book Series. (Available: <http://www.unhabitat.org/cdrom/governance/html/books/wgp.pdf>)

USAID. 1996. *Conducting a participatory evaluation,* USAID Development Information Services (DIS) Clearinghouse / CD-DIS / Development Experience System (DEXS). (Available: http://www.dec.org/pdf_docs/pnabs539.pdf)

Wilcox, David. 1994. *The Guide to Effective Participation.* Partnerships Online (Available: <http://www.partnerships.org.uk/guide/index.htm>)

Work Group on Health Promotion and Community Development. no date. Group Facilitation. *Community Tool Box Web Site.* University of Kansas. Lawrence, Kansas. (Available: http://ctb.ku.edu/tools/en/chapter_1016.htm)

Youth Action Effecting Change. 2003. *Youth Community Asset Mapping Manual, Booklet 1.* (Available : http://www.eya.ca/yaec/docs/manual_download/YCAM%20booklet1.pdf)