

The SCP Source Book Series, Volume 3

Establishing and Supporting a Working Group Process

Prepared and written by staff and consultants
of the Sustainable Cities Programme

About the SCP Source Book Series

The SCP Source Book Series provides detailed operational guidance for the benefit of people implementing city-level projects within the Sustainable Cities Programme. Each volume in the Series covers either an important part of the SCP process or an important topic which is central to urban environmental planning and management. The volumes currently being produced (1999) include the following:

¹ In general, the SCP Source Books are developed based on city experiences or are developed as operational tools which will then be fine-tuned, adapted and applied in cities. An SCP Source Book can be process-specific (Volumes 1 - 5), topic-specific (Volume 6) or of a cross-cutting nature (Volumes 7, 8 and 9)

Volume 1: Preparing an Environmental Profile
Volume 2: Organising, Conducting and Reporting a City Consultation
Volume 3: Establishing and Supporting a Working Group Process
Volume 4: Formulating Issue-Specific Strategies and Action Plans
Volume 5: Institutionalising the EPM Process
Volume 6: Urban Air Quality Management Handbook
Volume 7: Building an Environmental Management Information Systems
Volume 8: Integrating Gender Responsiveness in EPM
Volume 9: Measuring Progress in EPM¹

The emphasis in this Series is on **relevance** and **realism**. These volumes are the *product of experience* - field-level experience gained over the past eight years in SCP city projects around the world. Precisely because it is drawn from the lessons of experience in so many different cities, the information contained in these volumes is not city-specific but can readily be adapted and applied to the tasks of urban environmental planning and management (EPM) in virtually any city context.

The Sustainable Cities Programme (SCP) is a global programme of the United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-HABITAT) and the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP). It is the leading technical cooperation programme in the field of urban environmental planning and management and is the principal activity of the United Nations system for operationalising sustainable urban development and thus contributing to implementation of *the globally-agreed Agenda 21* and *Habitat Agenda*. The SCP is currently active in the following places:

Africa: Accra (Ghana), Dakar (Senegal), Dar es Salaam (Tanzania), Ibadan (Nigeria), Lusaka (Zambia), Maputo (Mozambique), Moshi (Tanzania), Nampulo (Mozambique), Zanzibar (Tanzania)

Asia: Colombo (Sri Lanka), Madras (India), Cagayan de Oro, Tagbilaran, and Lipa (Philippines), Shenyang (China), Wuhan (China)

Middle East: Ismailia (Egypt), Tunis (Tunisia)

Latin America: Concepción (Chile)

Central & Eastern Europe: Katowice (Poland), Moscow (Russia), St Petersburg (Russia).

Further information about the SCP Source Book Series, or about the Sustainable Cities Programme itself, may be obtained from:

The Sustainable Cities Programme, UN-HABITAT

P.O. Box 30030, 00100 Nairobi GPO, Kenya, Tel: 254 - 20 - 623 225 or 623 784

Fax: 254 - 20 - 623 715, E-mail: scp@unhabitat.org, web-site: <http://www.unhabitat.org/scp>

User's Guide

This Document is divided into three Parts, each of which has a different purpose and a different content:

Part A

Introduction and Overview

This describes briefly the Working Groups as they operate in an SCP city project, explaining their role in the over-all SCP process. Part A is a general over-view which should be read by *everyone* concerned with the SCP project, including policy-makers and political leaders.

Part B

The Guide: Establishing and Supporting a Working Group Process

This is the main Part of the document. It gives a careful explanation of what the Working Groups are - and of how they can best be organised, established, and supported throughout the life of the SCP project. The explanation is detailed and systematic; it is aimed at the professionals and practitioners who will actually be implementing the SCP project on a day-to-day basis. Thus Part B contains not only explanations and guidelines, but also special 'tips' and good advice based on experience in other SCP cities. Examples are also given, in summary form, to show how things were done in these other cities. Part B is thus intended as a reference 'guidebook' which the SCP project staff and partners can consult over and over again as they organise, set up, and work with the project's Working Groups.

Part C

Annexes and Reference Materials

To further assist those implementing the SCP project, Part C contains annexes and supplementary information which is directly related to the Working Group process. For instance, , there are sample Terms of Reference for consultants and others who assist with the Working Groups, outlines for case study preparation, etc. The annexes and reference material will be of value at different times during the project implementation process, and will help the SCP project staff save time and energy. Relevant bibliographic resources are also noted, as are names and addresses of useful contacts.

Copyright: The United Nations Human Settlements Programme
(UN-HABITAT)
and the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), 1999

UN-HABITAT: P.O. Box 30030, 00100 Nairobi GPO, Kenya
UNEP: P.O. Box 30552, 00100 Nairobi GPO, Kenya

HS/551/98E

ISBN for this volume: 92-1-131411-9

ISBN for the series: 92-1-131407-0

Establishing and Supporting a Working Group Process

The opinions expressed in this document are those of the authors and not
necessarily those of the United Nations.

Reprinted: December 2003

Table of Contents

About the SCP Source Book Series	ii
User's Guide	iii
Part A: Introduction and Overview	1
A1 The SCP Process	3
A2 The SCP Working Groups	5
A3 The Working Group Process	7
Part B: The Guide: Establishing and Supporting a Working Group Process	11
B1 What is a Working Group?	13
B1.1 General Features of the Working Group	13
B1.2 What is Special About the SCP Working Group Idea?	15
B2 Setting Up the Working Groups	17
B2.1 Getting Started - the Overall Process	17
B2.2 Identifying Stakeholders	18
B2.3 Briefing, Informing and Sensitising Stakeholders	21
B2.4 Forming Core Groups ("Consultative Groups")	26
B2.5 Gaining Mandate	28
B2.6 From Core Groups to Working Groups	29
B3 Size and Composition of Working Groups	32
B3.1 Working Group Size	32
B3.2 Working Group Composition	34
B3.3 Composition of Working Groups in SCP Cities	38
B4 Changes in the Number and Focus of Working Groups	40
B4.1 Flexibility and Change in Organisation of Working Group	40
B4.2 Patterns of Working Group Arrangements in SCP Cities	42
B5 Working Group Structure and Functions	43
B5.1 The Structure in General	43
B5.2 The Issue-Specific Working Group	45
B5.3 Working Group Coordinators and the Coordinating Working Group	46
B5.4 The Steering Committee	51
B5.5 Technical Coordinating Committee (TCC)	52
B6 Supporting the Working Groups	53
B6.1 General Support to the Working Groups	53
B6.2 Support from the Working Group Member Organisations	54
B6.3 Support from the SCP Project Team	55
B6.4 Support Resources from the Project Budgets	57
B6.5 Special Technical Support Arrangements	60
B7 Running Working Groups Effectively: The Routines	63
B7.1 Setting up and Running the Meetings	63
B7.2 Documenting Working Group Activities	68

Table of Contents, cont'd

B8	Motivating Working Group Members	73
B9	Sustaining the Process: a Prime Agenda From Day One	75
Part C:	Examples, Illustrations and Supporting Material	81
C1	Glossary - Explanation of Terms	83
C2	Information Sources	87
	Key EPM & SCP Documents	87
	Other Important Documents	88
C3	Format, Guidelines & Outline for EPM Case Study	89
	Part A: Introduction	89
	Part B: Previous Experience	89
	Part C: Addressing the Issue	89
	Part D: Overall Reflections	101
	Part E: Checklist of Attachments	102
C4	Guidelines and Outlines for Synthesising Lessons of Experience Captured in Issue-Specific Case Studies	103
C5	Terms of Reference Related to Working Groups (from the Sustainable Katowice Project)	105
C6	Terms of Reference Related to Working Groups (from the Sustainable Ismailia Project)	111
C7	The Global Sustainable Cities Programme: Lessons of Experience	114
C8	Working Groups are the Core Ingredients Within the City's SCP Process Institutional Framework	123

The SCP Source Book Series, Volume 3
Establishing and Supporting a Working Group
Process

Part A

Introduction and Overview

A1

The SCP Process

The Sustainable Cities Programme (SCP) is a world-wide technical cooperation activity of the United Nations. It works at city level in collaboration with local partners to strengthen their capabilities for environmental planning and management (EPM). Each city-level SCP project is adapted to the particular needs, priorities, and circumstances of that city; nonetheless, all SCP city projects follow the same general approach and all are implemented through the same series of activities known as the SCP Process.

The SCP recognises that cities play a vital role in social and economic development in all countries. Efficient and productive cities are essential for national economic growth and, equally, strong urban economies are essential for generating the resources needed for public and private investments in infrastructure, education and health, improved living conditions, and poverty alleviation.

Unfortunately, the development potential of cities is all too often crippled by environmental deterioration. Aside from its obvious effects on human health and well-being (especially of the poor), environmental degradation directly holds back economic development. For development achievements to be truly 'sustainable', cities must find better ways of balancing the needs and pressures of urban growth and development with the opportunities and constraints of the urban environment.

Environmental deterioration, however, is not inevitable. Although many, perhaps even most, cities are still suffering severe environmental and economic damage, there are encouraging signs. Some cities are learning how to better plan and more effectively manage the process of urban development, avoiding or alleviating environmental problems while realising the positive potentials of city growth and change. The SCP aims to support cities in finding - and managing - development paths which are more effectively fitted to their environmental opportunities and constraints.

Reflecting this background, and reflecting the special characteristics of the Sustainable Cities Programme, there is a *common approach* which is shared by all SCP cities and which holds true across the full, wide range of partner cities:

- central focus on development-environment interactions
- broad-based participation by public, private and community sector groups
- concern for inter-sectoral and inter-organisational aspects
- reliance on bottom-up and demand-led responses
- focus on process: problem-solving and getting things done
- emphasis on local capacity-building.

Similarly, there is a shared *SCP Process* which provides a general framework for city-level project implementation - a framework, moreover, which has been tested, revised, improved and evolved through experience in more than 20 different cities since 1991. The process consists of a sequence of activities which are logically and practically connected, together with a number of

specific outputs which are important for the progress of the project. The key point is that by following the SCP Process, the work of implementing an SCP city project will build an effective process of environmental planning and management which is integrated into local society and government.

Naturally, the way in which the SCP process works out *in detail* will be different from one city to another. But the *general* pattern has proved to be useful and effective in cities all across the world. Broadly speaking, there are three general ‘phases’ in the process of SCP project implementation.

The **First Phase** (“*Assessment and Start-Up*”) is a 6 to 9 month initial period which normally includes the following main activities:

- identification and mobilisation of project participants and partners;
- familiarisation of project partners with the core EPM concepts and SCP approaches;
- preparation of the Environmental Profile and initial identification of priority environmental issues (See Volume 1 of the SCP Source Book series, *Preparing the SCP Environmental Profile*);
- review of available resources, tools, and information and initial design of geographic information systems (GIS) and environmental management information systems (EMIS) specifically adapted to the city’s needs;
- working out the organisational structure, work plan, and operational procedures for the project;
- organising and holding the City Consultation;
- establishing the Issue-Specific Working Groups.

The City Consultation is a major event which brings together the work of Phase One, consolidates social and political participation and support, and launches the SCP project into Phase Two. (Volume 2 of this SCP Source Book Series - *Organising and Running the City Consultation* - provides detailed guidance.)

The project’s **Second Phase** (“*Strategy & Action Planning*”) is a 15 to 24 month period of intensive analysis, discussion, and negotiation within the Issue-Specific Working Groups. The number, focus, and membership of these Working Groups will change and evolve as the project proceeds, but they will remain the principal feature of the SCP Project. (See Part B of this volume.) During this period, each of the agreed priority issues will be further elaborated and developed, to reach a consensus on appropriate strategies for that issue. The strategies will then be developed into action plans which can be agreed by the organisations and groups involved in implementation. (See Volume 4 - *Formulating Issue-Specific Strategies and Action Plans*.)

It is likely that small-scale demonstration projects will be undertaken to test the approaches developed and to show what can be done through the SCP process. In addition, some of the first action plans will produce investment and/or technical assistance proposals which will be developed into properly-formulated and ‘bankable’ proposals. All of these Phase Two activities of the Working Groups will be gradual, pragmatic and cooperative, reflecting the real-world conditions for strategy formulation and implementation. Finally,

also during this Second Phase, the main project activities aimed at institutional capacity-building and human resource development will be carried out.

The **Third Phase** of work ("*Follow-up & Consolidation*") is an open-ended follow-up and implementation period, which begins towards the end of Phase Two and carries on for an extended time afterwards. The strategies and action plans coming out of the Working Groups will be further elaborated, especially in order to build toward an over-all city-wide environmental management and urban development strategy. Investment proposals will be worked out in detail, subjected to rigorous analysis, and pursued vigorously with funding sources. The task of institutionalising the environmental planning and management (EPM) process, initiated during Phase Two, will be undertaken in earnest (see Volume 5 - *Institutionalising the EPM Process*). In addition, the remaining training and institutional development activities will be implemented. Finally, there will be regional and/or national workshops and meetings, to explore ways of extending SCP activities into other cities, building upon the experience gained in the project.

A2

The SCP Working Groups

As emphasised in the previous section, the main activities of the SCP project during Phase One and Two take place in and through the issue-specific Working Groups. The priority environmental issues which are identified during Phase One - and endorsed at the City Consultation - become the topics around which Working Groups are organised. Indeed, the Working Groups are the principal means by which the SCP project will help its city partners to address these agreed priority issues.

This, then, is one of the defining characteristics of an SCP Working Group. Each Working Group is focused on one specific issue; its membership and its activities are all concerned with that particular issue - and only with that issue.

Urban environmental issues, remember, are different from the normal day-to-day issues and problems facing an urban administration. Environmental issues are generally '**cross-cutting**' - they cut across familiar problem categories and they require action from many different departments, institutions, and disciplines. This is one of the basic reasons why environmental issues have proved so difficult for city governments to deal with.

To help the city develop more effective ways of dealing with these cross-cutting environmental issues, the SCP Working Groups are also cross-cutting: they bring together representatives from all the different organisations and groups which are concerned with the particular issue. This is another important characteristic of the SCP Working Groups: they are a forum for cooperation and participation, drawing members from a very wide range of interested groups and organisations.

Environmental issues affect many different people and interests; equally, it takes the combined efforts of different government departments, private

businesses, social groups, and the public at large to effectively deal with these issues. Each SCP Working Group therefore has a broad-based membership which is drawn from all the different groups and organisations, public and private, which are directly concerned with its particular issue. (In the SCP project, these are called “stakeholders”).

In this way, the Working Group will bring together the information, ideas, and capabilities of diverse members who represent the various groups and organisations which need to work together to solve the problems. Membership normally includes representatives of the key city government departments and agencies, other public sector bodies concerned with the issue, private industry and business, NGOs and community groups, and other interested parties, not only experts and officials but also ordinary citizens. Through the Working Groups, these people can collaborate effectively and make a serious and substantial contribution to helping the city deal with its environmental problems.

The Working Groups are quite busy during Phase Two and Three; they have crucial tasks to undertake, steadily throughout the project. This is why members must be able to contribute considerable personal time and energy to the Working Groups, not only to regularly attend the meetings but also to do other work as follow-up to and/or preparation for the meetings.

These individual members are not part of the Working Group in just a personal capacity. On the contrary, they are selected as representatives of key “stakeholder” groups and organisations. Thus, they have a responsibility to represent the interests and views of their respective organisations - as well as a responsibility to bring to the Working Group the information, knowledge and expertise which their organisations have to offer. They must also keep their organisations fully informed of what is happening in the Working Groups and ensure that their organisation fully supports what is going on.

This is why members of the Working Groups need to be relatively senior and to have sufficient authority or position to make sure these crucial links between the Working Group and their “stakeholder” organisations work well. Only when these linkages work well, will the Working Groups function successfully.

Working Groups, it should be emphasised, are purely temporary and ad hoc creations; they have no powers other than those of their member organisations and groups. They facilitate constructive collaboration, they pool information and ideas, they coordinate action - but they do not replace or challenge the existing structure of authority and responsibility in the city. So, SCP Working Groups are *not* permanent new organisations; they only supplement and support existing ones; Moreover, SCP Working Groups only last as long as the need for them lasts; when sufficient progress has been made in addressing the priority issue, the Working Group can be phased out. Its activities are then taken up and carried on by the various organisations which had been represented on that Working Group. This is the ultimate objective, of course: to strengthen capacities within the city to support improved environmental planning and management in the long run.

SCP Working Groups are not permanent organisations but only continue so long as they are effective and useful; they do not go around or replace any existing institutions but instead support their work.

To summarise, we can identify the following special characteristics of the SCP Working Groups - characteristics which show how they are different from ordinary committees and similar bodies:

Each SCP Working Group is focused on one particular priority issue and its membership is made up of groups and organisations with a key interest (or “stake”) in that issue.

SCP Working Groups deal specifically with the sort of complex “cross-cutting” issues which existing government structures are least well-equipped to deal with.

SCP Working Groups have representation and participation from a wide range of “stakeholders” from the public sector but also from the private sector and from community interest at large.

Although focused on separate issues, the SCP Working Groups have a common operational framework, using the well-proven SCP process and methodologies.

SCP Working Groups are not “talk shops” but are carefully-organised mechanisms for informed discussion and analysis, negotiation and consensus-building, and collaboration on formulation of strategies, action plans, and implementation of projects.

The SCP Working Group approach is not rigid, but is readily adapted to changing circumstances and is flexible in terms of focus, membership, activities and action.

A3

The Working Group Process

The Working Groups are normally set up at the end of Phase One of the SCP project, based on the selection of priority issues agreed at the City Consultation; the City Consultation should also give a mandate for the Working Groups - a formal endorsement of the Working Group Process and of the initial Group topics. In most cases, however, a small core of key “stakeholders” and experts will have been working on the topic during Phase One, and this small core group (often called a “Consultative Group”) will be the nucleus from which the full Working Group is developed.

Each city will have a slightly different pattern of Working Groups, depending upon local conditions. In general, however, it is advisable to begin Phase Two with a small number of Working Groups, perhaps three to five. As

they proceed, they will clarify their respective issues and reach a better understanding of how these issues may best be approached. Typically, some issues will then be sub-divided, with separate Working Groups being established to pursue those sub-issues. It may also be concluded that a particular issue is not really appropriate or timely and this issue may then be dropped altogether. In general, however, the number of Working Groups gradually increases as the SCP project proceeds, reflecting both changes in circumstances and the increasing capacity of the SCP project for supporting the Working Group process.

The critical task in setting up the full-sized Working Groups is to ensure that the full range of important “stakeholders” is included. For each Working Group, the organisations and institutions and interests which are closely related to that Group’s issue should be represented. It is an important and sensitive task to identify and mobilise these various “stakeholders”, especially those from the private sector and community groups, who may for many reasons be less ready to participate.

Each Working Group will have a designated Coordinator, who is normally associated with the SCP project team, a full-time staff member of that team or a consultant or perhaps someone seconded from a relevant government department. It is the responsibility of this Coordinator to guide and manage the activities of the Working Group, to facilitate its discussions and meetings, to coordinate contributions of its various members, to ensure proper follow-up after and preparation for meetings.

The different Working Group Coordinators meet together regularly, along with the SCP project team, as the Coordinating Working Group; as the name suggests, its purpose is to ensure proper coordination across the different Working Groups. This is actually very important. Because each Working Group is focused on a separate issue, there is always the danger that overlaps and linkages between these issues could be missed out. One of the jobs of the Coordinating Working Group is to avoid this danger by ensuring that cross-issue perspectives are fully considered.

In addition to the Coordinating Working Group, most cities establish a Steering Committee. Comprised of high-level decision-makers and officers and top representatives of other stakeholder groups, the Steering Committee has two main roles: first, it should mobilise and strengthen political and social support for the SCP project - and for the changes being introduced through it; second, it should support and back up the Working Groups, for instance by ensuring that departments and agencies release data and information which is needed and that they send the appropriate members to participate in the Working Groups.

During the life of the SCP project, operational and administrative support for the Working Groups will come from the SCP project office, which will also organise as appropriate a variety of specialist inputs to assist Working Group activities: consultants, technical sub-contracts, training, information and expertise from the Sustainable Cities Programme and from other UN agencies, etc.

Nonetheless, *the key inputs to the Working Groups are those which come from the members, and from their respective organisations*. They possess the knowledge and ideas and information which is necessary for actually doing the work of the Working Groups. It is the members - the “stakeholders” - who will attend meetings, share their understandings and abilities, negotiate strategies and action plans, and initiate demonstration projects. It is the stakeholder organisations represented on the Working Groups who will provide the data and information, the expertise, the mandate and authority, and ultimately the financial resources, to implement actions designed to deal with the issue.

This cooperation cannot be forced or imposed. It can only come because these members and organisations have been convinced that the Working Group is evolving a new and more effective way to collaborate and thus to improve urban environmental planning and management. Thus, building up the activities and credibility of the Working Groups will be a gradual process which must be carefully organised and steadily supported. This in turn does not just “happen” but must be cultivated and fostered with well thought out practices and methodologies. Fortunately, the global SCP has accumulated quite a lot of valuable experience from the many cities which have been implementing SCP projects, and the lessons of this experience are available.

If the Working Groups are properly established, supported and operated - and enjoy the full and enthusiastic cooperation of the “stakeholder” organisations who are members - then the process will work well. In these favourable circumstances, the SCP Working Groups will proceed through a series of activities (see below) which will steadily build up capacities for environmental planning and management - and which will directly contribute to solving the city’s environmental problems.

Key Working Group Areas of Activity

- Clarify the Working Group’s issue, analyse its underlying causes and its various associated factors and conditions; clarify the immediate and longer-term impacts and implications of the problem, and define the institutional, technical, financial and other aspects of the problem that need to be discussed and negotiated.
- Determine the particular groups/areas/stakeholders affected by the problem and explore the economic and social costs borne by each; identify the stakeholder with the knowledge, expertise and authority to deal with the issue; establish the full range of stakeholders crucial to further deliberation and action, mobilise them, and involve them (and their organisations) as Working Group members.
- Assess various existing and proposed strategies and policies for dealing with the problems; discuss and negotiate and build consensus on priority strategies and sub-strategies for that issue.
- Assess existing and proposed interventions, projects or programmes which support the agreed strategies; discuss and resolve conflict over approaches; negotiate concrete action plans for sets of interventions, including identification of investment proposals.
- Develop and agree on mechanisms to further coordinate and monitor the progress of the agreed action plans.

The SCP Source Book Series, Volume 3
Establishing and Supporting a Working Group
Process

Part B

The Guide: Establishing and Supporting a Working
Group Process

B1

What is a Working Group?

B1.1 General Features of the Working Group

Working Groups are the main focus of activity in an SCP city project during Phases Two and Three. They become the central mechanism through which the work of the SCP project is undertaken and carried on.

Working Groups are normally brought into operation just after the City Consultation, based on the work done for and during the Consultation. (They may well be based upon “Consultative Groups” which are typically formed in the lead-up to the City Consultation - see Chapter B-2 below.) They remain in action throughout the remainder of the SCP project - and are the basis for institutionalising the work of the project in the longer-term.

The priority environmental issues which are identified and formulated during Phase One of the SCP project - and prioritised and confirmed through the City Consultation itself - become the basis for the Working Groups. Each Working Group is focused on a specific issue; its membership and its activities are all concerned with that particular issue. (In the SCP context they are often referred to as “Issue-Specific Working Groups”.)

This is the first *key feature* of an SCP Working Group: it is organised around an environmental issue - it is *not* organised according to institutions or professions or disciplines. This is because environmental issues by their very nature are “**cross-cutting**”: they do not neatly fit into traditional bureaucratic categories but in reality cut across departments, institutions, professions, levels of government, etc.

Key Feature 1

A second *key feature* of the SCP Working Group is its broad-based membership, drawn from the full range of organisations and groups, to ensure active participation of all the “stakeholders” whose cooperation is required. This is because environmental issues affect - and are influenced and affected by - a wide variety of different agencies, institutions, groups, and interests.

Key Feature 2

The membership of each Working Group is therefore drawn from all the different “stakeholders” who are relevant to that particular environmental issue - the groups and organisations which:

- have expertise or information concerning that issue
- have responsibilities and authority in relation to that issue
- are affected by and/or affect that issue

Also, because managing environmental issues successfully requires the cooperation and support of so many different “stakeholders”, the Working Group needs to include representatives from many different public sector bodies, from the private sector, and from the community groups and the public at large.

A Working Group thus combines the skills, knowledge, interests, and points of view of people who represent the many different organisations and groups which have a central role to play in regard to that Working Group's particular environmental issue. Its membership will span across sectors, link between institutions, bring together disciplines and professions, and encourage experts and non-experts alike to collaborate in the shared tasks. In this way, a meaningful consensus can be built, based upon participation in decision-making and leading to informed and committed collaboration in implementation.

Key Feature 3

A third *key feature* of SCP Working Groups is their emphasis on *work*! They are not simple discussion committees or coordinating bodies; on the contrary, Working Groups in the SCP project have a wide range of very important tasks to carry out, tasks requiring sustained hard work. Indeed, they are the principal mechanism through which the objectives of the SCP project will be achieved.

For this reason, Working Group members must also be people who can commit the necessary time and energy to personally and regularly attend the meetings - and do the work. To achieve the tasks and outputs required for the SCP project, the Working Groups must meet regularly and frequently, with consistent and substantial preparation before and follow-up after the meetings.

Working Groups will be supported by the SCP project office, which normally functions as secretariat and provides the necessary organisational and logistical activities. They may also benefit from specialist inputs such as technical consultants or subcontracts, as well as from specialised expertise and/or information made available from UN or other international agencies. However, the role of these specialist inputs is strictly supplementary; the responsibility for achieving the desired outputs remains with the Working Groups - and in particular with the organisations and interests represented on them.

Key Feature 4

This role of members as "representatives" is a fourth *key feature* of the SCP Working Groups. Although Working Group members have clear individual responsibilities, including active participation in meetings and substantive work between meetings, each is there as representative of one of the important "stakeholders" in that Group's environmental issue. People are members not simply in their personal capacity - but most crucially, as representatives of organisations and groups and interests which are central to the task of dealing with that issue.

The Working Group members provide the essential link between the Working Group and the "stakeholders". Their role is to bring into the Working Group the ideas, views, information, proposals, knowledge, and interests of their respective organisations or groups. In addition, they must also bring sufficient authority to discuss and plan and negotiate on behalf of their "stakeholder". Finally, they must also represent and report - and advocate - the activities of the Working Group back into their parent organisations.

For this reason, Working Group members should be of sufficient seniority or standing to ensure they can bring the requisite information and authority

into the Working Group - and to ensure they can report back at sufficiently high levels in their respective organisations. Establishing and maintaining this steady interaction between the Working Groups and the relevant stakeholder organisations is crucial for the successful functioning of the SCP project.

This close and sustained link between the Working Group members and their respective organisations is crucial because of the fifth *key feature* of the SCP Working Groups: they have no separate or independent powers or authority. They have only as much influence and authority as they can gain from the active participation of the important stakeholders, because formal or legal decision-making, spending and implementing authority remains, of course, with the respective existing institutions and organisations.

Key Feature 5

SCP Working Groups are *not* permanent new organisations, and they do *not* replace or override existing organisations. Working Groups do *not* compete with existing institutions - but instead, they supplement and complement them, providing a new mechanism which facilitates and strengthens collaborative action focused on specific environmental issues of agreed priority interest to the city.

B1.2 What is Special About the SCP Working Group Idea?

The SCP Working Group is not, of course, a new idea. The general idea of a “working group” (or “task group”) has become widely known and accepted. Almost all cities recognise the necessity for coordination across departments and organisations, and they also realise the need for new and effective ways to achieve this. In addition, the vital importance of consultation and participation has become very widely accepted - and built into development activities of all kinds, especially at the city and community levels. Equally, the usefulness of a problem-focus (instead of an organisational or procedural focus) has been amply demonstrated in many contexts, especially where dealing with complex modern problems or issues which do not easily fit existing administrative and managerial systems. Indeed, by the end of the 1990s this general approach had achieved the status of “best practice” in the field of development management.

Thus, the SCP has not invented something wholly new; instead, it has taken a number of “best practice” ideas, combined and reformulated them, and developed them into a simple operational mechanism specifically adapted to dealing with urban environmental problems. In addition, the Working Groups have been carefully integrated into a logical and systematic overall process (the “SCP Process” described earlier in Section A1); as a result, they function in a coherent and coordinated manner which enhances their operational effectiveness. Finally, the SCP Working Groups have a greater emphasis on broad-based participation and on focusing on agreed priority issues of shared importance.

We can therefore summarise the “special” aspects of the SCP Working Groups which make them different from the consultative practices which are generally known today:

- Representation and participation is very wide-ranging and is certainly not confined to the public sector; the emphasis is rather on involving

stakeholders from the private and popular sectors including marginalised and vulnerable groups;

- The activities of the SCP Working Group are neatly fitted into the issue-specific strategy planning and management framework (the SCP process); once established, the Working Groups systematically follow a carefully designed planning process, through which they will negotiate strategies and action plans and ultimately generate implementation and investment projects;
- The Working Group in the SCP context deals specifically with those “cross-cutting” issues for which collaboration and cooperation is most necessary and for which traditional administrative systems are least well suited;
- Working Groups are not meant to merely inform or consult stakeholders, but are instead mechanisms for joint problem-solving, and consensus-building, promoting conflict resolution and facilitating negotiation;
- The Working Group system in the SCP context is flexible and readily accommodates any changes in the number, focus, membership, and structure of Working Groups which may be necessary during the SCP project process;
- SCP Working Groups are not permanent institutions; they augment existing institutions in dealing with issues that are difficult to handle by sector institutions and will terminate when such issues are resolved.

The full meaning and significance of Working Groups in the SCP process will become clear as you read through the detailed explanations in the remaining chapters of this Source Book. However, a summary of the main characteristics of Working Groups can be given at this point, and is shown in Box 1, below

*Box 1:
What is a
Working
Group?*

An SCP Working Group...

- *Focuses on a cross-cutting issue of agreed priority*
- *Brings organisations and groups together to build linkages and partnerships*
- *Combines the resources and expertise of many organisations*
- *Draws participants from different professions, groups and backgrounds*
- *Follows a problem-solving approach and is action-oriented*
- *Facilitates negotiation and consensus-building*
- *Integrates negotiation and conflict resolution at different levels*
- *Promotes information pooling and exchanges*
- *Articulates visions and formulates strategies*
- *Develops and agrees action plans, leading to concrete results*
- *Can readily accommodate new participants and new sub-issues*
- *Can focus on issues city-wide or in particular locations*
- *Lasts only so long as the issue needs to be addressed in this way*

B2

Setting Up the Working Groups

B2.1 Getting Started - the Overall Process

Establishing Working Groups is *not* a simple, one-off activity that takes place at one time. Instead, it is a **process** which begins in Phase One of the SCP Project, building especially on the momentum gained through preparations for and implementation of the City Consultation. Formal setting up of the Working Groups normally takes place immediately after the City Consultation and is the first critical task of Phase Two.

The core activity in this process of establishing Working Groups is to identify, inform, and mobilise “**stakeholders**” to become active participants in the Working Groups. This is the most important activity of Phase One of the SCP Project, and the success of Working Groups depends crucially upon it being done well.

Remember, interaction with **key** stakeholders and project partners starts in earnest at the beginning of the SCP project and is particularly important in both of the key tasks of Phase One: the Environmental Profile and the City Consultation. [Refer back to the other SCP Source Books: *Volume 1: Preparing the SCP Environmental Profile*, esp. section B7.2, and *Volume 2: Organising, Conducting and Reporting an SCP City Consultation*, esp. section A2, B3, B4 and C3. During Phase One, you will be seeking out and interacting with potential stakeholders, a time-consuming process of identifying and bringing into the project those people and groups who will be crucial for its longer-term success.

However, even during the early stages of this process you will already have encountered many stakeholders who will almost certainly have crucial and leading roles to play in the project. These key stakeholders should be organised, in Phase One during the period leading up to the City Consultation, into what are called “**Consultative Groups**” (or sometimes, “Core Working Groups”). This is particularly desirable, because:

- as heavyweights among stakeholders in the city, their information, opinions, and involvement on priority environmental management issues are crucial;
- their early involvement and commitment will be of considerable assistance to the project, not only in preparation of the Environmental profile but especially in the preparations for - and running of - the City Consultation; indeed, the “Consultative Groups” often play a major role in the City Consultation and are crucial to its success;
- the early involvement of these key stakeholders, organised into issue-based “Consultative Groups”, greatly facilitates and speeds up the transition into fully-organised Working Groups at the beginning of Phase Two (immediately after the City Consultation).

Hence the opportunity to establish Consultative Groups during Phase One should not be missed. If for any reason Groups are not set up during Phase

One, task of moving smoothly from the City Consultation into properly-functioning Working Groups at the beginning of Phase Two will be much more difficult - and you will risk losing the momentum gained at the City Consultation itself. This is particularly true in projects which experience delays in holding the City Consultation, in which case the Phase One Consultative Groups are very valuable in keeping things moving and sustaining the work of the project. (See Box 4, below.)

The overall process for establishing Working Groups will ideally involve the following steps:

- identify the potential stakeholders and determine which groups and persons among them are likely to be crucial for achieving a good head-start;
- mobilise the active participation of the key stakeholders by a careful and continuous process of briefing and informing and working with them;
- organise the initial key stakeholders into “Consultative Groups” and work closely with them on Phase One activities (Environmental Profile, City Consultation);
- through the City Consultation process, secure political and institutional support for the project and, specifically, for the Phase Two Working Groups
- building on the Consultative Groups, organise Working Groups around the priority issues agreed at the City Consultation
- expand the Working Groups incrementally and systematically, to broaden the base of stakeholder participation and representation.

Identifying stakeholders, sensitising them, forming Consultative Groups, gaining mandate, and formalizing and expanding the Working Groups - these are the key steps in setting up the Working Groups for an SCP project. Each of these steps is described briefly in the sections which follow:

B2.2 Identifying Stakeholders

Identifying and mobilising stakeholders is the first crucial activity in the SCP process, which is built around the principle of *stakeholder participation* in negotiation and decision-making. Failure to identify and involve the right people will fundamentally weaken the entire SCP process and threaten the success of the whole project. Who are the right stakeholders to be involved - and how can we determine who they are?

The “right” people are those whose view points, information, expertise, and mandate are essential for effectively addressing the priority urban environmental issues. In other words, the involvement of each and every stakeholder is clearly connected with a role they play in respect to the particular issues and, especially, in finding and implementing solutions.

Stakeholders appropriate to specific issues will thus fall into one or more of the following categories:

- those whose **interests** are affected by the environmental problem and/or by environmental strategies and action plans, as well as those whose activities significantly affect the environmental issue
- those who control or influence **management instruments** relevant to the environmental issue and its management
- those who possess important **information and expertise** needed to address the environmental issue and to develop management strategies and action plans.

As we all understand, urban environmental issues cut across administrative and organisational boundaries and involve a wide range of people and groups. Thus, we can expect the relevant stakeholders to come not only from many different organisations in the public sector but also from a variety of private sector and community groups. Although most of these will be local (city-level) organisations and groups, some will be regional/provincial, some national, and some even international. For a typical environmental issue, stakeholders might be looked for in the categories shown below in Table 1. (Note: this table includes a full range of *possibilities*; in any one city, and for any one particular issue, some of these may not be applicable.)

To identify the important stakeholders therefore needs a systematic and detailed review of “who is who” with respect to the particular issues likely to be of concern to the city. (Formally, specification and prioritisation of environmental issues takes place at the City Consultation; however, SCP project cities have generally been able well in advance to identify the likely key issues, or at least most of them.) Initially the SCP project team, together with members of a project Steering Committee if one has been established, can start listing potential stakeholders, based on existing general knowledge of the city and the environmental situation. This will produce an *initial* list of stakeholders, but this list will only be provisional - a starting point. Systematic efforts to further identify appropriate stakeholders - especially those in the private and popular sectors, must continue steadily, right up to the City Consultation and beyond. (Work on preparing the SCP Environmental Profile, which goes in parallel during Phase One, will also concern itself with identification of stakeholders.)

The identification of stakeholders should become gradually more thorough and reliable as you approach the City Consultation. This will be assisted by two factors:

- (a) the City Consultation as a city-wide platform should involve a very wide range of people and groups concerned with the city’s urban development and environmental management, and hence preparations for it must include all possible stakeholders with a role and influence in addressing possible priority issues;
- (b) by that time the SCP project team will have sensitised, informed, and actively involved those professionals and politicians whose support for organising the City Consultation was crucial and therefore will have the assistance of these knowledgeable persons in the task of identifying additional stakeholders.

Table 1: Possible categories of Stakeholders

Category of Stakeholder	Local (City) level	Regional or National level	International level
City Council (political authority)			
Mayor and/or Chief Executive Office of the city government			
City Government administrative (sectoral) departments			
Municipal companies, autonomous organisations, para-statal bodies			
Public regulatory bodies			
Regional/Provincial government - administrative (sectoral) departments			
Regional/Provincial government - executive agencies or special bodies			
National (central) government administrative (sectoral) departments			
Academic and research institutions			
Private sector organisations (Chambers of Commerce, Trade Associations, etc)			
Industrial or commercial companies with major impact on/ interest in the issue			
"Informal" sector groupings and organisations			
Community Based Organisation (CBOs)			
Non-Government Organisations (NGOs)			
Women's Groups, Youth Groups, Senior Citizen's Groups			
Religious organisations, other charitable foundations, cultural organisations			
Media (Press, Radio, Television)			
International development support programmes and projects			
others...			

Even with all these efforts, however, you will almost certainly not be able to identify **all** the relevant stakeholders by the time the city Consultation has finished. During the early Phase Two activities of setting up the Working Groups and starting them to work on the issues, it is highly likely that new stakeholders will be identified and brought on board. (Equally, some of the originally-identified stakeholders may turn out to be not quite the right persons and may leave the Working Group.) In addition, as each Working Group progresses - clarifying issues, analysing options, working out strategies and action plans - new roles and competencies might be in demand, leading to identification of new stakeholders and players.

In other words, the number and range of stakeholders will certainly change throughout the life of Working Groups, reflecting new information and new conditions. Nonetheless, it is vital that a well-founded initial list of stakeholders relevant to the key environmental issues be developed during Phase One, so that the appropriate people and groups are informed and activated - and ready to go as the Working Groups are formalised immediately after the City Consultation.

B2.3 Briefing, Informing and Sensitising Stakeholders

The basic SCP approach - which underlies all the SCP city projects - has a number of very specific characteristics and principles:

- central focus on development-environment interactions
- broad-based participation from public, private and community sectors
- concern for inter-sectoral and inter-organisational aspects
- reliance on bottom-up and demand-led responses
- focus on process - on problem-solving and getting things done
- emphasis on local capacity-building.

These fundamental features of the SCP approach are quite different from those of the “traditional” planning and management approaches which are followed in most cities in the world. In contrast to the SCP, these long-established traditional approaches tend to have the following characteristics:

- separate treatment of environment and of development
- very limited participation from outside the government bureaucracy and an almost exclusive reliance on public sector control and management
- organised by sectors and traditional professional groupings
- reliance on top-down, supply-driven responses and actions
- focus on master planning, legalistic controls, and static plans
- emphasis on administrative procedures and organisational stability.

These “traditional” approaches are generally well-established, built into the structure and functioning of local (and regional and national) government; legal procedures, professional training, career advancement, and the weight of long-familiar custom and precedent all reinforce this position. This long-familiar traditional mode of urban government administration will be second nature to those involved in it, and their approach to urban environmental issues - and to the SCP project - will be heavily influenced by this.

The important key differences of the SCP approach will therefore need to be carefully and systematically - and repeatedly - explained to and discussed with the key stakeholders, especially those in the public sector. This is the process which we refer to as “**sensitisation**”.

The essential purpose is to create the critical minimum support in the core establishments (key stakeholders) of the city. In the initial stages of the SCP project you should aim to identify the potential **change-agents** - people who are likely to understand and appreciate the new SCP approach and be willing to work with it. This small core of change agents will then be instrumental for not only supporting the SCP project but also for nurturing and propagating the SCP ideas more broadly among their colleagues and working associates. Remember; the tasks facing the city are enormous, and the project team can never accomplish them alone - indeed, that is not the purpose of the SCP project anyway. Instead, through the SCP project you are initiating a process which is intended gradually to bring out fundamental changes in the way your city manages urban development and environment.

Therefore, sensitisation in this context is not something that will be accomplished through a couple of formal seminars or workshops. It requires a systematic and consistent promotion of new ideas and new approaches to urban and environmental management and therefore demands effective communication strategies and successful demonstrations. To successfully create this new operational framework and effectively involve all stakeholders - regardless of their background, social status or official position - in decision making and implementation, will require a tremendous and sustained effort. You must bridge serious gaps in perception and understanding between the different stakeholder groups, overcome entrenched sectoral and administrative barriers, and mobilise the active support of key players who may well be very cynical and opposed to change.

You must be realistic as well as persistent. Many - perhaps even most - people will initially be sceptical about the SCP approach; they need to be convinced that it is a worthy idea - and that it offers a real prospect of constructive progress. It will be a difficult and demanding task to overcome these barriers and to turn resistance into acceptance. New methods and techniques of communication and information, persistently applied, will be vital for success.

To develop communication strategies and sensitisation approaches, you could usefully adapt to your local circumstances the following general procedures.

1. Before starting to sensitise stakeholders, take care to familiarise everyone on the SCP project team with the concepts, principles, methodologies, and operational procedures of the SCP process. You will not successfully communicate the SCP ideas to stakeholders unless you first have a clear grasp of these ideas yourself and are comfortable with them. Any confusion about SCP which lingers in your own mind will almost certainly breed confusion in the minds of the stakeholders, sometimes with very unfortunate results. (See section C2, Information Sources.)

2. It is essential to appoint a “training officer” within the project team, as the person who will be responsible for organising and maintaining the overall sensitisation and briefing effort. This person will not personally do all of the training and briefing - that is a job for everyone on the SCP team; however, experience shows it is vital to have a named “focal point” for the project’s training and sensitisation activities. Also, it is often helpful to include in your “training team” two groups of people: one, those who are familiar with the SCP process and able to explain what it is, how it functions and what it could do for the city; and two, communication or training specialists who can support you and your team expertise in techniques for putting your messages across easily and effectively.
3. One of the initial tasks is therefore to organise internal orientation sessions for the people who are supposed to undertake subsequent briefing and training (sensitisation) activities. The idea is to create a level of understanding and knowledge about the process among the members of the training team so they will be adequately equipped and prepared to carry out their “sensitising” tasks. (This is similar to the familiar “Training of Trainers” (TOT) approach.)
4. A priority task for the project team is to develop a well structured package of briefing and training materials to be used when working with stakeholders and partners. There is no shortage of general materials on the concept and application of the SCP process, most of which should already be available within the project team. Your task, however, is to package this vital information into readily-understood pieces suitable for a step-by-step assimilation by the different stakeholders and customised to your local circumstances. This will require you to adapt existing general materials, modifying them to local needs and audiences, adding local examples and illustrations to make the points clearer, and developing summary presentation materials with clear diagrams and illustrations.

This is quite a challenge! Fortunately, you do not have to develop every thing at once. The overall SCP process can be presented in summary form, but the more detailed explanation of the various stages and activities in the SCP process should be organised into separate “modules”. Each of the modules could then be utilised at the appropriate time in the progress of the project. Moreover, each module could be further customised or varied, to suit different types of audience (for example, for specialists and non-specialists). For example, whilst it is imperative to provide an overview of the whole process right from the beginning, an in-depth understanding of the strategy planning process can only be achieved by discussing it in the context of a specific issue, in training and briefing activities which take place at the time when Working Groups are actually beginning to grapple with strategies. Doing this will also make the sensitisation process richer and more lively, as it will be based on local experiences and cases.

5. The various consultative meetings which take place as part of preparing the Environmental Profile and the City Consultation provide the first opportunities for meeting stakeholders and partners and introducing the SCP process. As these are the first encounters with the stakeholders,

it is important to be very well prepared and to spend sufficient time explaining not only the project itself but particularly, what role they might play in respect to both the Environmental Profile and the City Consultation. Single meetings are never sufficient, and so a carefully-planned series of meetings will be required to thoroughly explain and discuss the Environmental Profile, the City Consultation, and their role in the SCP process. To generate both comprehension and enthusiasm, you will need to simplify and translate the process and concepts into a clear operational language. You will also need to show how the particular stakeholders will benefit from participating in the process. Remember as well, that during these early meetings you need to learn from the stakeholders, to find out how they perceive the process and how they see their role in it. First impressions are often lasting impressions, so it is vital to be well-prepared and to make a success of your initial meetings.

6. Use different types of training and information activities - do not rely solely on formal presentations. Different techniques can be used to convey the message to different audiences, and also to reinforce the message being given to the same audience. For instance, you can organise briefings and meetings for representatives of a particular sector or organisation, or cross-sectoral meetings with stakeholders from different groups and sectors; other techniques would be suitable for reaching community groups and the citizenry at large. The media should be utilised (radio, television, press - as appropriate locally) to provide general information support. Although most of your activities will be focused on groups, in a few cases there will also be individual meetings with particular key stakeholders (e.g. the mayor).

Training and sensitisation activities aimed at broad-based audiences might enable you to reach many stakeholders quickly and easily, but this may not be effective in the initial stages of the project, when there is a need for appreciating and working with the specific different interests, concerns and special capacities of different stakeholders. You may need to pave the way and bridge possible gaps by approaching the different stakeholder groups and prominent individuals separately. Initially, therefore, a consultative process organised by sectors and groups of stakeholders would be more appropriate.

7. This will also provide you an opportunity to develop and apply specific communication strategies suited to the different stakeholder groups. Different stakeholder groups could have particular convictions, attitudes and propensities which need to be taken into account in approaching them. Politicians for example need to respond to their electors, and this tends to make them focus on visible physical improvements and problems that are amenable to short-term solutions. People engaged at the executive or managerial level can often be buried in day-to-day problems, lacking time and resources to consider long-term development issues or management approaches. Communities and CBOs will naturally be very locally-focused and may fail to appreciate the connection between the issues at the micro-level and the city level. Operators in the informal sector and subsistence economy may have little incentive or knowledge to be interested in issues beyond their immediate daily priorities. Private sector operators are likely to be driven by their needs for profitability and economic survival.

*Box 2:
Convincing Stakeholders
and Building Credibility*

Many people will be sceptical and ask, what is unique about your SCP initiative? Many will have experience of previous initiatives, which never delivered on their promises, and they may view the SCP initiative as just another of the same kind. There is no easy answer to this credibility problem, but the following four “tips” based on SCP city experience may be of help.

Tip one - Project a realistic image: Do not be discouraged by any level of scepticism; it may reflect failures, undelivered promises, and frustrations of the past. You should be careful to project a realistic image of the SCP initiative: be modest (and hence believable) about the speed and scale of change being sought - and avoid making grand promises and raising too-high expectations; above all, be realistic about the time-scale of change which the SCP project can stimulate. Control the tone and content of your public relations activities.

Tip two - Seize problems as opportunities: In some circumstances, critical problems can be utilised as opportunities for a demonstration of the value of the SCP approach. It may be that one of the city’s critical problems reaches a “crisis” condition, in which case action is needed urgently. This is a challenge, but also an opportunity. It is an opportunity to use the SCP process as the vehicle for mobilising resources and directing the focus of the key stakeholders onto the “crisis” issue, thus showing that the SCP initiative can actually produce results in helping address the issue. This will demonstrate two things: one, that the SCP initiative does not have predetermined priorities or agenda different from that of the stakeholders; and two, that what was lacking was not merely financial resources, but mainly an effective process that can bring together all actors in operationally feasible and mutually beneficial manner.

Tip three - Amplify your successful demonstrations : It is strongly urged that small-scale “demonstration” projects be undertaken as early as possible in Phase Two of the SCP project, based on the early work of the Working Groups. Once implemented, such “demonstration” projects become important visible results which can significantly increase political and popular support. It is important, therefore, to speed up the demonstration projects and to ensure they are properly documented and publicised - and replicated as widely as possible. This will make your sensitisation effort much easier and will add credibility to the SCP project overall.

Tip four - Do not start with addressing many issues: If you try to address many issues from the very beginning, your resources and support to the newly-established Working Groups will be spread too thinly and it will be difficult to make progress in any of the issues. It is far better to start with a relatively small number of issues (and Working Groups) - in which some visible success may be achieved - and only move on to more and more complex issues after experience has been gained and after political and stakeholder support has been consolidated and strengthened.

Academics and researchers (and sometimes urban and regional planners) tend to appreciate and consciously promote long term development issues and institutional changes, although they are also often isolated from “real-world” constraints. Approaching these and other groups of stakeholders who are characterised by different levels of perception and types of interest would require carefully-segmented and differentiated communication strategies.

B2.4 Forming Core Groups (“Consultative Groups”)

As emphasised earlier (section B2.1), the Working Groups evolve through a lengthy process which should begin - even if only with a small number of participants - early in Phase One of the project. The first step of the evolution is setting up “Consultative Groups”, which can begin with anywhere from two to five persons as the starting core. These people should represent the leading stakeholders for that issue, and as such are likely to be well informed and resourceful as well as crucially and directly concerned. Others may be gradually identified and added, of course, but this small core of key stakeholders should provide the essential basis for getting started.

It is normally possible to identify, quite early in the project, the majority of the really key stakeholders (refer back to section B2.2 on Identifying Stakeholders.) As soon as possible, these persons should be approached and properly briefed on the project and on the possible leading roles they could play. When they agree to join in, they can be asked to form the core group which will initially be the Consultative Group and later become the Working Group. Even if only two or three people are available initially, that is enough to begin the process. Once brought together, however, these small Consultative Groups must be intensively and reliably supported by the SCP project team, especially in the beginning. (Later, in Phase Two, Working Groups will become somewhat more self-supporting.)

It is strongly recommended that these core “Consultative Groups” be established well before the City Consultation. Doing so will give the project an important “head start”, strengthening Phase One activities as well as providing a “flying start” into Phase Two activities. Involvement of the key stakeholders in the Phase One Consultative Groups also has the great benefit of helping to bind these people to the project, making them feel part of it and committed to it.

During these early stages, the project should focus only on a small number of key issues, each of which should be carefully selected to ensure it is a genuine cross-cutting environmental issue of large-scale impact and long-term importance. (See Box 3.) These beginning issues will then be further explored and developed in the preparations for the City Consultation - during which time the Consultative Groups should play an active role. In addition, at the City Consultation it is likely that the key stakeholders who have been involved in the Consultative Groups will play a leading role in the Consultation itself.

*Box 3:
Focused Issues and Limited
Working Groups*

The SCP Working Groups are issue-specific: each separate Working Group deals with only one priority environmental issue. Issues to be dealt with in the SCP process should be broad-scale cross-cutting urban environmental issues - those which cut across sectors and interests, which affect the entire city or large areas of it, and which are long-term and serious in impact. The SCP process is not aimed at dealing with purely sectoral, day-to-day operational problems, or with issues which are narrow in scope and impact. Whilst this distinction is understood well by the SCP team and specialists, it is not so clear to other project partners, especially in the early stages of the project; as a result, in several cities issues were identified as priorities but did not fit the definition. There is always a temptation to use the new participatory mechanism of the SCP project to deal with difficult but narrowly sectoral problems, for example. In contrast, in some cases the process of formulating issues did not wholly succeed in giving clear focus, so that the issues remained vague and diffuse. Working Groups in Ismailia and Katowice took a long time before they could translate the broad sectoral issues (agriculture, urban development, industry in Ismailia, land and water resources in Katowice) into more precise and well-defined thematic issues such as industrial waste management or solid waste management.

A different but related lesson of experience from SCP city demonstrations, is the need to initially limit the number of issues and Working Groups. Starting with too many issues will spread too thinly the time, resources, and technical support capabilities of the SCP project team, especially in the early stages. In addition, if the project addresses too many different issues, focus will be lost and the attention of partners and stakeholders will be diffused across too many divergent topics. In Dar es Salaam, nine environmental issues and numerous clusters of sub-issues were set up right from the beginning; and yet after over four years of hard work, the main concrete results and achievements were primarily in relation to two issues (solid waste and to some extent upgrading). It can perhaps be supposed that these achievements would have been even greater had the entire effort been concentrated on these same issues.

The City Consultation will provide an agreement on the priority issues to be pursued in Phase Two. In most SCP cities, these turn out to be similar to the issues which were identified before the Consultation and brought up for discussion - although in some cases there have been some changes. However, for those issues which are agreed as priorities, the Consultative Groups will carry on, forming the initial core of the full-fledged Working Groups which are then formed. In this way, continuity is preserved and, most important, the momentum gained through the build-up to and holding of the City Consultation will be used to give the project a running start in Phase Two.

Box 4:
Establishing “Core”
Working Groups:
The Experience of
Chennai

In Chennai preparations for the City Consultation took much longer than planned. During the extended period when waiting for final approvals for the City Consultation, however, the project team was patiently negotiating and developing the institutional framework required for anchoring the issue-specific Working Groups. Experienced local consultants were hired to prepare, in conjunction with representatives from lead sectors and agencies, the Environmental Profile and subsequently to assist in identifying priority issues. Normally, it is expected that the City Consultation would be the place and the process for identifying and prioritising issues. But in order to avoid the real danger of the project grinding to a halt while waiting for an indefinitely postponed Consultation, a systematic process of extensive negotiation and preparation, which was spearheaded by the lead stakeholders, kept things moving and indeed eventually resulted in a more substantive and well-focused, and hence more productive, City Consultation.

The key to this result was the establishment of core working groups organised around the issues identified as priority in the preliminary work of the project. This facilitated the early involvement of key actors and the building-up of critical institutional support for the process. Each core group had an identified “lead agency” (see below) which had clear mandate and competence in respect to that issue; they were high powered establishments whose contribution could make a critical difference. As later confirmed by the commitment of these lead agencies to host and house the project’s EPM activities, the idea of building the working group process by starting with a Core groups worked out well in Chennai..

Lead agency:	Issue:
Chennai Metropolitan Development Authority	Reducing Traffic Congestion
Chennai City Corporation	Improving Sanitation and Solid Waste Management
Metro Water Corporation	Cleaning of Polluted Waterways

B2.5 Gaining Mandate

The legitimacy of Working Groups comes from the broad-based commitment and support which is consolidated and made explicit at the City Consultation. As discussed in the preceding section, although “Consultative Groups” (core Working Groups) can - and should - be operationalised well before the City Consultation, they will remain somewhat preliminary in nature and will mainly play an advisory, consultative and preparatory role. Only when priority issues - and the structure of Working Groups focused on them - are formalised through the City Consultation can the “real” Working Groups be set up. This is not simply a technicality, but an important matter of principal and of

practicality. In terms of principle, the participatory, bottom-up approach is absolutely essential to the SCP process, and therefore Working Groups cannot be set up until there is a clear endorsement given by the broad-based participatory mechanism of the City Consultation. Working Groups cannot be established by “experts” working in isolation from the full range of stakeholders. In terms of practicality, it is well demonstrated that mechanisms (such as Working Groups) which do not derive from the wishes and views of the essential participants will never be able to operate effectively - because they will not be fully accepted by those whose cooperation is vital.

Indeed, it is expected that the City Consultation will adopt a formal **Declaration** in support of the SCP project - which will identify the agreed priority issues and explicitly endorse the establishment of Working Groups to deal with those issues. Afterwards, whenever new Working Groups (or sub-Groups) are formed or new members are invited to join, reference should be made to the particular section in the Declaration of the City Consultation which underpins the Working Group process as the accepted way of dealing with priority issues. This “mandate” as derived from the City Consultation will also provide a proof of legitimacy, to convince any persons or organisations who question the basis on which the Working Groups are proceeding.

Nevertheless, the mandate expressed in the Declaration as the common voice of the participants should not be considered the last word on the subject, nor can it be taken as binding on each and every stakeholder in the city. Of course the Declaration of the City Consultation carries an important political message. However, the continuing mandate and lasting support for the Working Groups can be assured only through a steady build up and expansion of understanding and participation by an ever-widening circle of stakeholders - through a gradual but steady change of attitudes. This can only be assured by achieving success in the SCP project itself, by actions and accomplishments which are seen - and seen to be valuable and important. Failure to build up this grass roots support, failure to show real achievement, will cause the project to lose support and lose mandate - and no amount of declarations on paper can make up for it. Hence, it is imperative at each stage of the SCP project process to take stock of achievements and to take active steps to buttress and renew the commitment of all those whose support is needed.

B2.6 From Core Groups to Working Groups

Once the City Consultation has been completed, and the priority issues confirmed, the Consultative Groups (core groups) for those issues will have to be expanded into full-scale SCP Working Groups. What started as a small team should be transformed into a properly organised Working Group, which will be carefully structured, with formal operational procedures. The extent and speed of expansion depends on the complexity and nature of the particular issue and on the types and number of stakeholders involved in it.

As the project progresses into Phase Two, the growing scope of work and the need for broader representation make the continued incremental expansion of the core working groups a necessity. One of the inherent advantages of this gradual expansion process is its ability to respond to and

*Box 5:
Sustaining
Mandate*

One of the results expected from a City Consultation is gaining a political “mandate” for the SCP project and process. The Declaration that comes out of the Consultation is an important document for confirming and communicating the support gained at the Consultation. A City Consultation is definitely an exciting event, which in terms of scale and broad base of participation might be unprecedented in local experience, and it is likely to generate a high level of interest, awareness, enthusiasm and initial support.

The support generated through the City Consultation is therefore a political achievement from which the legitimacy of the SCP project - and the Working Group process - is derived. But this is the formal part of “gaining mandate” - and only the starting point. Sustaining this political support and translating it into an operational framework is a completely different matter. The political support manifested at the City Consultation will quickly fade away unless it is consistently nurtured, reinforced, and followed up through the provision of proper organisational structures, supporting resources, and (where necessary) enabling legislative and institutional framework.

In previous SCP cities, it was not uncommon to see the initially supportive stakeholders holding back or shying away from taking active part in the Working Group process. Some of them, like those in the private sector, may fail to see the benefits they can gain from participating. In the case of local offices of central government agencies and ministries, the local representatives, despite taking part in the Working Groups, may find it difficult to reconcile the priorities given by their headquarters with those of the local stakeholders. Also, in many instances the public sector representatives in the Working Groups were too junior to properly represent their institutions at decision making level or even to inform and maintain the interest of their seniors. In some cases, elected officials want to see actions on the ground before the end of their election term and are impatient with the relatively longer-term and painstaking process of negotiations taking place through the Working Groups.

There are no universal or easy answers to these problems. However, the lessons learned through the experience of SCP cities suggest the following points:

- the need for continuous sensitisation activities, patiently and steadily working with the key stakeholder groups all through Phase Two after the City Consultation;
- the need for special briefings and similar activities to bridge any information gaps between high level decision makers and the Working Groups;
- the need for linking with national level authorities and ministries in order to ensure political support and to help redirect national plans and resource allocations towards local priorities;
- the need for initially focusing on critical issues in which the interests of diverse stakeholder groups can be most readily converged;
- the need for mobilising external resources to undertake fast-track actions that could enhance credibility and increase local support.

Without such efforts, and consistent follow-up, the political mandate manifested at the City Consultation is likely to remain elusive.

accommodate changes incrementally. Hence, as issues are clarified and knowledge about relevant stakeholders is improved, Working Groups will be expanded or modified to reflect appropriate representation of the various interests and view points, changing as the situation evolves.

For this purpose, building and constantly updating a reliable data base of potential stakeholders is essential. Smaller cities and secondary towns may find it relatively easier to identify the key local stakeholders, due to frequent direct contact and personal knowledge. This is not possible in the case of bigger towns, and certainly not in metropolitan cities. Even for smaller towns, reliance on personal knowledge is liable to result in an unbalanced list which misses some of the important groups of potential stakeholders. Hence, it is advisable to develop a systematic data base of potential stakeholders, classified by issues or broader themes. This data base of stakeholders should be maintained and updated systematically by the project team, allowing it to be used constantly as an information source and reference point for working Group membership. As an initial guide, the following categories of information can be used to help build and update the stakeholder data bank.

- ***Participants in the Phase One Consultative Groups (core groups)***
- ***Participant list (attendance list) of the City Consultation***
(See the SCP Source Book series, *Volume 2: Organising, Conducting and Reporting an SCP City Consultation*, section B4)
- ***List of members of the discussion groups at the City Consultation:***
Those participating in the various discussion groups at the City Consultation should have been listed in the worksheets, which include name and affiliation. (See also the SCP Source Book series, *Volume 2: Organising, Conducting and Reporting an SCP City Consultation*, section C3)
- ***The institutional discussion worksheet completed on day 4 of the City Consultation.*** This is virtually a list of key actors in the city, since it classifies the actors by major kinds of interventions or particular roles they are supposed to play in information, expertise, decision making and (See also the SCP Source Book series, *Volume 2: Organising, Conducting and Reporting an SCP City Consultation*, section C7)
- ***Minutes of Working Group meetings:*** During Working Group meetings particular roles and stakeholders who had not been considered before may well arise during discussions or be suggested by members.
- ***The SCP Environmental Profile.*** The last section of the Environmental Profile (dealing with management) includes considerable discussion of key stakeholders, related as well to its earlier discussion of activity sectors. The information in the Profile needs to be summarised, classified and entered in the stakeholders data base.
- ***Participant list of mini-consultations and workshops:*** New stakeholders or interested parties may appear during intermediate events like the consultations or special SCP workshops. Names from these attendance lists should be entered into the stakeholders data base.

- ***Socio-economic studies and human resource surveys*** can provide useful information about the kind of interest groups and stakeholders in the city; in some SCP projects local consultants have been commissioned to do systematic stakeholder surveys which also highlight existing local capacity in terms of information, expertise and resources.
- ***Other international or special development projects*** may have been active in your city, and they are likely to have built up their own networks of knowledge and information about key “actors” in the city.

B3

Size and Composition of Working Groups

B3.1 Working Group Size

Although SCP Working Groups are mechanisms for involving stakeholders in decision-making and consensus-building, they are first and foremost *operational units for working*. Working Groups in the SCP project have real and substantive tasks to perform, throughout the project: clarifying issues, developing issue-specific strategies, agreeing action plans, and formulating investment and technical assistance projects. There is thus an overriding need for Working Groups to be effective operational units - and this has an important effect on the **size** of Working Groups. Indeed, experience of SCP city projects has shown quite clearly that expanding Working Groups beyond the optimal operational size can seriously hamper their progress. There are two main reasons for this:

- as the number of people taking part in a Working Group increases, the ability of its members to interact readily and to function as a team diminishes, as does the ability of the Group to actually complete its business and maintain consensus; and
- finding meeting times suitable for all members becomes increasingly difficult with larger size, resulting in higher levels of absence and non-attendance.

Therefore you need to keep Working Groups at a size which is manageable, which encourages group cohesiveness, and which encourages productive participation and cooperation and is convenient. From this perspective, the experience of SCP cities suggests that 10-12 members is the ideal size of a Working Group. (This “optimum” size of group is consistent with experience in a wide range of circumstances and situations, not just SCP Working Groups.)

Once a Working Group is fully operational, it is also important to ensure that it has enough members to function well. Being too small is also a serious danger. With too few members, a group is too easily dominated by one or two interests or view -points, and it is very difficult to ensure sufficiently broad representation - which runs the risk of losing the Working Group’s essential link to stakeholders. People sometimes argue for small groups in

the name of “efficiency”; but that efficiency is usually gained at the expense of proper participation and discussion and negotiation.

If a Working Group begins full-sized but later falls below the minimum, this indicates potentially serious problems in the group’s functioning and/or membership: what is causing members to drop out and what is discouraging others from joining?? Indeed, if a Working Group stays below the minimum size, it may be appropriate to either combine it with another Working Group or to drop it altogether in order to concentrate project resources on issues and Working Groups which are making better progress. (Both of these responses were successfully used in Katowice, for example.)

Thus, experience (in SCP cities and elsewhere) suggests that Working Groups should have the following size constraints:

The idea of limiting the size of Working Groups may sound contradictory to the underlying principle of promoting involvement and participation of all relevant stakeholders. There is no real contradiction here, although it is

optimum size	=	10 to 12 members
maximum size	=	no more than 14
minimum size	=	no less than 7

*Box 6:
Working Group Size*

important to strike a balance between all-inclusiveness and operational effectiveness. Also, keep in mind that different stakeholders will have different degrees of interest in the issue being dealt with: for some, their involvement is crucial and central, while for other there may be an interest but not such a strong one. Ideally, Working Groups should directly involve those with the most essential interests while still ensuring that the involvement of other stakeholders is also provided for.

So, while the Working Groups as the “heart” of the SCP process operate with a membership limited to the key stakeholders, it is vital to organise other participatory mechanisms and activities to maintain and promote a much broader level of participation by **all** stakeholders. This is certainly possible, and the SCP cities have ample experience of consultative mechanisms which have allowed them to involve all stakeholders without over stretching the size of the Working Groups. Such mechanisms have included the following:

- **Extended Working Group meetings** (meetings on specific topics, to which additional stakeholders are invited)
- **Mini-Consultations** (issue-specific city-wide meeting which brings together all possible stakeholders)
- **Issue-specific Workshops** (issue or topic-specific meeting of a more technical nature, involving a wider range of stakeholders)
- **Working Group sub-groups** (a standing sub-committee of the Working Group, which has the task of dealing with some particular topic and which draws additional members from outside the Working Group)

- **Neighbourhood or community consultative meetings** (issue-specific meetings held in particular areas and aimed at stimulating wide participation, especially of stakeholders from outside the public sector)
- **Project presentation meetings** (issue-specific or project-specific meetings aimed primarily at national or international support agencies)
- **Demonstration project groups** (for small-scale demonstration projects undertaken at the initiative of a Working Group, it is useful to set up a special task force which includes a different range of stakeholders.)

B3.2 Working Group Composition

The most important factor in determining the vitality and effectiveness of Working Groups is the **composition** of their membership. Naturally, there will almost always be a long list of persons and groups who have a “stake” - crucial or marginal - in a particular environmental issue. But for a Working Group to be successful, it must be kept relatively limited in size and must therefore include the city’s key stakeholders as its active members - the people who can really make the whole Working Group process work. How can this be assured, in practice?

*Box 7:
Involving More
Stakeholders
through Activities
Related to the
Working Groups*

Participatory Mechanism	Nature of Involvement
Issue-Specific SCP Working Group	stakeholders with lead or critical role
Extended Working Group	includes, in addition to the above, other stakeholders who have special expertise or interests in the topic(s) of special sessions
Sub-groups	involves additional stakeholders who are concerned with specific aspects of an issue and operate in parallel to and under a Working Group
Neighbourhood/Community Meeting	meeting with a larger community or group with a key interest in some aspect of the issue, and involving all local stakeholders
Mini-Consultation	issue-specific city wide meeting involving all issue-specific stakeholders, generally used for clarifying an issue or for reviewing strategy options
Workshops	issue- or topic-specific meeting involving additional stakeholders, especially those with relevant technical expertise and knowledge
Project Presentation Meeting	meeting particularly targeted at local, national and external funding agencies, and involving those stakeholders involved in resource mobilisation

We can look at this question of Working Group composition in relation to two interrelated but separate aspects:

- **inclusion** of the prime stakeholders
- the level of **competence** of the members.

The idea of *inclusion* does not mean simply to include everyone who can be thought of as a stakeholder for that issue. On the contrary, stakeholders have quite different degrees of “stake” in a particular issue, and these differences determine their suitability for inclusion in the Working Groups. These difference may run along some or all of the following dimensions:

- how significantly are they affected by the particular environmental issue?
- to what degree do their activities affect the environmental issue?
- what is their knowledge, expertise and information about that issue?
- what are their responsibilities and powers in relation to the issue?
- what implementation powers and instruments do they control?
- what resources can they bring to address the issue?
- how many people’s interests are represented by their group?

The prime stakeholders, then, will be those who have important “stakes”, as measured on these various dimensions. They are the people or groups whose participation is vital for the problem-solving tasks - finding solutions and implementing them. It will be these directly-concerned “prime” stakeholders who will have the capacity, and in general also the enthusiasm, to contribute most effectively to the Working Groups. And it is these prime stakeholders who need to be *included* as the core members of the Working Groups.

Please note the many different dimensions of stakeholder involvement, as well as the emphasis on (for key stakeholders) having the capacity to work out and implement solutions. A mistake made in some SCP cities has been to overload the Working Groups with technical “experts” (especially from universities and research institutes) who are not directly part of the key implementing and decision-making organisations. Doing this reduces the Working Group to a technical committee which is largely unrelated to actual city management and is basically unable to engage in the core Working Group tasks of strategy reconciliation, negotiation on action plans, implementation, etc. While expertise is necessary and important, such technical experts (not directly connected to city management) should not comprise more than about a fifth of the Working Group membership.

There is also an important question of **competence** of the individual Working Group members. They should have the authority and ability to “speak” on behalf of their respective organisations or groups; they need also to have good direct linkages to the important decision-making and policy-making levels in those organisations, and they need to have personal access to the relevant information and expertise which comes from their organisations.

For example, it would clearly be important for a city’s water department to be represented on a Working Group which deals with a water supply issue. Having a representative from that department would satisfy the criterion of *inclusion* of key stakeholders. However, that is not necessarily enough by

itself. The person who represents the department on the Working Group must be senior enough and be given authority enough to enter into substantive discussions and negotiations during Working Group sessions. This person does not need to be the head of the organisation - that would be unrealistic to expect; but he/she must be senior enough to provide a direct and immediate link between the Working Group and the decision-making levels of the department.

If the active members of the Working Group are like this, with the authority and competence required, then the working tasks of the group will tend to be successful. However, if Working Group members are too “junior” and do not have the authority and competence to talk and act on behalf of their organisations, then the Working Group simply will not function properly; evidence from the SCP cities is unanimous on this point.

A related problem is the tendency of hierarchical organisations to appoint a very senior person as the named member - but this individual never actually comes in person but sends a variety of lower-level substitutes to “stand in” or represent him/her. Such “stand in” representatives are seldom able to contribute to the work of the Working Group and they normally have no direct access to relevant management levels in their organisation. A Working Group composed of senior people on paper, but with only junior substitutes at the meetings, will very quickly fail.

So the task is not only to get the “right” organisations and groups represented on the Working Groups - but also to get the “right” people committed to be the actual attending and working members on behalf of those organisations.

Identifying the key stakeholders has not been too difficult for most SCP cities. Securing their agreement at the institution level to participate in Working Groups has also usually been possible. But getting the properly competent and relevant individuals from those institutions into the Working Groups has been everywhere the most difficult task, especially getting the active participation of people from senior managerial or decision-making levels. Unfortunately, this has often seriously undermined the role of Working Groups as a mechanism of negotiation, decision making and action.

Part of the problem could be lack of understanding and commitment on the part of the top decision makers in those organisations. Arguably, however, the main reason for strategically positioned decision makers failing to take part in Working Groups is lack of time and the press of other responsibilities and obligations. Clearly, it is seldom if ever realistic to expect the heads or deputy heads of large organisations to take part personally in the recurring activities of a Working Group. On the other hand, it is difficult but still possible to secure for the Working Group a senior manager or senior professional who meets the necessary criteria of competence and authority. But it is not easy!

In response to this problem, a number of different approaches have been tried out in various SCP cities. Some of these are briefly described below; you may find it useful to adapt and apply one or more of these in your own city situation.

Briefing key decision makers regularly and systematically. The project team must follow-up and ensure, after each Working Group session, that the WG members adequately brief their colleagues and seniors in their respective institutions. Whilst this is a routine procedure one would hopefully expect in such a process, the experience in practice has not been promising. In many instances, the persons represented in the Working Groups were not in the position to directly contact or access their seniors or have not taken the required initiative to do so. In appreciation of this problem, in **Dar es Salaam** focal points in key institutions called “Desk Officers” were assigned - and it was their task to ensure that such regular briefing and informing took place on a continuous basis. Although this did not remedy the problem in Dar es Salaam, it might work in some other cities. Another approach, used to some degree in Dar es Salaam and other SCP cities, was periodically to hold special briefing sessions with the city council committees and chief executives. This arrangement helps to avoid a total breakdown of necessary communication, but it does not substitute for the regular flow of information which should be expected from the properly situated Working Group members who can make this link more systematic and effective.

Establishing a two-tier working group structure. Another approach applied in **Chennai** (and being contemplated in **Dar es Salaam**) was the idea of transforming Working Groups into small and efficient high-powered committees which meet less frequently to review and decide on options and recommendations submitted by advisory working groups or task forces. In Chennai these high-level bodies were called “action committees” to emphasise their role as primary places for decisions to be taken and implemented. The idea as proposed for Dar es Salaam would have the corresponding high-powered bodies (called issue-specific steering committees) and they would be technically supported by professional task forces established on the basis of specific Terms of References.

The thinking behind this arrangement is simple: make the working groups more effective by reorganising them functionally, i.e.; bringing the decision makers into a small and efficient group as prime movers and connecting them with a group of professionals and other actors who ensure that recommendations and options submitted to the decision makers are thoroughly discussed and evaluated by all other stakeholders. From this perspective, it could be seen as a division of labour between potential members of an Issue Working Group, rather than a distinctly two-tier structure. The principal danger of this approach is the possibility of the process being “captured” by a small group of high-placed persons and thereby losing the participatory and bottom-up spirit of the full-blown SCP Working Group process.

Integrating the working groups into the existing city management structure. If carefully designed and implemented, this approach bears promise in institutionalising the SCP process. Learning from the difficulties faced by other SCP cities, Lusaka has been the first SCP city which embarked on this route. The issue-specific Working Groups in Lusaka were originally established within the Lusaka City Council, and they operated as occasional committees of the council. What Lusaka basically did was to use the SCP process to strengthen the city council standing committees by bringing other stakeholders into the council’s decision making system through their membership of the Working Groups (which in Lusaka are known as

occasional committees) and allowing them to operate within the jurisdiction and mandate of the Council's standing committees. By internalising the functions and mandates of the Working Groups into existing institutional arrangements, such a structure can lessen the problems (discussed above) of composition of Working Groups and their connectivity with decision makers.

Changing the composition of working groups at each stage of the process. The tasks of the Working Groups change as they move through the SCP process: beginning with clarification and elaboration of the issue and sub-issues, they move on to review of strategies and formulation of agreed strategies, development and negotiation of action plans, collaboration in implementation of plans, and generation of projects. It can be argued that at each stage of this process, the Working Group requires a slightly different mix of competencies. Hence, as the group moves from considering policy options and strategies to developing action plans and formulating and implementing projects, its composition might best shift from policy makers more to managers and experts, reflecting the changing functions and requirements of the Working Group tasks. So, as the Working Group progresses, there might be a need for adjusting the composition of the Working Groups to ensure the best functional and professional mix. Thus, the need for senior decision makers would be crucial at the strategy negotiation stage where policy options would be evaluated and long term course of actions considered. As the negotiation enters into action planning and project formulation, the lead role would be taken by implementing agencies and specialised experts.

However, this approach somewhat exaggerates the distinction between decision-making functions and other professional/managerial functions; there is negotiation and decision-making involved at every stage of the process, for instance. Formulating action plans is not a purely technical activity. Also, ensuring the right composition and competence required at different stages of the SCP process calls for careful tracking of membership types and roles, and making adjustments on a frequent but not necessarily regular basis; this might prove difficult in practice.

B3.3 Composition of Working Groups in SCP Cities

The purpose of establishing Working Groups is to draw into a collective decision making process all the stakeholders with relevant necessary mandate, resources, information and expertise, from the public, private and community sectors, thereby improving the quality of urban environmental planning and management. As emphasised above, the strength of Working Groups lies in their composition.

From this perspective, the experience of previous SCP cities leaves much to be desired and shows the difficulties of achieving this ideal in practice. A review of composition of Working Groups revealed that in almost all SCP cities, the private and community sectors were notably under-represented. Almost everywhere, the composition was sharply skewed towards the public sector (ranging between 50 and 75 percent). Two fundamental explanations are forwarded for this:

First, since the public sector controls most of the policy and implementation instruments, (at least for most key urban environmental issues), the public sector bodies will naturally remain the major players in the Working Groups. Furthermore, in some cities the role and economic contributions of administrative and government services and public enterprises is disproportionately large; this is the case in **Katowice**, **Shenyang** and **Wuhan**, as well as **Ismailia**. Nonetheless, there are cities with issues for which the role of private and community sectors should have been reflected much more strongly than was the case in the respective Working Groups. For example, the absence/invisibility of the private sector in Working Groups dealing with industrial effluent in **Dar es Salaam** and with development of Korle Lagoon in **Accra** cannot be fully explained by the dominance of the public sector, for private industry is a major player in both environmental issues. In **Ismailia** the farmers and their associations were under represented in the agricultural Working Group indicating that there is a room for improvement in this respect.

Second, getting the private sector interested in long term environmental issues which unfortunately are perceived as not involving them directly, is quite difficult. Most efforts to involve the private sector have met limited success, and most SCP cities have not yet found effective ways to convince the private sector that they should respond and participate. There is a good example from **Accra** where a Brewery discharging its effluent into the Korle Lagoon took a long time to realise and understand its possible role in a Working Group established to deal with the discharge problems on the lagoon and its catchment area. Here again, experience shows that the key to success is to translate the more abstract and general issues into concrete terms - and costs and benefits - which are recognisable and meaningful to private sector stakeholders, to help them realise what they would gain from all this in the short and long term. This was obvious in **Ibadan** where a large number of community groups and informal sector operators approached the SCP project team seeking technical support - after they had seen the social and economic gains reaped by Odo Aku Community, whose people had, through a Working Group, successfully negotiated and implemented a spring water demonstration project. In fact as the result of this outpouring of interest by communities and informal sector operators, most of the Working Group activities in Ibadan were connected to private sector and community initiatives and the 50 percent representation of communities in Working Groups in Ibadan (by far more than any where else) underscores this fact. The same goes for **Accra**, where, private sector participation has been quite visible in the case of addressing the issue of waste clean-up at the Agbogbloshie Market.

Apart from the minimal participation of the private sector, in many cities the Working Groups have not succeeded in drawing senior decision makers into their ranks and this has deprived them the necessary power and influence to see their decisions implemented. It has in many cases undermined the role of the Working Groups as a negotiating and decision making mechanism. One exception could be **Ismailia** where the strong and consistent high-level political support and the high profile of the project manager enabled the project to bring the heads of agencies to most of the Working Groups functions. The problem in many cities has been alleviated through a consistent and tireless lobbying, often done effectively via informal channels, and through high level briefings and mini consultations organised at peak points of the

process. As noted earlier, **Chennai** and **Dar es Salaam** approached the problem by creating a two-tier working group mechanism, which introduced a small high-powered committee into the Working Group structure. **Lusaka** on the other hand linked the Working Groups, from the beginning, with the city council's standing committees which were part of the key decision making structure of the city. As the SCP demonstration cities have started to grapple with the issue of institutionalising the process, for example in **Dar es Salaam**, the problem of political support and mandate for the Working Groups - which is directly correlated to the level and composition of membership - has arisen with great force.

B4

Changes in the Number and Focus of Working Groups

B4.1 Flexibility and Change in Organisation of Working Group

The number of Issue Working Groups initiated at the beginning of Phase Two - and the issue topics for these Groups - will probably change during implementation of the Project. This has certainly been the experience of the SCP cities in the past. Changes in the number and focus of Working Groups may happen in a number of ways and for different reasons:

- An original topic may turn out to be very broad or to have additional aspects or complexities which require detailed individual treatment - in which case it may be quite useful to establish separate sub-Working Groups each focused on a particular aspect. (This is discussed in greater detail below.)
- A particular Working Group may reach the point at which they consider the original topic to have been sufficiently covered, or perhaps actions have been taken or conditions have change, which make the topic no longer a priority for Working Group activity.
- There may be topics which were reviewed early in the Project but which were not originally designated as priority - perhaps following the sensible tactic of starting Phase Two with a small and manageable number of Working Groups. However, some of these might later be raised to priority status, through changes in attitudes or in circumstances, and thus have new Working Groups established to look into them.
- Within a particular Working Group, it may be decided to set up a separate sub-Working Group to look after a proposed Demonstration Project.
- A Working Group may fail to function effectively, perhaps because the topic turned out to be too broad or ill-defined or perhaps because it was not possible to obtain proper cooperation from the necessary stakeholders; whatever the reasons, unsuccessful Working Groups

should be terminated, so that Project energy can be directed into the other, more successful Working Groups.

Thus, flexibility is important. Throughout the life of the project, the number and focus of Working Groups must be carefully assessed, to ensure that they remain appropriate to changing circumstances and priorities.

The most common experience from SCP cities in this regard is setting up sub-Working Groups (or sometimes new Working Groups) to deal with issues which are found to be too complex or too broad to be handled satisfactorily through a single Working Group. To handle such situations, it has often proved useful to establish sub-Working Groups. (Careful assessment should be made when doing this, to avoid unnecessary proliferation of groups or fragmentation of issues.)

To illustrate, consider the following situations which might warrant establishing sub-Working Groups. (The examples are hypothetical in detail, although based on experience.)

When components of an issue need to be explored separately:

Example: The solid waste problem of a big city could be so enormous and complex that the collection, disposal, and recycling components might need separate investigation, analysis and deliberation - just to make the issue more manageable. Great care must be taken, however, that the sub-Working Groups are coordinated through the main Working Group to ensure that the separate components are consistently brought together and addressed in an integrated approach.

When aspects of issues need to be investigated separately:

Example: Suppose a group has been working on the pollution problems of an urban lake, focused on the technical aspects of the problem, and has been evaluating the merits and demerits of various technological options. In the middle of its exercise, one of the stakeholders brought the group's attention to a very important institutional aspect of the issue, which if not resolved could make the whole effort a waste of time and resources. Further meetings on this aspect of the problem indeed revealed that the institutional problem is critical and does not seem to have any ready solution. The Working Group could well then decide to establish a sub-Group with adequate expertise and relevant representation (which would include people not only of the main Working Group) to look specifically into this aspect of the problem and bring the matter back for full scale Working Group deliberations.

When new approaches for addressing an issue need to be thoroughly analysed:

Example: Imagine that a City Council admitted its inability to cope with the growing demands for waste collection, but remained reluctant to see any option other than continuing in the same old way. However, some people strongly believed that the old way is unsustainable, and that it was time to consider privatising waste collection, at least in the central business district. The solid waste Working Group was faced with two basic problems. First, there were many who believed the priority is for immediate action through campaigns and mobilisation of the relevant city council departments. Second, those who felt that privatisation was the only real solution were still not sure

about the exact way to approach it - the policy, institutional and legislative details and implications. In such a situation it might be advisable to establish a sub-Working Group that would explore in detail the feasibility of privatising the waste collection. This could help break the deadlock and allow the Working Group to focus on immediate improvement of the city council's collection management, while waiting for the sub-Group's findings and recommendations before proceeding to develop proposals for privatisation.

When an issue is geographic-specific and with special concern in some areas:

Example: Perhaps in a city water and sanitation have been identified as priority issues. After further examination by the Working Group, the problem was found to be extremely serious and debilitating in particular settlement areas of the city. It could be very useful to then establish sub-Working Groups for each of the geographic areas, to help mobilise the communities, to develop acceptable delivery and cost recovery schemes, and negotiate with the water authority for quick implementation.

When an issue evolves to affect new stakeholder groups, whose role was not clear in the first instance:

Example: A Working Group addressing the problem of water scarcity agreed to encourage recycling and reusing waste water. It also agreed to initiate a demonstration agricultural project that would utilise the city's partially treated waste water for irrigation. It was realised that the farmers who are supposed to use the water and the consumer groups and buyers of the food produced should be involved in the process, to review the commercial feasibility of the project and to consider environmental health issues. This might demand not only separate consultations with the farmer and consumer groups, but also specialised technical studies and input - and establishing a sub-Working Group could be the best way to do this, while allowing the main Working Group to carry on with larger issues of water supply and management.

B4.2 Patterns of Working Group Arrangements in SCP Cities

One of the key attributes of SCP Working Groups is the flexibility they offer in dealing with different issues at different levels and scales. In addition to allowing for change of composition of membership to suit the needs of different phases of the SCP process, their flexibility can also accommodate and address sub-issues, special topics, and geographic focus. The evolution of Working Groups in the various SCP cities has often gone from a small number of broad-topic Working Groups to a complex structure of numerous Groups and sub-Groups.

In **Dar es Salaam**, nine issue-specific working groups were established, each of which generated three or four sub-Working Groups organised around sub-issues or specific geographic areas. Hence for example the "Solid Waste Management Working Group" had four sub-Groups, three of which were dealing with the collection, recycling and disposal aspects, while one was looking into privatisation modalities. The sub-Working Groups on "Urban Transport and Air Pollution" on the other hand featured geographic and topical aspects. Hence while all focused on public transport, at least two of the four sub-Groups were dealing with the problems of parking and traffic

congestion in the city centre. In issues like sand mining, Working Groups were in fact purely organised around geographic areas with potential and actual sand deposits. A similar pattern of Working Group arrangement has been noticed in the other SCP cities as well, although usually with fewer Groups and sub-Groups.

Concepción and Ismailia each had a Working Group concerning pollution problems of urban lakes. Community based Working Groups were also functioning in relatively poorer settlement areas of these two cities. The geographic orientation of sub-Working Groups was even more pronounced in the case of **Ibadan**: whilst there were initially only two priority issues, namely water supply and waste management, by early 1997 there were already twelve sub-Working Groups established around thematic and geographic lines. In fact one of the Working Groups was purely focused on the largest market place in the city with six thematic sub-Working Groups under it.

An interesting aspect observed through city experience was also the propensity of the geographic area based sub-groups to quickly move to the formulation and, so far as funds are available, to the implementation of demonstration projects; this tended to transform the geographic-specific sub-groups into project follow-up teams. Demonstration projects have been implemented in most SCP cities, including **Accra, Concepción, Dar es Salaam, Ibadan, Katowice and Ismailia**. The emerging experience of **Lusaka** has on the other hand highlighted an interesting possibility of linking community level initiatives with city-wide activities through a two-tier Working Group structure. In this arrangement, communities were encouraged to address their local problems through Issue-Specific Community Committees (ISCC), whose results and concerns were continuously fed into the strategy planning activities of the city wide working groups functioning at the city council level.

B5

Working Group Structure and Functions

B5.1 The Structure in General

The Working Group process is built on a simple and basic principle of cross-sectoral and stakeholder participation in planning and management decision making. Each Working Group is established around a specific agreed priority issue, and hence the structure and composition and tenure of Working Groups can only be determined issue-by-issue. In general, Working Groups are not permanent structures: when an issue is resolved, that particular Working Group phases out, with its functions and achievements being taken up by the different institutions and groups which in the first instance constituted that Working Group. On the other hand, as new development issues of cross-sectoral nature emerge, new Working Groups involving members relevant to this new issue would come into existence. Therefore although particular Working Groups may come and go, the Working Group process has to be sustained. Sustaining the process will be discussed later, but in this chapter

we synthesise and abstract from different city experiences to portray a generalised structure of Working Groups which is essential for properly operationalising the Working Group approach.

Although there is a general structure for setting up and running SCP Working Groups, it should be noted that SCP cities have, quite naturally, modified this general process to fit local circumstances. As a result, the structure of Working Groups has varied somewhat from city to city. The following capture the key areas of differences:

- Some cities established Steering Committees, while others did not. It has been argued that establishment of a Steering Committee is a necessary condition for creating a high-powered local support group and for ensuring political commitment. In practice, however, results have not been encouraging, and Steering Committees even when established have in most instances not played the active and supportive role which was hoped for.
- As an alternative approach to ensure the participation of senior officials and decision makers, Chennai and Dar es Salaam created a smaller second tier Working Group which meets **only** at critical decision-making points. Though this appears as the creation of a two-tier Working Group structure, at a closer look it can be seen more as a division of labour involving a modified sort of Steering Committee. In this way, the two cities sought to ensure participation of politicians and senior managers at least in key decision-points within the Working Group process.
- Though it did not bring about the desired results, Dar es Salaam at one point in the evolution of the Working Group structure set up what were called “Desk Officers” who were supposed to serve as the focal points and communicating links between the different stakeholder institutions and the Working Groups. The idea was to identify designated persons from the different institutions to act as “gate points” for their respective institutions, constantly being informed and in turn informing their seniors about progress taking place in the Working Groups;
- Dar es Salaam also introduced what is called a Technical Coordinating Committee, whose task was partly to fill the gap created by an inaccessible Steering Committee and to partly assist the Working Groups in inter-sectoral coordination and technical advice. If carefully designed and implemented, this could be a managerial level group which would be instrumental in technically “guiding” the Working Groups and in weaving together the different outputs so that they would fit into the sectoral and urban development plans.

Based on the overall experience of the SCP cities, notwithstanding these differences in city-by-city application, a *general structure for Working Groups* can be identified based on three key functions which must work properly if an SCP Working Group process is to be operationalised successfully:

- the Political Support function

- the Consensus Building in decision-making function
- the Coordinating function.

The Political Support function: Higher-level political support can be mobilised through a Steering Committee system - either a single committee encompassing all major players or a set of specialist committees focused on particular issues. Political support can also be mobilised, from a more grass-roots level, through widespread stakeholder sensitisation (discussed earlier) as well as through involvement of strategic stakeholders directly in the Working Groups.

The Consensus Building in Decision Making function: The issue-specific Working Groups themselves are the foundation of the whole process, providing the mechanism for participatory decision-making within the overall SCP framework and being the primary instrument for enhancing urban environmental planning and management. Each Working Group normally has a designated Coordinator, as is discussed further below.

The Coordinating function: Coordination is essential at two levels: first, among and across the separate issue-specific Working Groups; and second, between key implementing organisations and issue-specific interests. The Coordinating Working Group brings together the Coordinators of the various issue-specific Working Groups in a forum which facilitates the reconciling and coordinating of their separate strategies and other outputs. Depending on the complexity of issues and the technical sophistication required to coordinate between the different issues and sectors, there might also be a Technical Coordinating Committee; where used, this is normally composed of senior managers from key sectoral agencies or interests and similar persons. This Technical Coordinating Committee can facilitate the understanding by Working Groups of sectoral plans, strengthen consolidating the coordination function taking place at the Coordinating Working Group, and help to bring to the attention of top decision makers any critical inter-sectoral coordination matters resulting from activities of the Working Groups.

The basic elements of the SCP Working Group structure, and their expected roles and activities (which cover the three functions), are described in greater detail in the following subsections.

B5.2 The Issue-Specific Working Group

The Issue-Specific Working Group is the essential core of the whole SCP process, certainly from the City Consultation onwards. Most other project activities are designed to support and complement the activities of the Working Groups. In the end, the accomplishment of overall project objectives will come through successful Working Groups.

In simplified form, the Issue-Specific Working Groups will undertake the following essential activities:

- Clarify the issue: ensure the collection of necessary information (from all sources), analyse the underlying causes and its various associated factors and conditions, clarify the immediate and longer-term impacts

and implications of the issue, and define the institutional, technical and other aspects that need to be taken up by the Working Group.

- Based on the further clarification of the issue, and then continuously throughout the life of the Working Group, review the composition of the Group's membership, and assess what additions or changes are desirable to ensure inclusion of the relevant stakeholders.
- When appropriate, organise the establishment of sub-Working Groups, to handle important components of the issue, or to deal with the issue in particular geographic areas, or to further facilitate the handling of the issue.
- Assess the various existing and proposed strategies for handling the various aspects of this issue, discuss and formulate suitable possible strategy options, including actor-specific analysis of advantages and disadvantages of each.
- Discuss and negotiate and reach consensus on the most appropriate strategies for that issue.
- Assess existing and proposed interventions, projects or programmes which relate to the agreed strategies; discuss and negotiate concrete action plans for sets of interventions designed to implement the agreed strategies, including partner-specific and time-specific plans for resource commitments and action.
- Based on agreed strategies and action plans, develop/appraise* project proposals for capital investments and technical support investments.
- Develop a detailed work programme and elaborate the technical and logistical support required.
- Develop and agree mechanisms to further coordinate and monitor the progress of the agreed action plans.

** Given the level of effort and competence required to develop/formulate projects, it might be unrealistic to expect Working Groups, especially those in smaller towns, to undertake this without considerable technical support. In all cases though, Working Groups should be able to assess options and to appraise projects.*

Based on the above general functions of a typical issue-specific Working Group, it is strongly advised, for the purpose of clarity of tasks and focus, that general Terms of Reference be written for each Working Group (and for each sub-Working Group, if applicable). This will encourage all members of the Working Group to focus on a commonly agreed set of tasks and activities, helping to ensure against diversion of effort or confusion of purpose. It will also help the Working Group Coordinator and the SCP project team to properly monitor both Working Group and overall project progress.

B5.3 Working Group Coordinators and the Coordinating Working Group

Evidence from SCP projects worldwide agrees on the critical role of the Working Group Coordinator, the person who is the *organiser, facilitator, and spokesperson* of the Issue-Specific Working Group.

An energetic, dedicated, well-informed, and competent Coordinator is essential for the success of the Working Group.

The **Coordinator** will be assisted in various ways by the project team, by consultants and other Project resources when necessary, and by the other members of the Working Group. But the Coordinator is the person directly responsible for the successful functioning of the Working Group. Thus, it is extremely important for the Project to identify and mobilise appropriate persons to be Working Group Coordinators. Among the many SCP Projects, Coordinators have been selected in a variety of ways, each suitable to the particular local situation:

- drawn from the Project staff
- elected by the Working Group members
- appointed on a consultant basis by the Project
- identified by the Project from among Working Group members and accepted by the Group.

The following field experiences highlight the different ways through which the SCP cities managed to integrate the Coordinators:

- After being seconded by their respective institutions, Working Groups Coordinators were hired as full time project staff (Dar es Salaam)
- Coordinators were assigned to work on a part-time basis and were remunerated as per their outputs - meetings held, meeting reports, case study papers, implementation follow-up reports, information collection results, etc. (Ismailia)
- People were contracted under the project budget to function as Coordinators and resource persons, with dual responsibilities of Working Group coordination and substantive technical advice/support (Katowice).

However the selection is done, the Coordinator needs to be accepted by the Working Group, not on the basis of seniority or official position, but on the basis of ability, energy, and commitment to leading the activities of the Group. Ideally, the Coordinator should have the following characteristics:

- (1) have skills in communication and in personal interaction with a variety of different stakeholders
This is mainly a personality characteristic - being the sort of person who can communicate readily and easily.
- (2) be able to function as a Group Facilitator*, understanding the methods and techniques of guiding and facilitating group meetings
The techniques of facilitation can be learned, but the person must be able and willing to apply them.
- (3) has sufficient practical experience and technical-professional knowledge to deal confidently with the Group's topic
*The Coordinator does **not** need to be a "top expert" but does need to understand the topic in general.*
- (4) has a good understanding of the SCP process, both the general concepts and the approach of the Project itself

** In some local situations the role of a Chairperson might be more prestigious and different from the role of a Coordinator, necessitating the use of more senior or politically important personalities for chairing meetings.*

This can be learned, through reading and briefings, but the person must be “open” to these new ideas.

- (5) can allocate the time and energy necessary to organise meetings, to conduct them, and to follow-up as necessary
*Having sufficient **time** availability is essential, especially to have substantial time available before and after the meetings.*

The Coordinator’s precise operational role will vary from one Project to another, reflecting local conditions, but a general description of the Coordinator’s responsibilities might include the following:

- in consultation with key Group members, propose agenda for meetings, organise the meetings, act as Facilitator and Chair during the meetings, and organise the necessary follow-up.
- draft and secure agreement on a detailed work programme for the Working Group, and ensure steady and orderly progress toward concrete outputs
- identify technical support needs for different aspects of the Group’s work, and mobilise appropriate resources, data, information, expertise (from Group member organisations and/or through the Project itself).
- as Facilitator, guide meetings to encourage creative participation, maintain focus to the Group’s activities, and encourage constructive negotiation and consensus-building
- participate in, as well as guide and facilitate, discussions and negotiations within the Working Group, on clarifying issues assessing and reconciling strategies, developing demonstration projects, formulating interventions and action plans, mobilising additional stakeholder support and participation, etc.
- ensure the keeping of proper minutes and documentation from meetings, as well as ensure the preparation of necessary documentation, maps or other inputs to the meetings
- liaise with local and national institutions whose support and inputs might be required for moving the Working Group activities forward
- build a spirit of teamwork and commitment among the members of the Working Group, stimulate enthusiasm and creativity
- exchange information with other Working Group Coordinators and participate regularly in the Coordinating Working Group.

This list could provide the basis for a Terms of Reference for your Working Group Coordinators.

Box 8: Assigning Working Groups Coordinators: The Experience of SCP Cities

In selecting and mobilising coordinators, different SCP cities have used different approaches. In Concepción and in Dar es Salaam, the coordinators were full time project staff. In Dar es Salaam, though they were generally full-time and integrated into the project staff, they were drawn on secondment from various ministries and municipal departments, with the intention of both linking with and helping build capacities of the contributing ministries and departments. This arrangement was expected to have three advantages: one, the coordinators will be available on full time basis; two, they will be selected on the basis of their professional and institutional background; and three, once completing their initial assignment they will return to their respective institutions and bring with them the SCP knowledge and experience. There are some disadvantages, however: first, institutions may tend to release only junior staff; and second, being full-time on the project they may become “disconnected” from their respective institutions and may not be perceived as “stakeholders” by their peers in the working groups.

In many other cities such as Accra, Ibadan and Ismailia the coordinators were selected from the members of the respective Working Groups. In Ismailia the most energetic and younger members of the groups were selected as coordinators; their availability (for a day or two each week) was among the selection criteria. This arrangement can facilitate inter-institutional linkages and the eventual internalisation of Working Group activities into the existing institutional system. This arrangement is also less costly and hence likely to be sustained. From this perspective, the experience of cities highlights the merits of selecting the coordinators from the “lead” institutions vis a vis the respective issues, an approach also taken (albeit in different form) in Chennai.

In Katowice on the other hand, the coordinators were local consultants hired through the SCP project. This approach brings on board coordinators with special expertise who can function as resource persons. It also creates a group of consultants who are conversant with the SCP process, making future replications easier. On the other hand, apart from being a costly arrangement, this approach has the danger of excluding direct linkages with key stakeholder organisations, as the consultants are generally from academic/research or private consultancy backgrounds. Having “technical” experts as coordinators also introduces the danger of the Working Group being seen as a place for mere technical exercise.

Issue-Specific Working Groups are of course focused on particular Issues or sub-issues. This is the key to their effectiveness, because it brings groups together in a shared problem-solving approach focused on a specific cross-cutting topic. However, precisely because Working Groups are organised in this way, it is vital for the Project to have a reliable mechanism for coordinating activities *across* different topics. This is the role of the **Coordinating Working Group**.

The Coordinating Working Group normally consists of the Coordinators of all the various Working Groups, together with the Project Manager (or Deputy Manager) who is usually Chairperson. Sometimes additional professional staff from the project team also attend.

The Coordinating Working Group must meet quite regularly, as its basic purpose is to ensure good continuous liaison and coordination among the various Working Groups - and to ensure that the Working Groups as a whole are functioning properly and in accord with the project's overall work programme. In general, its main functions normally include (but not be limited to) the following:

- to monitor and assess the progress of Working Groups, individually and overall, and to provide a forum for discussing and agreeing any steps which may need to be taken to ensure proper functioning of the WGs
- to check for overlaps and/or gaps between the work of different Working Groups, especially concerning linkages and connections between issues and problems, as well as questions of coordination of organisations or stakeholders
- to ensure that evolving issue-specific strategies are consistent one with another and across issues and, later, to help development of overall environmental management strategies
- to collectively advise Project management on priority use of resources such as consultants, workshops, GIS/EMIS, etc.
- to provide a constructive forum at which additional inputs (e.g. from international development support programmes) can be brought in.

*Box 9:
Coordinating
Working Group in
Dar es Salaam*

The coordinators for the nine issue-specific Working Groups in Dar es Salaam met regularly to brief each other on progress made in the Working Groups and to discuss matters that need to be coordinated. The meeting was chaired by the City Planner who was also National Project Coordinator (NPC) for the Sustainable Dar es Salaam Project. In his capacities as the town planner and project coordinator, he was perfectly placed to link Working Groups activities to the planning perspectives and priorities of the city council. At these bi-weekly meetings, relevant international programmes such as Healthy Cities and LIFE sometimes also participated, giving a unique opportunity to coordinate the external support activities.

These opportunities were not, however, efficiently exploited: Progress reports were not well structured or prepared on time, the meetings were neither effectively run nor consistently attended; and external programmes were not enthusiastic to coordinate their activities within the SCP framework. Despite these drawbacks, the coordinators meetings worked well enough to show the positive impact a well structured and formalised coordination mechanism (the Coordinating Working Group) can have on improving implementation and maximising the use of existing resources.

B5.4 The Steering Committee

The establishment of a Steering Committee early in the SCP project could be critical for galvanising and mobilising the necessary political support. But the Steering Committee can also play an important role in supporting the Issue-specific Working Groups and helping to ensure the success of their activities.

The Steering Committee, remember, typically includes a cross-section of highly important stakeholders as its members, people such as:

- the mayor (or chief executive) of the city
- the chairperson or leader of the city council
- the heads of key local development authorities and local government departments whose mandate and activities are critical for urban development and environmental management
- representatives of central ministries with important responsibilities for urban development and environmental management
- the heads of local, regional or national regulatory bodies working in the environmental field
- heads of relevant research institutions
- representatives of city wide private sector associations and city-wide or otherwise significant NGOs
- representatives of key funding agencies, who are already involved significantly in the development of the city or who might be involved in the future.

A project Steering Committee has a wide variety of useful functions in support of the SCP project overall, but it can also be an important feature in the whole Working Group system. Steering Committee activities in relation to the activities of Working Groups might include the following:

- have regular briefings from the Coordinators to keep the Steering Committee members well informed about progress in the various Working Groups
- make clear and publicly visible its support to the activities of the Working Groups, so that the public at large and all staff in the various organisations understand the importance of the SCP Working Group process
- assist Working Groups in resolving issues which might need policy changes (or re-interpretations and elaborations) which require city government intervention
- ensure, through persuasion if possible (and through government order if necessary), that high level decision makers from the important stakeholder organisations actively participate in the Working Groups when needed;
- facilitate access to information which is held in various organisations, to loosen “blockages” if necessary when there is resistance to actually passing over reports, data, maps, etc. to the Working Groups;

- build linkages and promote coordination between new initiatives arising from the Working Groups and existing or planned programmes and projects;
- organise and facilitate contacts, briefings and meetings with central government ministries and agencies;
- support and facilitate local, national and external resource mobilisation for implementing projects generated through the Working Group process;
- provide leadership for internalising and institutionalising the SCP process into the existing local public, private and community institutions.

Although the potential role and functions of a steering committee are obviously quite important, there are SCP demonstration cities which did not have a Steering Committee at all (as in Concepcion), or which only later saw the need of establishing one (for example Dar es Salaam). Even where Steering Committees were operational, in most cases they were relatively ineffective and did not live up to their potential. Many reasons have been suggested for this situation: the too-busy schedules of high-level members; lack of understanding of the potential benefits of the SCP process and consequent lack of genuine commitment; frequent institutional changes and, particularly, high turnover of elected political leaders; competition or conflict (especially political) among members; and a difficulty in getting high-level stakeholders to take the longer-term view of the SCP process.

Experience suggests that while Steering Committees could have an important political role to play, realising this potential depends on three factors: (a) the degree of commitment by the members; (b) the institutional arrangements (primarily where the Committee is anchored and by whom chaired), and (c) the proper functioning of a regular briefing mechanism which keeps the Steering Committee members abreast of latest developments and Working Group activities.

B5.5 Technical Coordinating Committee (TCC)

Where it exists, the Technical Coordinating Committee (mentioned briefly in Chapter B3) is normally a technical/professional committee which fits between the Working Groups and the Steering Committee. A Technical Coordinating Committee generally has three major purposes: (i) to help the Coordinating Working Group in reconciling issue-specific strategies; (ii) to help link Working Group activities to those of on-going and planned sectoral initiatives; and (iii) to advise the Steering Committee and the Working Groups on cross-cutting issues related to inter-sectoral coordination, capacity building and resource mobilisation.

The members of the Technical Coordinating Committee are expected to be senior or middle managers and professionals drawn from the main departments and agencies which are responsible for operating and/or managing and/or supervising key urban development and environmental sectors. People at this level are likely to have more time available than the

highest-level people who are members of the Steering Committee; in addition, they are likely to be more immediately familiar with the urban development and environmental issues which are being tackled by the Working Groups.

In support of Working Group operations, a Technical Coordinating Committee needs to have regular meetings with Working Groups coordinators, and on relevant occasions with the various Working Groups themselves. When properly functioning, a Technical Coordinating Committee can assist the Working Group process in a number of ways, such as the following:

- assist Working Groups to better understand the context and details of existing plans;
- assist Working Groups to give full consideration to and make maximum use of on-going or planned sectoral project initiatives;
- facilitate Working Group access to, and exchange of, technical information from the different sectoral organisations;
- advise the Steering Committee on inter-sectoral coordination matters arising from the Working Groups;
- advise the Steering Committee on institutional and legislative changes or reforms that might be needed to promote inter-sectoral coordination and to institutionalise the SCP process
- take stock of existing local capacity in terms of expertise and information and encourage inter-institutional linkages, sub-contracts and other arrangements that can enable Working Groups tap such resources more effectively.

B6

Supporting the Working Groups

B6.1 General Support to the Working Groups

Working Groups are not permanent institutions, nor do they have the staff and other resources of a self-sufficient organisation. Working Groups are set up to address critical bottlenecks in urban environmental planning and management - the lack of involvement of important stakeholders in decision making, the breakdown of linkages across sectors and between planning and implementation, and the lack of coordination in planning and implementation. Their main tasks therefore are discussion, review and assessment, integration of ideas, negotiation, formulation of strategies and actions, consensus-building, and coordination. In general, scientific knowledge or technical expertise is *not* a critical bottleneck and Working Groups have *not* been set up to provide such expertise. They are *not* intended by themselves to carry out detailed technical studies, to develop projects in detail, or to implement action plans.

So, to successfully undertake their basic tasks, Working Groups need support of different types:

- organisational and logistic support
- general technical support
- specialised technical support.

Organisational and logistic support - provided primarily by the SCP project - includes the various administrative and secretariat activities which are necessary for supporting the Working Group meetings themselves. Preparing and following-up meetings, maintaining liaison with members and their organisations, managing special activities and consultants, keeping up with documentation, etc. - these are all the normal organisational tasks which are necessary to ensure a smooth operation of the Working Group.

General technical support is not issue-specific; it includes professional and technical capabilities and resources which are needed by many or even all of the Working Groups. Examples of such support could be: mapping and use of Geographical Information Systems, group facilitation techniques, use of an Environmental Management Information System (EMIS), methodologies of conflict resolution and negotiation and arbitration, project profiling, information and communication techniques, approaches to institutional development, etc. As this type of general technical support is shared by most Working Groups, it can be provided with a reasonable degree of continuity - and with some economies of scale. This makes it desirable to organise the provision of such technical support on a coordinated basis, quite likely through the SCP project.

Specialized technical support, on the other hand, is the support which represents a specific response to a particular need of one Working Group. This kind of technical support tends to be issue-specific and indeed problem-specific, arising from the particular activity which a Working Group is undertaking at a particular time. This makes it difficult to anticipate what sort of technical support will be required during the project. Examples (based on SCP city experience) could include: water quality testing in urban waterways and in urban lakes, legal advice in privatising a solid waste collection system, environmental health risk assessment for a waste water reusing project, financial analysis of derelict land reuse, etc.

Operational support to the Working Groups will typically come from a variety of sources and be organised in many different ways. The main sources of support, however, will be from:

- the organisations of the Working Group members
- the SCP project team
- resources from the project budget
- special technical support arrangements.

B6.2 Support from the Working Group Member Organisations

Although Working Groups do not have staff or resources of their own, they do have a powerful source of expertise and capability: the Working Group

members and the organisations to which they belong. This is a basic principle behind the whole concept of Working Groups in the SCP:

the day-to-day work of the Working Groups is to be done by the Working Group members, both individually and backed up by the organisations which they represent

Remember, although individual persons are members of the Working Groups, they are members on behalf of their respective organisations - and it is their organisation which is making a commitment to participate in the SCP project and in its Working Groups.

As emphasised earlier, it is *fundamental* to the SCP process that governmental and other stakeholder organisations in the city will provide - at their own cost - the persons, time, and backup resources required for the Working Groups. (This is normally embodied in the signed Project Document for the SCP project.) The first responsibility of the participating organisations (key stakeholders) is to make the appropriate **persons** available - on a continuing basis - for the Working Groups; part of this “agreement” is that the selected person will participate in the Working Group, regularly and energetically, with this participation being treated as a prime responsibility (not as a “side” activity).

However, it is also the responsibility of the participating organisation to provide, when necessary and appropriate, additional technical support to the Working Group, directly or through their member. For instance, it is clearly the responsibility of the organisations to provide, through their representatives, the data, maps, reports, and other information which is required for the Working Group. In a similar way, the parent organisations can be called upon to provide inputs of technical expertise and technical support, where it is needed for a particular activity of the Working Group. For instance, if the metropolitan water authority is participating in a Working Group on water supply in peripheral areas, it can reasonably be expected to provide not only the requisite data on deliveries and consumption in those areas; but in addition, it can also be expected to provide appropriate technical expertise (through its Working Group member or through backup support in the organisation) to help analyse the potential of ground water supplies in that area.

A Working Group is expected to bring in members from all important stakeholder groups concerned with its specific issue, and therefore the organisations with the greatest expertise and experience in relation to that issue should be represented. Their pool of knowledge and expertise should remain the most important resource to support the activities of the Working Group.

B6.3 Support from the SCP Project Team

Each SCP city project has a designated Project Team, which comprises a number of full-time personnel who provide the professional and support manpower for actually running the project. (The Project Team is sometimes called the Technical Support Unit (TSU) or Technical Support Team (TST) or even something else; the differences in name are not significant.) The

project team staff are normally full-time, under the leadership of a full-time head - often designated the Project Manager - who is responsible for day-to-day operational management of the SCP project.

The general experience in SCP cities has been of a relatively small project team: the Project Manager and two or three professionals, with secretarial and administrative support staff. In some SCP cities, however, the team is bigger, with more professionals and support staff, although some of them are part-time. In some cities (e.g. Katowice) the core project team is paid from SCP project funds; in others (such as Shenyang, Wuhan, and Chennai) the staff are on secondment from (and paid by) the city or metropolitan government. There is sometimes a mix of core staff paid through a project budget supplemented by additional project team staff seconded from local organisations. Additional people may be “attached” to the project team, often on a part-time or contract basis; these may be staff from relevant stakeholder organisations, or perhaps retired civil servants and employees, or academics and researchers from local institutions, or local professional consultants.

The arrangement of a project team is flexible and responds to local circumstances. What is important, however, is that a full-time core of competent and responsible people (the project team) are available to organise, guide, support, and manage the operational activities of the SCP project.

The first and foremost responsibility of the Project Team in relation to Working Groups is to provide the necessary organisational and logistic support. The project team will take care of planning and preparation for meetings, support to the Coordinators in actually running meetings, and ensuring proper follow-up from meetings. This support will encompass communications with Working Group members, scheduling and organising appropriate meeting rooms and facilities, preparing and circulating documents, ensuring the writing-up of minutes and reports, organising any special events, liaising with the media, etc.

These may perhaps be considered unexciting and everyday managerial and organisational tasks; *but they are absolutely crucial*. Unless the project team undertakes these organisational and logistical support consistently and efficiently, the Working Groups simply will not be able to function properly. Experience in the SCP cities shows the truth of this point: to be successful, Working Groups require the steady support of good operational management from the project team.

The Working Group Coordinators will also play a crucial role, of course, and the organisational and logistical support from the project team must be managed in close collaboration with the various Coordinators - to ensure that the support is meeting the real needs of the Working Groups. Both individually and through the Coordinating Working Group, the Coordinators have a key responsibility for working with the project team to ensure that proper and timely support is given to the Working Groups.

In many SCP cities, project team support to the Working Groups also included direct staff inputs: one professional staff member of the project team was assigned, on a continuing basis, to each Working Group. That

member of the project team was expected to attend all meetings of the Working Group, to provide the direct first-hand linkage between the Working Group and the project team, and to assist the Coordinator in any ways necessary. These project team staff members normally reported to the Project Manager, to keep him/her fully informed, and they also normally attended the meetings of the Coordinating Working Group. This system ensured that project team support to the Working Groups was consistent, well-informed and responsive.

Finally, the project team is responsible for mobilising, organising and supervising extra resources and inputs for particular aspects of a Working Group's activities, once this agreed to be necessary and feasible. This is particularly (but not exclusively) the case for support resources which are funded through the SCP project budget, as noted in the next section.

B6.4 Support Resources from the Project Budgets

The SCP project itself, through its project budgets (external and domestic funds) and its project team, can mobilise and organise a variety of valuable inputs to support the Working Groups. Because of the way such budgets are set up, the SCP project budget does not normally identify potential resources specifically as "support to Working Groups". Nonetheless, there is a variety of ways in which the SCP project itself can provide additional Working Group support, such as:

- **Specialist Local Consultant (or Sub-Contract) Inputs.** There are usually times when the Working Groups need special technical inputs - in addition to the technical skills available through the Working Group members. Resources are available through the project budget to mobilise such inputs, which the project team can organise and supervise.
- **Specialist International Inputs.** Most SCP projects have some resources for a limited range of specialised international inputs, from UN-HABITAT and/or its consultants - or sometimes from elsewhere, utilising UN-HABITAT's international networks.
- **Briefings and Training on SCP/EPM.** The project team and especially its Training Officer have the capability and the materials necessary to give briefings and training inputs to the Working Group members, to keep them familiarised with the overall SCP framework within which they are working and to familiarise them with particular aspects of the project process.
- **Specialised Back-Up.** The Sustainable Cities Programme core team has and is further developing capabilities in several general areas of expertise: in basic mapping, in simplified GIS and EMIS, in process monitoring, in incorporation of gender aspects, etc.; these resources can be accessed through the project team and used to directly support the Working Groups.
- **Workshops, Seminars, Mini-Consultations.** The Project has resources for organising special workshops or seminars or Mini-Consultations, which are often quite useful for helping a Working Group

to consolidate or finalise particular parts of its work or to communicate with and draw from a wider audience.

The hiring of consultants and firms on sub-contract is one of the most important, but complicated, aspects of project support to Working Groups. In most cases, the extra inputs needed for Working Groups are tasks which can best be done by individual consultants (or occasionally, small teams of consultants), although there are also circumstances in which sub-contracting of local firms may be appropriate. (For example, if there is a large volume of work, or if the scope of work is quite broad and requires various disciplines, or if the work demands sustained inputs over a long period, then sub-contracting to a firm might be more suitable than hiring individual consultants.) In practice, essentially all of the consulting inputs to the Working Groups will be *local* consultants; the provision for international consultants is usually rather limited and is intended in any case for more specialised inputs in support of overall project implementation.

To make effective use of these technical inputs - whether individual consultants, groups of consultants, or firms under sub-contract - it is the responsibility of the project team to ensure that correct procedures are carefully followed, so that the support to the Working Groups will be appropriate and effective. Specifically, the following need to be done in all cases:

- (1) The nature of the technical input must be carefully worked out, in collaboration with the Coordinator and the Working Group, so that all those involved understand what is the role and scope of the technical input being organised - and the role of the other participants in working with the consultant and using the outputs produced through the assignment;
- (2) On the basis of those discussions, agreements and understandings, the project team must prepare a carefully written Terms of Reference for the proposed assignment; these ToR should include a clear specification of the objectives and context of the assignment, of the activities to be undertaken, of the outputs to be delivered, and the time-frame for the assignment. Terms of Reference should also include specification of supervision arrangements and reporting requirements, as well as payment schedules and conditions. (Examples of ToR are included in Part C of this Source Book.) In the majority of SCP projects the external funds have been channelled through UNDP and hence the pay-scales for national consultants are fixed by UNDP.
- (3) Based on the written ToR, offers should be invited from suitable consultants (or firms) and, through a clearly specified process the best candidates should be chosen. The key criteria for choice among consultants are normally professional training and background, experience in similar work, and availability for the time and timing required. It is extremely important that the process of selecting consultants is open and “transparent”, with clearly specified criteria and selection objectively based on CVs and qualifications of consultants and firms. The SCP project must be seen to be corruption-free in this regard.

- (4) Systematic arrangements for supervision of these technical inputs is vital. A clear reporting framework and a clear specification of supervisory responsibility must be agreed at the beginning - and be understood by all parties: consultant, Working Group, Coordinator, and project management. The project team must also put in place a mechanism for regular reporting of progress, checking against agreed benchmarks and outputs.
- (5) It is ultimately the responsibility of the project team to ensure the success of consultant or sub-contract technical inputs, and they should actively guide the whole process, intervening where necessary to keep things moving in the right direction. Project management should take a proactive role.

Working Groups in almost all SCP projects have benefited from special technical inputs provided through consultants and sub-contacts; indeed, in many cases these special inputs have proved critical in the success of particular Working Group activities and tasks. However, things have certainly not always progressed smoothly! There have been quite a few disappointments, with technical inputs that failed to produce what was needed, or failed to do so on time, or provided technical support of poor and unreliable quality. Although project teams are naturally reluctant to do so, in some cases consultant contracts had to be terminated, and/or fees be withheld or reduced, because of poor performance.

The reasons for these difficulties are various, but a few common features stand out.

First, a thorough and tightly-written Terms of Reference, with clear specification of tasks and activities and outputs, is absolutely essential for keeping the consultant (or firm) on the right tract. Consultants hired without written ToR, or with brief and generalised ToR, tended to cause more difficulties than those working under properly prepared ToR. Ambiguous or vague ToR cause misunderstanding and create loop-holes which allow consultants to interpret the job as they see fit. (If the original ToR are later seen to have been too tight or too narrow, they can always be loosened or re-oriented by mutual agreement - but it is almost impossible to tighten up ToR which were originally too loose.

Second, regular supervision and monitoring is also vital; proper guidance from the project team - delivered at the proper time - is extremely valuable in helping to ensure proper performance. The project team must take responsibility for detailed monitoring of inputs and outputs, to ensure proper progress according to agreed timetables and benchmarks.

Third, it is important to get the right kind of consultants; for instance, very senior academics or researchers tend to consider their knowledge superior to that of the project team or Working Group members and it has often proved difficult to supervise and monitor them and to keep them focused on the tasks actually specified in the assignment. For another example, it is important to have consultants who will actually give the time specified in the contract; there is sometimes a tendency to “double-book” their working time making it difficult for them to actually complete the assignment on the agreed schedule.

An enormous amount of time is required for properly mobilising and supervising consultants, and this can be quite a burden for a small project team. Indeed, in many cities it proved to demand more time and energy than could be made available. This was one of the reasons that led Ismailia to select one consultancy firm to execute a whole variety of tasks under two major “umbrella” contracts: Working Group Technical Support and Detailed Project Development. This approach requires the existence of competent and reliable consulting firms with the size and capability to undertake such large umbrella contracts - a situation which certainly does not hold in all countries. However, provided that the firm is selected in a genuinely competitive manner and that it has a clear “track-record” in such work, the arrangement will provide three advantages: *one*, it will be easier to negotiate and interact with one firm rather than a multitude of individual consultants; *two*, it gives some flexibility in the utilisation of the total available resources among the different components of the contracts, which allows responsiveness to the evolving needs of the Working Groups; and *three*, it gives a longer time frame of involvement allowing the consultants to become more familiar with the SCP process and thereby also to respond better to the support needs of the Working Groups.

Finally, it should be emphasised that consultancy in support of the Working Groups should be seen as more than simply the production of specified outputs. The consultancy support inputs should also be seen as important parts of the overall *capacity-building process*. Thus, one measure of success should be the degree to which Working Groups members and other participants have indeed benefited from the consultancy intervention. Emphasis should be on a two-way knowledge building process, with consultants and Working Groups member interacting constructively.

This is easier said than done, however. It took the consultants assigned to the Ismailia city demonstration project, for example, quite a long time to appreciate this aspect of their role. This role would require the consultants to perceive the Working Groups as their “clients”, identify knowledge and capacity gaps and respond to such gaps, better involve members in substantive undertakings, present research findings in a language intelligible to the Working Groups, be open and flexible to accommodate comments and views expressed in Working Group meetings, etc. Doing this will require attitudes and skills which go beyond professional qualifications. As the consultancy firm contracted for technical support in Ismailia came to realise how demanding such a task is, it took two concrete steps to meet the challenges: *one*, it assigned a highly qualified urban planner with extensive experience in grass-roots and participatory processes as the team leader and point person coordinating all the support activities; and *two*, it increased the time allocated to field work (in Ismailia) versus the home based work in Cairo. This gave a big push to the capacity building efforts.

B6.5 Special Technical Support Arrangements

Ideally the issue-specific Working Groups will have several knowledgeable persons and technical specialists among their members. Such members can then support the Working Groups by acting as “resource persons” who provide special technical expertise. Indeed, when organising Working

Groups in the first place, the project team should try to ensure that some such people are included as members.

Even if sufficient technical expertise is not immediately available from among the Working Group members, it may be desirable to recruit “resource persons” from other sources and bring them in as Working Group members, either permanently or for particular periods of work. Such resource persons could be drawn from among:

- public sector agencies (experienced civil servants);
- private sector (working in business or as consultants);
- NGOs (retired and active professionals);
- universities and research institutions.

The role of resource person could often require extra effort and time, and therefore it may in some circumstances be appropriate to compensate resource persons, even if they are members of the Working Groups. This is tricky, of course, because it introduces a distinction among Working Group members between those who do or do not receive compensation. It also runs the serious danger of making the other Working Group members (those who are not designated resource persons) feel that they do not need to provide any significant inputs themselves. In many cases, therefore, it is better to avoid compensation and simply try to ensure that enough Working Group members are able - and willing - to offer their technical expertise as part of their “normal” work as a Working Group member.

City experience has confirmed the importance of special topics which are of general applicability - such as gender aspects, poverty, mapping and use of Geographical Information Systems, Environmental Management Information Systems (EMIS), project preparation and profiling, etc. These topics prove to be important for many aspects of work in almost all of the various Working Groups, regardless of their environmental issue. However, people with knowledge and experience in these cross-cutting topics may not be found on many - or even any - of the Working Groups, because the Working Groups are organised by environmental issue.

It is therefore sometimes helpful for the project team to organise special “resource groups” - basically, small teams of people with expertise in techniques and topics which cut across the environmental issues on which the Working Groups are organised. This can be done by mobilising resource persons from a variety of stakeholder organisations and other sources, perhaps with direct support from one of the project team staff and using materials and backup support from the SCP core of UN-HABITAT/UNEP. In some cases, it might be useful to have the group of resource persons working with an expert who is hired through a consultant contract. Such “resource groups” could support the Working Groups through activities such as:

- organising small workshops and seminars, aimed at the Issue-specific Working Groups, to familiarise their members with the significance and scope of the special cross-cutting topics
- orienting project consultants (working for specific Working Groups) in the cross-cutting topic to assist them

- developing small working papers and information documents to summarise the special cross-cutting topic and suggest how it could fit into the work of the issue-specific Working Groups
- developing a data base of relevant resource persons and institutions in the local area.

*Box 10:
City Experiences in
Organising
Technical Support*

In most SCP cities the project team is small and therefore limited in its ability to directly provide technical support to the Working Groups. In Concepción and Dar es Salaam, however, the project teams were larger groups of professionals with sufficient strength to coordinate the Working Groups as well as provide more substantive issue-specific technical support. The project team in Concepción, for example, was involved in formulating a regional planning framework for the development of urban centres and the tourism sector, and in Dar es Salaam, the project team was able to develop, with technical support from the SCP Core Team in Nairobi, the Strategic Urban Development Planning framework for the whole city.

Almost all SCP cities have some experience in tapping the expertise available in universities and research institutes. In Dar es Salaam, a local training institute was contracted to support the Working Group process. The new planning paradigm introduced through the city demonstration project has aroused interest among the professionals drawn from the institute and has stimulated them to think towards integrating the SCP planning approach into the teaching curricula of the institute. In Ibadan also a local institute was contracted to help develop a digitised base map for the city, while a number of academics from the University of Ibadan were directly involved in Working Groups activities. The Suez Canal University in Ismailia was contracted to carry out a year-round water quality test of Lake Timsah, while a large number of academics, including the President and Vice President of the University, were active participants of the Working Groups. In Concepción, an inter-sectoral group working on the problem of industrial risk has stimulated university-industry cooperation, primarily geared to the establishment of a data base. Three lessons of experience can be drawn: *first*, tapping the potential of universities should be based on a serious assessment of what they are in reality good at - as well as an appreciation of what universities may not be good at; *second*, constructive collaboration needs to evolve through concrete joint activities and projects on the ground; and *third*, broader and long term thematic topics should be identified around which collaboration with academic and research institutes could continue to develop.

B7

Running Working Groups Effectively: The Routines

With hard work and good cooperation from stakeholders, perhaps Working Groups have been set up - with the right sort of members, with proper political commitment, and with the appropriate technical and other support. This would be an excellent start. **But**, to make the Working Group process function successfully requires effective techniques and routines for organising and conducting Working Group meetings, in order to run them in the most productive and business like fashion.

Remember, for each of the stakeholders, participation in the Working Groups costs time and effort - time which they must take away from other activities and commitments (what is called an “opportunity cost”). For private sector businessmen, senior public sector decision makers, and busy professionals, this “opportunity cost” is likely to be quite high - each hour of meeting time for such stakeholders costs them a lot. It is therefore crucial that the time spent in Working Group meetings is useful, productive - and worth their valuable time. If meetings are felt to be disorganised, unfocused, unproductive - then attendance will surely begin to fall, and it will become very difficult to maintain enthusiasm for active participation.

Thus, a central challenge is to make Working Group activities stimulating, productive, and valuable to the members - so they will participate actively and reliably. The Working Group meetings should be businesslike (effective, no time-wasting) and exciting (creative, participatory). They must be clearly quite different from “ordinary” meetings (of which there are far too many). Members should feel that they benefit from the *process* of the Working Group activities - and they should also feel that they and their organisations gain concrete benefits from the *outputs* of the Working Groups. The way in which Working Group meetings are organised and, especially, conducted will largely determine whether all this can be achieved - and whether the Working Groups are successful.

B7.1 Setting up and Running the Meetings

Scheduling and Calling Meetings. The best situation is for Working Group meetings to take place on a regular basis, so that members can incorporate the agreed schedule into their own agendas and time-planning. (This helps increase attendance.) So at an early meeting, it is desirable for members discuss and agree a set time which could be fixed as the “regular” meeting time - for instance, the second Monday afternoon of the month, or the first and third Thursday mornings. In this case, when a schedule of meetings has been agreed in advance, it is usually sufficient for the Coordinator or project team to send out two reminders: one, which includes the agenda for the coming meeting, about ten days ahead of time and in writing (letter or fax), and a second reminder (which could be by telephone) about three days before the meeting.

However, regular meetings are usually supplemented by occasional extra meetings, typically in relation to unforeseen events or changed situations.

It can sometimes be very important to have such meetings, and so the ability to react quickly and flexibly is vital. (See Box 11) In the case of these unscheduled meetings, special care must be taken to ensure that all members are given as much notice as possible - preferably first by a quick telephone call and then with a written follow-up (if time permits); in addition, they should be given full information about the reason for the meeting - why it is being called and what the topic(s) will be.

*Box 11:
Example of
Unscheduled
WG Meeting*

Working Group members, or perhaps the Project Director, may learn about new developments or issues that would be of interest to the Working Groups. This was the case in Ismailia. The Project Director met key city, village and Governorate councillors, community activists and decision makers almost on a daily basis. Her position in the "Land Allocation Committee" of the Governorate, for instance, has been wisely used to inform the members of the relevant Working Groups and help fine-tune their focus. In one incident, after being informed about official approval to locate a new hospital on land preserved for Green Space, the urban development Working Group reacted immediately with a clear position and convincing alternative proposal that was strong enough to lead the Governor of Ismailia to reverse the decision.

Another point to remember concerns local cultural norms and expectations. Varying according to the local customs, there may be sensitivities to status and hierarchy which need to be taken into account when sending out invitations for meetings. Thus, although the Coordinators (and/or the project team) will be responsible for organising meetings and setting them up, it may in some cases be necessary for invitations or reminders to be sent out through different channels, or with the signature of certain people, so that the communications are considered appropriate and courteous - and authoritative - according to local norms of behaviour.

Meeting content and Agenda. To function properly, every Working Group meeting, whether regularly scheduled or special, must have a clear and well-organised order of business - an **agenda**. When meetings are taking place on a regular schedule, it is possible for the Working Group members to agree, at the end of a meeting, the main points of business for the next meeting. It is then the job of the WG Coordinator to take that agreement and organise the next meeting around it, including preparation (and circulation in advance) of an agenda. In the case of a special meeting, outside the normal schedule, the WG Coordinator must take the initiative to quickly prepare an agenda and send it to the members.

However it may be done, *there should always be a well-prepared agenda for every WG meeting.*

It is strongly recommended that an overall framework (**work plan**) for the Working Group be prepared during the first month or two of its operation. Normally done by the Coordinator in collaboration with the project team, this generalised work plan is intended to provide specification of activities and their sequence, within a time-scale keyed to the SCP project framework and time-scale. The generalised work plan for the Working Group will be

structured around the components and phases of the SCP process; its purpose is to provide a broad guideline to Working Group members (and to the Coordinator) so that the progress of the Working Group can be properly gauged. It also helps members to see how activities fit into one another - and to see where they are going, to see their own progress through the overall process. The general work plan also provides a framework within which the individual meeting agendas can be formulated.

The detailed meeting agenda, however, remains the essential tool for organising and guiding meetings and making them successful. This point must be emphasised over and over again. Good meetings do not just ‘happen’ - they must be organised and prepared. An unprepared meeting, without an agenda or with a fuzzy, ill-defined agenda, is simply a disaster waiting to happen!

For this reason, it is important to link the preparation of the agenda to a careful ***budgeting of meeting time***. Time is always a scarce resource, and unless managed well, it will simply be wasted without achieving what was desired or needed. Furthermore, if stakeholders feel that their time is not being properly or effectively used, they will increasingly become detached from the WG process, failing to attend meetings and not giving the WG’s work any priority attention. If the WG goes this way, with inconclusive meetings and failure to achieve visible progress, the process will flounder - and to revive it will not be easy.

Some of the key conditions for successful Working Group meetings are the following:

- (1) Ensure that the topics for the meeting are clearly articulated, sharply focused; and limited in scope. Do not try to have meetings with broad and fuzzy topics. Have clear objectives for the meeting - and make sure all members understand that a Working Group is **not** a ‘discussion club’!
- (2) The Coordinator, assisted by the project team and perhaps by selected WG members, should prepare everything thoroughly, well ahead of the meeting, assembling background material as appropriate, preparing an agenda (and accompanying work sheets, if suitable) and circulating it all in advance. The advance papers should also highlight to points and issues for which the members should come prepared, as well as specific requests for particular members to bring certain ideas and information or perhaps to prepare certain inputs. Meetings without such background material and well-structured preparation can easily degenerate into inconclusive “talk-shops”.
- (3) Work out in advance and announce in clear terms what contributions each stakeholder is expected to make in the meeting; do this routinely at the beginning of each of the meetings. People respond well when they have a well recognised role to play and feel there is a positive purpose to their attendance and participation.
- (4) Use pre-prepared materials - such as fact sheets, thematic maps, lists of concrete questions, and situation summaries - during Working Group meetings. Carefully designed materials like this are very useful in

stimulating structured contributions from the WG members and guiding the group, step-by-step, toward positive conclusions and outputs.

- (4) Ensure the meeting room is amply provided with flip charts, overhead projector, white boards, felt pen markers, pin-boards (map board) for mounting cards and other graphics, and any other useful meeting support facilities. The Coordinator should prepare for and extensively use these facilities - and encourage the WG members to use them as well, as part of their participation in the meeting. (As a priority, the Coordinators should also be given training in the use of visualisation techniques and other techniques of moderating and facilitating meetings.).
- (5) The total time duration for the meeting should be clearly agreed and defined in advance, so that members can commit their time accordingly. It is vital that meetings keep to the agreed schedule - and are not allowed to drag on and run over the allotted time. If the meeting time has been used up and the agenda has not been completed - there are important items still outstanding - then one of three approaches can be taken: (a) ask members how many are able and willing to stay on for another 30 minutes (always use a fixed time for overspill) and carry on if a majority are in favour; or (b) carry the unfinished items over to the next regular meeting; or (c) ask members if they will wish to have a special (extra) meeting just to complete the day's unfinished business.
- (6) Structure the meeting to ensure the best use of the available time and to maintain focus and pace. General experience in small-group meetings suggests the usefulness of a structure such as that shown below. (A similar structure was used in Ismailia for its Working Group meetings.) This example is fitted to a two-and-a-half hour maximum time-slot, with the "unscheduled" 15 minutes being available to cope with a late start and/or slight run-over at the end.

First 15 minutes: Start-up

Summarise the highlights of the previous meeting (but only highlights - do not review the whole meeting or read through formal minutes); ensure all present have copies of all relevant papers (some people may forget to bring along the previously-circulated papers, so have extra copies available); outline the purpose of the day's meeting, with reference to the previously-prepared agenda; introduce those present and describe any special role some of the participants might have during the proceedings.

Next 30 minutes: Setting the Stage

Brief presentation of the situation(s) or topic(s) for the meeting; factual inputs and statements from informed members; presentation of working papers or proposals, if any (often supported by thematic maps or other graphics); final summary by Coordinator (or by the day's discussion leader, if different).

Next 60 minutes: Focused Discussion

Open floor discussion of the prepared topic(s) - with brief interjections by the Coordinator and/or chair person, to underscore key points and also to bring discussion back to the agenda if it wanders away (which it typically will); during this period it is often quite useful for the Coordinator to use cards for recording key points or questions (or some similar facilitation

technique), and it is essential for someone (the Coordinator and/or the project team member present) to keep a good running record of the key points and contributions.

Next 15 minutes: Summarising and Bringing Things Together

The Coordinator (or chairperson) should now summarise the main features and results of the discussion, relating it all clearly back to the agenda; open discussion should be limited to questions and clarifications; consensus should be reached on a common understanding of what gone on and where things stand.

Final 15 minutes: Decisions and Actions

Any decisions made, or needing to be made, should be clarified and agreed; in particular, agreement should be reached on what actions need to be taken, and by whom, between now and the next meeting - together with a clear timetable for anything which needs to be obtained or produced before the meeting; the main focus for the next meeting should also be agreed, and the time of the next meeting confirmed. The meeting should close on this positive note - deliberation - decision - action.

*Box 12:
Participation versus
Efficiency -
A False Choice*

Many people understand and appreciate the benefits of participatory planning and consultative processes, but question its efficiency in decision making. Especially those who are accustomed to hierarchical decision-making authority tend to feel that 'too much discussion' gets in the way of decision-making. Also, professionals and technical specialists sometimes discount the possibility of useful contributions from non-professionals and think that urban environmental issues are too complex for non-technical discussion. Although there is a fundamental misconception and prejudice in such views, it is also true that participatory mechanisms (such as the Working Group process) may - at least initially - be rather time-consuming. However, this participatory process is immensely valuable in building consensus and thereby mobilising resources and cooperation for improved implementation. And with careful planning and facilitation of meetings, the potential difficulties of communication (between professionals and non-professionals) and of excessive (and inconclusive) discussion can be reduced. Indeed, this is one of the key tasks for the project team and the Coordinators, to ensure that the Working Groups achieve a constructive balance between participation and decisiveness.

For example, when moderating meetings, the Coordinator (or other facilitator) must learn to encourage full and constructive participation - including from the non-specialists - while still keeping the discussion focused and on track toward the decisions which need to be made. The facilitation role is certainly crucial in this respect, which is why Coordinators and others should be given proper training in facilitation techniques and methods. This is difficult, but not impossible; in the case of Concepción the project team actively developed their meeting support and facilitation skills and have been conducting the Working Group meetings in a successful and professional manner. Other cities have tried, for instance, to have "pre-meeting" discussions with some or all of the members, to let ideas flow in a less-structured way and to encourage the members to interact informally, as a way of loosening up the barriers to communication.

Finally, it is also important to secure an appropriate location and space (**venue**) for the Working Group meetings. A well-equipped meeting room of the right size, and conveniently located for those attending, is essential. The room needs to have all the relevant meeting aids, and it should have space for maps and displays. The room should be big enough to accommodate the Working Group comfortably (seating twenty for instance: 12 to 15 WG members plus several others such as project team staff, Coordinator, and

perhaps one or two guests). Avoid rooms which are too big for the group; they inhibit discussion and make participants feel uneasy. The furniture and furnishings should be comfortable and functional. In arranging the furniture, always try for a round-table format, with people seated at tables and able to see one another; always avoid lining up in rows - and always avoid having a separate podium or high-table.

Location of Working Group meeting rooms is not critical, so long as the location is reasonably accessible to all those attending - avoid going to nice purpose-built but remote facilities. In many SCP cities, the Working Groups generally meet in rooms which are part of, or quite near, the project offices. This is efficient for servicing the meetings - providing tea/coffee/refreshments, accessing or duplicating documents, relaying messages, etc. Having meeting rooms attached to the project offices is also useful in avoiding possibly awkward choices between facilities offered by different (and perhaps to some degree competing) organisations.

In addition, it is very helpful to have rooms which are devoted exclusively to Working Group use; this allows them to be equipped on a more permanent basis, with useful maps and displays being kept on the walls and added to regularly, for example. Having a fixed venue also gives a sense of continuity to the Working Group.

On the other hand, it is sometimes constructive to hold meetings, at least occasionally, in meeting rooms provided by various WG member organisations, perhaps in rotation. This can help build a sense of ownership and commitment - and it can also help in facilitating communications among Working Group members and their parent organisations. Depending upon local circumstances, this could be done on an occasional basis, with a fixed meeting room (perhaps in the project office) being kept as the “normal” meeting place.

Finally, it is also helpful to organise occasional field visits and field meetings, whereby the members actually go to a site which is relevant for their current deliberations and hold their meeting at or near that site. This requires commitment of somewhat more time - perhaps a half-day - but it can be a boost to both group “spirit” and an aid to discussion of that site-specific topic. It also demonstrates to outsiders that the Working Group is not just a “back-office” activity but one which also comes into the field to see things first-hand.

B7.2 Documenting Working Group Activities

There are three fundamental reasons why systematic documentation of Working Group activities is a crucial function.

First, the SCP process is dynamic and continuously evolving as it progresses over time. In order for the project team to properly manage the city’s SCP project, a lot of information is required - and required to be collected regularly and continuously from all of the Working Groups. This would include information - separately for each of the Working Groups - on items such as the following: the composition of membership (which stakeholders are involved and active), the role played by each of them at the different

stages of the process, changes in perception and understanding of issues, shifts in inter-agency and inter-sectoral relationships observed during the process, structural and institutional constraints encountered on the way, and any key operational lessons learned. All this information documented in a structured format which is both consistent across Working Groups and suitable for use in project management.

Second, the Working Group process is not an end in itself, but is rather a mechanism to address urban environmental issues by way of participatory negotiation, strategy formulation, and action planning. As part of the overall SCP process, the Working Groups are helping the city partners build toward new and more effective approaches to urban environmental management. For the benefit of project management - and also for the benefit of long-term institutionalisation of the process - it is vital that information about the Working Groups (and indeed about all aspects of the SCP process) be systematically documented. Information about what has been going on must be kept - on a continuing basis - following a carefully structured format which will allow meaningful analysis and understanding of what has been happening. This information must be in permanent documented form, freely and widely available.

In other words, it is essential to build an effective “institutional memory” and to promote cumulative learning and continuity - to ensure that the work of the Working Groups is known to and understood by other people in the various stakeholder organisations and not just by the individuals who are Working Group members. In the absence of well thought out and consistently applied documentation procedures, there will be no lasting or institutional memory; instead, all the hard-earned knowledge and lessons of experience will remain in individual personal memories or diaries and never be available for wider use.

Third, as part of the Global Sustainable Cities Programme, cities undertaking SCP projects subscribe to the ideal of sharing lessons of experience with other cities, not only nationally but internationally. Indeed, this is one of the strengths and potential advantages of participating in the global programme. Lack of well established documentation procedures will therefore undermine the role which the city, as part of a mutually beneficial global network, could play in advancing collective knowledge and know-how.

To summarise, there are three main purposes for documenting Working Group activities:

- one, to track the process as it unfolds and evolves, in order to derive lessons of experience applicable to further promoting and consolidating the process;
- two, to systematically construct from the separate Working Group activities, a structured and coherent set of outputs (issue-specific strategies, action plans, and project ideas);
- three, to capture lessons of experience of a general nature with a view to sharing them with other cities participating in the SCP.

Documentation can be carried out in different ways, with the detail, nature and form of documentation varying according to the purpose. In some

cases, for example, summary written records are sufficient; in other cases, maps and statistics and other supporting materials will be needed. To be properly accessible, documentation must be systematic, and stored and held in a way which allows them to be readily identified and consulted. So far as possible; all key documents should be converted to computer-based records; this vastly simplifies the task of access and transfer of information.

As an illustration, proper Working Group Documentation could include the following:

- (a) issue-specific case studies (e.g. “Solid Waste Collection in the City”). This would document the progress achieved in addressing a particular issue, looking at progress and changing circumstances over time, with the situation at the start of Working Group activities taken as the base line or reference point. New approaches, policy changes, and management tools which showed themselves to be helpful and successful can also be shared with other cities in the global SCP programme;
- (b) Issue-specific strategy development worksheets*, which highlight the analysis and conclusions leading to the issue-specific strategies and action plans which were developed; these worksheets should provide an overview of the problem; the key stakeholders, the roles they played, the strategy options considered, and the positions of the key stakeholders vis a vis those options.
- (c) A chronological record of activities and events (a sort of Working Group diary) and records of especially noteworthy events in the life of the Working Group.
- (d) A synthesis report highlighting the progress of the city’s SCP process overall, building upon the work of all the various Working Groups.
- (e) A narrative report of any demonstration projects initiated by the Working Group - the process of formulation, implementation and their results, etc.

* Where necessary, these must be accompanied by strategy maps.

Documentation is a very necessary task - and a challenging one. It must be done on a continuous basis. Efforts to go back and reconstruct events are seldom effective; recording and documenting **at the time** is the only approach which works. Thus, documentation is one of the functions that needs to be *institutionalised* in the whole SCP project process. Institutionalising the documentation function - building it into the routines of operational activity - will enable it to capture events and lessons as they occur, but it will also have the benefit of providing a firm basis for continuing the process after the end of the SCP project.

The experience of the SCP cities has confirmed the need for institutionalising the process; that experience shows clearly that documenting, synthesising and disseminating information and operational lessons can *not* be handled on *ad hoc* basis. There must be a clear institutional arrangement, and it is the responsibility of the SCP project team to ensure that an appropriate arrangement is put in place, as early as possible in the project. The following are some of the possible arrangement cities could adapt:

- Assign a full time information officer whose task will also include supervising and guiding documentation, information dissemination, and also measuring progress in the SCP process.
- Alternatively, assign a project team member to be personally responsible for formulating and implementing documentation procedures in the project as a whole, as one of his/her prime duties. (This might usefully be combined with the role of Training Officer.)
- Contract a selected partner (preferably a learning or research institution) to be responsible for implementing the documentation and information process, perhaps linking the documentation exercise to the training function and to development of training materials and curricula.
- Organise workshops which are tightly structured around the elements of the SCP/EPM analytical framework and assign particular authors (stakeholder, consultant, other) to prepare and present full-fledged case studies. (Outlines for issue-specific case studies and for synthesis reports are shown in Part C of this Source Book.)
- Actively promote cooperation with local universities and teaching institutions, such that case studies from the SCP project will be documented (by staff or students) for use in teaching programmes.

*Box 13:
Some City Experiences
in Documentation*

In many cities, dossiers have been compiled for each Working Group (or for each issue), intended to include documentation on all the various Working Group activities and including proposition and discussion papers, sector studies, minutes of meetings, etc. - filed in chronological order. However, these dossiers are often incomplete and not organised in line with the key items and activities of the SCP process, making it difficult to quickly find related items and to put together the relevant items of information that need to be joined, for example to formulate an issue-specific strategy. This was revealed in Dar es Salaam during the Strategic Urban Development Planning exercise. Whilst the Coordinators knew and could personally recollect what had happened in their respective Working Groups, getting this same information in a readily retrievable and transmittable format was not easy. In fact, the Coordinators had to work backwards to reconnect the end-results with the thinking and negotiation process that took place in the Working Groups and led to those results.

Information and documentation should also include consideration of public relations and awareness raising. Being preoccupied with day-to-day activities, SCP cities have had little time to write an article or produce a good quality documentary video for public consumption. Increasingly, however, cities have come to realise that publicising the activities of the Working Groups is one of the most powerful tools of public education and communication and a means for forging popular and political support. There are encouraging experiences in this respect. In Ismailia, the SCP project together with an NGO working in the field of sustainable development has published and widely circulated a magazine highlighting the issues which the different working groups were dealing with, and was planning to initiate a quarterly newsletter. At the peak period of Working Groups activity, Ismailia also succeeded in getting a weekly column in a leading national newspaper in which an assigned journalist would follow-up and write articles on the various environmental issues of the city. Though not sustained, Ibadan too has published a newsletter which provided an overview of the different issues and working groups. Ibadan, Ismailia and Dar es Salaam have each produced a video documentary film. Katowice encouraged citizens to walk in to the project office, at a specified weekly time (known as the "Info-Hour"), for an open discussion on any subject of their interest. They also produced a Polish-language occasional newsletter, with the assistance of an experienced "populariser".

A related aspect is *dissemination* of the information which is documented. Effective dissemination requires, among other things, that information about the project is sufficient in detail and breadth, is up-to-date - and is easily and readily accessible. Dissemination is facilitated, for instance, by keeping a clear and up-to-date filing and indexing system which allows interested partners to know what exists and to actually get at it quickly. But remember: in a few months of operation, what has been generated through the Working Groups can become a large collection of material amounting to a small library. The quantity is potentially so large, that you must have a standardised referencing and filing or storage system in place from the beginning. Without such a system, the documentation process will probably just generate boxes full of papers which no one can figure out, much less make use of. Documentation is only useful if the information documented is knowable and accessible.

The range of “documents” and information materials which you may wish to hold and store in a readily accessible and useable way might include the following items which will typically be generated through the activities of the Working Groups:

- issue-specific technical reports, proposition papers and related technical data useful for project development and physical monitoring;
- work sheets used by Working Groups during development of strategies and action plans;
- investment project profiles;
- sector and/or sub-sector plans;
- urban development plans;
- indexed source and thematic maps;
- action plans;
- chronologically organised minutes of Working Groups meetings;
- compendium of on-going and pipe-line projects relevant to the different priority issues;
- stakeholder data base;
- data base of consultants and TORs;
- consultant reports and materials;
- database on relevant funding agencies and sources;
- training materials;
- electronic, printed, visual and audio documentation of local initiatives and achievements;
- reports and materials on relevant legislation and on administrative systems;
- city and/or agency development budgets;
- articles and news reports clipped from local and national news media;
- project progress and monitoring reports.

B8**Motivating Working Group Members**

For the Working Group process to succeed, the members - the people who actually attend meetings and do the work - must feel committed to it and feel **motivated** to stick with it and make it a success. Experience shows, however, that it is not easy to generate or sustain adequate motivation among Working Group members. It is in fact a complicated and difficult - but very important - task.

The Working Group process (indeed, the whole SCP process) is built around stakeholder participation, which is assumed to generate motivation through direct self-interest and sharing in responsibilities. But this linkage between participation and motivation may not work so well in practice. For example, although public sector organisations are key stakeholders in the process, the representative who sits on the Working Group will have only an indirect “stake” in the process, especially those who work in large departments or agencies. The Chairperson of a CBO or the owner of a private business, on the other hand, is likely to have a more clearly direct interest; but that interest is likely to be relatively more narrow, which would motivate them to be involved in some aspects of Working Group activities but not in others.

In addition, in many countries professionals in public sector departments are poorly paid and have difficult working conditions - factors which may make it hard for them to generate great enthusiasm on behalf of their organisation. Also, the Working Groups will often demand more work than simply attending meetings, but this extra work will tend to fall on a small number of the members (those with the expertise and capabilities to deal with it), and this can cause feelings of unfairness, with some members spending much more time and effort than others.

Hence, at the practical level, one needs to carefully consider the issues of motivation, and consider ways in which the project can increase motivation and active interest. The primary motivating features, of course, will be non-financial - SCP projects do not have funds to pay for Working Group attendance, and in any case the idea of payment runs against the basic participation-motivation principle of the SCP. Nonetheless, in some cities (particularly in Africa) have found it necessary and useful to provide some modest level of financial reimbursement.

Taking the non-financial incentives first, there are many approaches which can be taken, including the following:

- Ensure due and visible recognition for the members’ work; this can include such things as being mentioned by name in the Minutes or reports, or letters from the Coordinator or Project Director to their immediate superiors in appreciation of their work, or ensuring that they are mentioned in public information materials, especially those which go to the media.
- Rotate the venue of Working Group meetings: this will lend a certain prestige to the member whose organisation is hosting the meeting, as well as help more generally to build a sense of collective ownership among members.

- Make the meetings stimulating and genuinely interesting to the members: if they feel intellectually stimulated by the Working Group meetings, and feel that they really gain something personally from the experience, they will be strongly motivated to continue active participation.
- Provide training and other special opportunities: give the Working Group members access to the various training activities that the project undertakes, as well as special training exercises which might be relevant; organise field trips and similar activities in relation to the Working Group, to add variety and interest to the work.
- Change the perception of members (and their organisations) so that the SCP Working Group is seen as a logical and constructive part of their “normal” work and not as some “extra” and in parallel.
- Ensure that all members regularly receive copies of the reports, maps, analyses, information and other materials generated through the Working Group; if these materials are useful to them in their day-to-day work, that will provide an additional motivation for participation.
- In general, do everything possible to make all members feel that their personal participation really does make a difference.

Nonetheless, in some cities it was considered essential to provide some form of financial incentive for Working Group members. This may occur because it is the “norm” in that city for public sector workers to receive extra pay or allowances for any duties which take them out of their office and away from their normal work. It may occur because low pay means that, in practice, virtually all technical staff hold two jobs and thus extra time (in the Working Group) may in fact mean loss of income from the other job. There can be no generalisations; the context for financial incentives is different in each city. (There are also many SCP cities in which no financial incentives are considered; they might be illegal as well as unconventional.)

When financial incentives are used, they must be handled with great care for a number of very important reasons:

- **cost** (even small payment multiplied by many people and many meetings can add up to a large sum - and most SCP project budgets are quite limited);
- **sustainability** (do not introduce under the project a payment system that cannot be continued after the end of the project);
- **equity** (payments to Working Group members may cause feelings of unfairness among their colleagues at work who are not members);
- **efficiency** (payments made simply for attending meetings or being a member do not encourage *active* or meaningful participation);
- **credibility** (it can damage the reputation of the Working Group SCP process if there is an idea that people participate only to get the financial reward).

If financial incentives are used, they should be very carefully designed, with the above points kept in mind. For example, set the level of remuneration no more than (or even somewhat below) the levels paid to similar people in similar situations locally. Also, try as far as possible to vary any payments, so they reflect to some degree the actual work done by different members. This might mean a small flat rate for meeting attendance, topped up with additional payments for specific outputs produced (or specific additional tasks undertaken) between meetings.

In Accra, Ibadan and Dar es Salaam transport allowances were paid, and this was well justified as the participants in some cases had to travel quite a distance for attending Working Group functions. The problem was sustainability, as this payment depended upon the availability of project funds. In fact, failure to pay transport allowances was cited as the single most important factor for explaining the highly skewed pattern of working groups meetings in Dar es Salaam. Interestingly, the SCP project in Dar es Salaam came up with an innovative idea of sustaining payments to participants by allocating funds from revenues of the City Council which were generated as the result of implementing projects proposed by the Working Groups. If this is realised, it might have the effect of transforming Working Groups into collective enterprises, generating more value-added that justifies their existence. Ismailia too used to pay sitting allowances for Working Group members, but later replaced this with just top-ups for Coordinators and Working Group members who provided special expertise or produced research outputs.

*Box 14:
Financial Incentives -
City Experiences*

B9

Sustaining the Process: a Prime Agenda From Day One

As emphasised throughout this Source Book, Working Groups are at the heart of the SCP approach. They are a mechanism for consensus building in decision making and serve as the inter-sectoral and inter-agency links in addressing priority issues and improving information flows. They are a vehicle for mobilising resources and strengthening implementation capacities. Gradually, the Working Groups will nurture new attitudes among the city's different stakeholders, helping them to develop new perspectives on environmental planning and management and to use new tools and approaches to overcome traditional sectoral and organisational barriers.

But the full impact of such changes will only be felt when the Working Group approach is internalised or anchored within the existing structure - when it is well understood, accepted, and consistently and routinely applied in urban development management. This is called "institutionalisation" (and

it is dealt with in detail in Volume 5 of the SCP Source Book series). The ultimate objective of the SCP project is to help the city improve its environmental planning and management process - improvements which will continue *after* the SCP city project itself has ended. Institutionalisation is thus the key to **sustainability** of the new SCP/EPM process.

Institutionalisation is a complex and daunting task which takes place and develops over a long time period. It is difficult to define or establish from the beginning the behavioural and organisational changes that will be necessary for institutionalising the process in a particular city. In addition, there are always specific local factors which also influence the manner and form in which a particular city will accommodate and internalise the Working Group approach and other elements of the SCP process. Therefore, institutionalisation should be viewed as an continuous process within the overall SCP framework, a process which is manifested through steady incremental changes in attitudes and behaviour, absorption of new approaches, shifts in routines and patterns of inter-agency relations, modifications in formal and informal mandates, strengthening in knowledge and capacities, etc.;

Institutionalisation, therefore, should be seen as an integral part of the whole SCP process - it is *not* a separate element or component, and it is certainly *not* something which can be “left for later” and picked up at the end of the project. On the contrary, from day one, a primary tasks of an SCP city project should be to stimulate the stakeholders to think about where and how the Working Group approach could be anchored and sustained after the project is terminated. In other words, from the very beginning, the Working Group participants (and the project team) should be thinking about what the situation will be *after* the project has finished.

Failing to do this will encourage participants to perceive the Working Groups as parallel activities which are separate from their “real” work. The Working Groups may then be seen as purely a special project organisation, and the stakeholder institutions will keep them separate, thus undermining the chances of success in changing the city’s attitudes to environmental planning and management - and especially in sustaining such changes.

It is vital that the project team, the Coordinators and the Working Group members understand the need for conscious action, starting from the very beginning of the project, to build in a long-term process of Institutionalisation.

A process of institutionalisation of the Working Group approach can be seen as concerned with the following five elements:

(1) Introducing a participatory approach to decision making.

Working Groups are the vehicle of participatory planning and decision making. The Working Groups themselves are not permanent establishments: a Working Group is established whenever there is an important cross-cutting issue to be dealt with; but as soon as the issue is satisfactorily resolved, the functions, results and capacities achieved and built through the Working Group will be internalised within the participating institutions and organisations, making the existence of the Working Group as such no longer necessary. But as new issues arise

and are seen to require cross-cutting participatory mechanisms, then new Working Groups could be established. Thus, institutionalising the participatory approach to planning and decision-making means ensuring that the Working Group approach is a well-understood and firmly accepted way of resolving cross-cutting issues. This is achieved by *demonstrating* (through the SCP project) the advantages and benefits of the Working Group approach and by thus changing attitudes and perceptions; and this cannot be done through administrative reorganisation, legislation or decree. ,

(2) Ensuring that the Working Groups and their activities are perceived as part of the existing institutions and system - and not as something separate and parallel.

It is part of the underlying rationale of the SCP Working Groups that stakeholder institutions and groups are directly represented, and that those representatives will provide the effective link between the Working Group and the participating organisations. It is expected, therefore, that these people will ensure their parent organisations correctly understand the integral relationship with the Working Group. However, such expectations are not always realised in practice, for a number of reasons. For example, the representation itself (Working Group membership) might be incomplete, with some stakeholders being left out; if the membership is too narrow, the sense of “connectedness” may become lost. Or it may be the case that those representing their organisations could lack the necessary level of seniority and influence to adequately fulfil their expected “ambassadorial” role. And in any case, the existence of an externally funded project tends to encourage people - and organisations - to view the activities of that project as separate, disconnected, and not really part of their long-term work. Sadly, this is especially true in cities which have considerable experience of externally-assisted projects, most of which have been run, deliberately or otherwise, as separated or even isolated activities; this may make it difficult to convince people that the SCP approach is genuinely different.

To counter some of these potential problems, a number of steps could be taken, including the following:

- Constant monitoring - and where appropriate, modifying - the composition of Working Groups to ensure that they reflect the appropriate stakeholders and at the right level and type of representation.
- Regular briefing and informing of senior decision makers, to constantly emphasise the inter-connectedness of the Working Group activities and their organisations.
- Negotiating with department heads and municipal committees to include, into their normal reporting routines, information on progress of the relevant Working Groups, their role in them, and the relevance of those activities to their own organisations.
- Instituting the practice of regular public hearings, at local and city levels, on issues being addressed by Working Groups.
- Organising occasional consultative meetings with particular stakeholder groups or sectors, to inform them and to emphasise their actual and potential role.
- Designating properly-briefed focal persons in each of the key institutions.

(3) Internalising functions and tools introduced and capacities built through the Working Groups into the appropriate institutions .

Institutionalisation in this respect could involve a variety of different approaches, including the following:

- (a) Addressing an issue in a certain way might entail the creation of a new function or strengthening and expanding an already existing function; privatisation of solid waste collection, for example, could require strengthening the contracting and quality supervision functions of the responsible city organisation.
- (b) The technical support functions which were discussed in Chapter B6 have to be maintained in some way after the end of the project, and this could entail moving the project staff functions (and personnel) into an appropriate organisation in the existing permanent structure; this could also be done by providing specific training for existing staff or perhaps arranging a technical support contract with a local university or research institution.
- (c) Focus on fine-tuning and adapting planning and management tools developed through Working Groups and incorporating them into day-to-day use in relevant stakeholder organisations. Such tools could include: the process-oriented tools such as those used in conducting city consultations and preparing the environmental profile, or issue-specific tools that have been developed during the course of action planning, or tools and principles that have been derived from lessons of experience in implementing demonstration projects, or resource allocation and prioritisation tools such as criteria applied for prioritising investment projects, etc..
- (d) Concentrate on filling institutional gaps that might have been detected in specific areas like urban encroachment, informal settlements, urban lakes, industrial waste management, etc., by giving new or expanded mandates and functions to existing institutions, together with the necessary expertise.

(4) Sustaining the internalised functions and capacities:

For capacities and functions to be sustained, they must be backed up by adequate resources, political support and institutional stability. Finding institutions which are able and willing to take up the Working Group functions and to attract and maintain able professionals to support them is a difficult task in practice.

(5) Creating a monitoring and evaluation system:

The final key element of institutionalisation is building a monitoring mechanism that allows progress to be measured consistently and steadily, in a way which provides the information necessary for making improvements and modifications along the way. Monitoring functions, indicators, and procedures need to be established at three levels: one, at the level of measuring progress in improving the physical

environment; two, at the level of the SCP project itself and its achievements of its objectives and success criteria; and three, at the level of measuring progress in adapting the SCP process in general and the working group approach in particular as a day-to-day management routine. In many ways, this latter is the most crucial form of monitoring, especially for long-term sustainability and institutionalisation of the process (see Box 16).

As emphasised repeatedly, a Working Group is not a permanent establishment, but exists only according to need. Generally speaking, a typical Working Group passes through the following phases:

Start-up: A Working Group starts with a small core, consisting of the prime stakeholders in relation to that issue.

Expansion: The Working Group Gradually expands in size and adjusts in composition to accommodate all the relevant stakeholders. This will also coincide with a higher intensity of activity and group functions, culminating with the generation of strategies, action plans and project proposals.

Maturity: Working Group functions will become routine and regular, and their activities will start to be internalised into the key stakeholder agencies that have formed the core part of the group. Successful initiatives would be replicated and expanded, being picked up by other groups and interests. The Working group will be primarily concerned with monitoring of the implementation of agreed actions.

Termination: It may seem ironic, but the successful maturity of a Working Group should lead to its own termination, as its activities and ideas and functions are institutionalised into participating organisations and stakeholder groups. Though it ceases to exist as a separate Working Group, the ideas and understandings, strategies, action plans, demonstration projects, information system and other tools developed through its work will be carried on through the relevant stakeholders.

*Box 15:
How Long Will a
Working Group
Last?*

Box 16:
Measuring Progress

The ultimate objective of the SCP process, and of the Working Groups, is to embody new approaches and methods of environmental planning and management. It is to change attitudes and behaviour, to cultivate new ways of doing things; and all of these changes are gradual. Because these changes are gradual and *qualitative*, there is no easy way to attach number values to what is happening - no way to measure *quantitatively*. That is one of the difficulties the SCP faces in responding to challenges which ask “how much has been achieved?” and “how far has the new process been taken up?”

Despite these difficulties, it remains very important to measure progress in the Working Group process: to monitor the effectiveness of the Working Groups, to make timely adjustments as and when necessary, and also to provide a more confident picture to interested decision makers, researchers, and donors. The Sustainable Cities Programme core team and its partners in the Urban environment Forum (UEF) have been working to develop just such a methodology, which is being elaborated in Volume 9 of the SCP Source Book series - *Measuring Progress in EPM*. The new Measuring Progress tool provides a list of possible process and management indicators and illustrates their applications in an SCP project context. The methodology helps capture key qualitative features of Working Groups like participation and the potential impact they have on improving development and environmental management, using indirect measures (“proxies”) as well as techniques of ordinal ranking, subject valuation, etc.

The SCP Source Book Series, Volume 3
Establishing and Supporting a Working Group
Process

Part C

Examples, Illustrations and Supporting Material

C1

Glossary - Explanation of Terms

This Glossary is a list of words or terms, in alphabetical order, with an explanation or elaboration of their meaning. Its purpose is to help explain the particular meaning of words or terms *as they are used in the SCP project context*. The listing given here therefore includes *only* terms and words which are relevant for understanding the SCP process - and in particular, for understanding the Working Group process. (Different Glossaries are given in the different SCP Source Book volumes, each focused on terminology related to the subject of that volume.)

In most SCP cities, English is not the mother language for the people working in the SCP project; this is true even in cities where professionals may perhaps use English even on a daily basis in their working lives. For this reason, it is highly recommended that the Glossary is carefully translated into the most appropriate local language(s) and freely distributed, certainly to all those involved in the Working Group process.

Change Agents:

Strategically positioned individuals who understand and appreciate the possibilities inherent in the SCP approach - and who have the commitment and capability to positively influence people and organisations to accept and eventually incorporate the Working Group process into their routine operations and behaviour.

City Consultation:

The City Consultation is a crucial event within the SCP project process. Taking place at the end of Phase One of the SCP process, it brings together and builds on the work done during that Phase, consolidates social and political participation and support, and launches the SCP project into Phase Two. The City Consultation should give firm approval to the SCP Working Group process and to the priority topics for which Working Groups will be established; it is thus a vital step in establishing the Working Groups and giving them credibility and authority (“mandate”). (Volume 2 in this series of SCP Source Books provides detailed guidance on the organisation and running of the City Consultation.)

Community Based Organisation (CBO):

These are organisations based in and working in one or more local communities (neighbourhoods or districts); they are normally private, charitable (non-profit) organisations which are run by and for the local community. Typically, they were created in response to some particular local need or situation - often related to the local environment - and they usually support a variety of specific local improvement actions (for instance, environmental up-grading, youth education, employment promotion, etc) which are generally undertaken by or with the local people.

Coordinating Working Group:

Composed of the Coordinators of the issue-specific Working Groups together with project staff, the Coordinating Working Group meets

regularly to exchange information and inform each other of progress, to coordinate across Working Groups and their activities, and to help bring together and reconcile strategies and other outputs coming from the different Working Groups.

Environmental Management Information System (EMIS):

An EMIS is an organised process through which information relevant for environmental management is identified, generated, and utilised in a routine manner. It is a tool, when it becomes relatively functional, which directs and guides investment and city development along a sustainable path. EMIS in the SCP context is developed on the basis of a systematic spatial analysis of specific issues, geographic distribution of resources and related environmental sensitivities. It portrays spatial development options and opportunities which allow the prioritisation of development areas, the guidance and optimisation of investment and the factoring-in of long-term environmental costs in development. EMIS consists of layers of maps, spatial attributes, parameters and criteria for prioritisation; and 'rules' and development conditions defined and negotiated by stakeholders to influence the development pattern of a city

Environmental Planning & Management (EPM):

This is a general term which refers to the over-all processes through which a city's environment is (or can be) managed. It emphasises the close inter-relationship between urban development and urban environment, and it stresses the crucial roles of economic, political and social processes. In relation to the SCP, the EPM process has been developed into a general methodology for strengthening the ability of cities to effectively manage urban development and the environment.

Environmental Profile:

The SCP Environmental Profile provides a systematic overview of the development and environment setting and institutional arrangements of a city, with this information organised and analysed in a very particular manner, which is designed to highlight the development-environment interactions, the critical environmental issues, and the sectors and stakeholders most directly concerned with them. (See Volume 1 of the SCP Source Book series, *Preparing the SCP Environmental Profile*, for details.)

Mini-Consultation:

A reduced-scale version of the City Consultation, generally organised for clarification and elaboration of one specific issue, or perhaps to review options and to agree on issue-specific strategies. Mini-Consultations are a useful device for a Working Group to use, to take stock of progress and activities, and to formalise strategies negotiated through Working Groups. The much greater range and number of stakeholders who are involved in a Mini-Consultation allows the Working Group to interact directly with the full range of opinions, ideas, and interests - something which is not always possible in the smaller confines of the limited-member Working Group.

Non-Governmental Organisation (NGO):

The term NGO is applied to a wide range of organisations which are not established by or operated by government. NGOs are usually private,

non-profit organisations which are run by their members. Typically, an NGO is concerned with one particular area of activity: women's rights, education, environmental protection, small-scale employment, etc. Most NGOs are local in scope, but some are regional, national or international, with active local/national branches. Some NGOs are even international in scope. NGOs often acquire considerable expertise and experience in their particular areas of activity, and some employ professionals or specialists to manage their work.

Proposition Paper:

A brief paper which deals with an issue or a topic. Beginning with an overview of the existing situation, a Proposition Paper will provide case examples, from which it draws universally applicable principles. A Proposition Paper will then discuss approaches for adapting these principles and experiences to specific local circumstances and priorities. It does not prescribe 'the solution', but offers the framework for seeking solutions.

Sensitisation:

This refers generally to the process of giving regular briefings and training to stakeholders at different levels, to create a better understanding of the SCP process and "sensitise" them to the kinds of changes in planning and management approaches which are promoted through the SCP and through the Working Group process.

Stakeholder:

In the context of the SCP, this word is applied to groups, organisations and individuals who have an important 'stake' in the process of urban environmental management - regardless of what their particular 'stake' may be. Equally, the term stakeholders includes both formal and informal organisations and groups, and covers groups in the public sector but also in the private sector and in the community (or popular) sector. Stakeholders are also sometimes referred to as 'actors' in the local EPM process. Stakeholders are those organisations or groups or individuals who should be members of the SCP Working Groups.

Steering Committee:

A high-level committee comprising leading representatives of the key stakeholder organisations, especially those in the government sector. The Steering Committee is set up to build and consolidate political support for the SCP project and to ensure proper cooperation of stakeholder organisations with the activities of the project, including especially the Working Groups. It also promotes inter-agency coordination and facilitates resource mobilisation for implementing the strategies and action plans formulated and negotiated through the Working Groups.

Sustainable Cities Programme (SCP):

The Sustainable Cities Programme (SCP) is a global programme of the United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-HABITAT) and the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP). It is the leading technical cooperation programme in the field of urban environmental planning and management, and it is the principal activity of the United Nations system for operationalising sustainable urban development. (See

also section C7 in this Source Book volume for a more detailed explanation.)

Technical Support Unit (TSU):

TSU is a commonly used term to refer to the core professional team which is set up to guide, manage and support the implementation of the SCP city project. In this volume, the term “project team” has more commonly been used; any difference in terminology is not significant. The Project Team or TSU is the responsible for ensuring that the project is properly implemented, for example, being responsible for ensuring that the Working Groups are set up properly and operate effectively and successfully. This core professional and administrative team may be hired through the project budget or drawn by secondment from institutions in the public sector and departments of municipalities, usually those which are formal signatories to the project.

Terms of Reference (TOR):

A ‘Terms of Reference’ is a document which specifies in a clear and systematic way the work which is to be done by a consultant or sub-contractor. In the UN system, as in most large international organisations, it is necessary to prepare a Terms of Reference, which is then used as the basis for identifying suitable consultants/contractors, for issuing contract, and for supervising and monitoring the work done.

Visualisation Technique :

This term refers generally to a number of related or similar techniques for facilitating and guiding meetings and discussions. They typically rely on the use of cards or other means of writing individual contributions, which are then assembled and sorted and analysed to give clarity and focus to the discussion and to help move toward conclusions. The card or paper techniques are supplemented by use of flip-charts and other visual aids, especially overhead projectors and white-boards. Application of the techniques is facilitated by worksheets which help to focus the discussion around three to four carefully structured key questions. Using these techniques can be extremely helpful in Working Group meetings - and are essential for larger meetings such as Mini-Consultation or the City Consultation.

Working Group:

An SCP issue-specific Working Group is a small body of stakeholder representatives who come together to address a cross-cutting issue of their common concern. The members possess mutually complementing information, expertise, policy and implementation instruments and resources, which they bring together within the framework of the SCP process.

Working Group Coordinator:

There is a Coordinator for each issue-specific Working Group, and it is this person’s responsibility to facilitate, guide and manage the work of that particular Working Group. (See section B5.3 for more details on Coordinators.)

C2

Information Sources

The following publications are important sources for understanding environmental planning and management in general - and for understanding the SCP process in particular. All staff concerned with an SCP city project - and all persons concerned with the organisation and running of Working Groups, **most especially the Coordinators** - should read and make use of these documents. Indeed, copies should be readily available in the SCP project office and every effort made to have them read and consulted by the members of the various Working Groups.

Key EPM & SCP Documents

Sustainable Cities and Local Governance: The Sustainable Cities Programme

Written and published by the United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-HABITAT) and the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), Nairobi, Kenya, 1997

The SCP Process Activities: A Snapshot of what they are and how they are implemented

Written and published by the United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-HABITAT) and the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), Nairobi, Kenya, 1998

The Sustainable Cities Programme: Approach and Implementation

Written and published by the United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-HABITAT), Nairobi, Kenya, 2nd edition 1998

The SCP Source Book Series

Written and published by the United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-HABITAT) and the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), Nairobi, Kenya, 1999

The Environmental Planning and Management (EPM) Source Book.

Volume 1: Implementing the Urban Environment Agenda

Volume 2: City Experiences and International Support

Volume 3: The UEF Directory

Written and published by the United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-HABITAT) and the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), Nairobi, Kenya, 1997

Towards Environmental Strategies for Cities: Policy Considerations for Urban Environmental Management in Developing Countries.

Carl Bartone, Janis Bernstein, Josef Leitmann and Jochen Eigen

Published for the Urban Management Programme by the World Bank, Washington, D.C., USA, 1994

Environmental Guidelines for Settlements Planning and Management: Volume 1: Institutionalising Environmental Planning and Management for Settlements Development

Volume 2: Environmental Considerations in Metropolitan Planning and Management

Volume 3: Environmental Considerations in Regional Planning and Management

Prepared and published by the United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-HABITAT), and United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), Nairobi, Kenya, 1987

UN-HABITAT and UNEP Join Forces on Urban Environment

Briefing Note prepared for the United Nations Commission on Human Settlements (CHS15) and the Governing Council of UNEP (GC18)

Prepared by the United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-HABITAT), Nairobi, Kenya, 1995

Other Important Documents

World Development Report 1992: Development and the Environment

Prepared and published by the World Bank, Washington, D.C., USA, 1992

Sustainable Human Settlements Development: Implementing Agenda 21.

Prepared by the United Nations Human Settlements Programme, for the United Nations Commission on Sustainable Development, Nairobi, Kenya, 1994

An Urbanising World: Global Report on Human Settlements

Prepared by the United Nations Human Settlements Programme.
Published by Oxford University Press, 1996

World Resources 1996-97: The Urban Environment

Prepared by the World Resources Institute
Published by Oxford University Press, 1996

World Without End: Economics, Environment and Sustainable Development

David W. Pearce and Jeremy J. Warford
Published by Oxford University Press, for the World Bank, 1993

The Habitat Agenda: Goals and Principles, Commitments, and Global Plan of Action

Agreed at the United Nations Conference on Human Settlements (Habitat II), Istanbul, Turkey, June 1996

The Human Face of the Urban Environment: Proceedings of the Second Annual World Bank Conference on Environmentally Sustainable Development.

Ismail Serageldin, Michael A. Cohen, and K.C. Sivaramakrishnan, Editors
Published by The World Bank, Washington, D.C., USA, 1995

C3

Format, Guidelines & Outline for EPM Case Study

Part A: Introduction

A1 City Context (from Environmental Profile)

Part B: Previous Experience

B1 Previous attempts to address the issue, successes and failures

B2 Lessons of experience: why did previous attempts fail or why can the current situation no longer continue?

Part C: Addressing the Issue

C1 Improving Environmental Information and Expertise

1.1 Preparing Basic Overview Information

In this section, you should document base line information gathered on the issue and explain how it was acquired.

1.1.1 Scale dimension: magnitude.

1.1.2 Time dimension: trends in the last five years or more.

1.1.3 Impact of the city's problems: environmental, economic (lost productivity and efficiency) and social impacts; affected stakeholders desegregated by gender and other relevant attributes.

1.1.4 Spatial dimension: geographic distribution of affected settlements and natural resource areas.

1.1.5 Have the above been highlighted in the Environmental Profile (EP)? Describe how the above information was collected, from stakeholders or other sources during the preparation of the EP, and how it was presented. Were any difficulties experienced in obtaining information? To what extent were stakeholders involved in the preparation of the EP, and how useful was the information they provided?

1.1.6 How was the EP used to inform stakeholders and to create a new and better understanding of the issues? Elaborate if a mechanism for constantly updating and using the EP as an information source and tool has been worked out and applied, or is expected to be worked out and applied.

1.1.7 Highlight problems and constraints faced during the preparation of the EP and draw lessons of experience.

1.2 Involving Stakeholders

In this section, you should describe how you mobilised stakeholders and discuss any changes in their level of involvement in the project, giving reasons where appropriate.

1.2.1 Key stakeholders (by sector and functional role) and their roles in addressing the issue.

1.2.2 How were key stakeholders identified?

1.2.3 How were the CBOs of target communities identified and involved? In the case where strong and legitimate CBOs were lacking, how was representation of benefiting communities tackled? In the case where the issue was related to poor and marginalised groups of society, who represented such groups? Attach brief profiles (describing demographic and socio-economic structure and state of capacities) of CBOs who have been involved in the process as stakeholders.

1.2.4 Did the project team specifically attempt to involve any other stakeholder groups outside the formal planning and management structure, such as women's groups or the private sector? If so, how were they approached and what difficulties or successes were experienced?

1.2.5 How were stakeholders contacted, briefed and involved in consultations and working groups? To what extent was the preparation of the EP used to facilitate this?

1.2.6 Who (and at what level of decision-making) was involved when?

1.2.7 What were stakeholders' expectations at the inception of the project and how did these evolve over time?

1.2.8 How regular (in meetings) and how substantive (in contributions) was their participation? Give good and bad examples.

1.2.9 Was there any change in working group composition over time? When, what changes and why?

1.2.10 If participation varied among stakeholders and by a given stakeholder over time, what caused this and how was it tackled?

1.2.11 Did the project team use any techniques for constructively involving stakeholders, and if so, how successful were they?

1.2.12 Highlight problems and constraints faced during the identification and mobilisation of stakeholders and draw lessons of experience.

1.3 Setting Priorities

Here you should document the processes that led to the prioritisation of the different components emerging from the issue, and describe how stakeholders reached agreement on the most critical sub-issues or aspects on which to focus.

1.3.1 Did the working groups use a set of criteria or a framework to help them to prioritise the sub-issues? If so, how was it decided upon? Did all stakeholders agree on the criteria, or were significant differences of interest observed? If so, how were these resolved?

1.3.2 Elaborate on any other techniques which were used to prioritise the sub-issues.

1.3.3 List the individual priorities of each stakeholder group. Did stakeholders feel that the problem concerned them directly, or that they had a responsibility to participate in the solution of the problem, although they were not directly affected by it?

1.3.4 What was the final list of priority sub-issues, and how did stakeholders reach agreement on them? What induced stakeholders to change from their own individual priorities to acceptance of the final list? How were conflicts resolved?

1.3.5 To what extent was there a consensus on the final list of priority sub-issues? If not all stakeholders were involved in the prioritisation process, who made the decisions? With hindsight, do you think that the list of priorities accurately reflected the sub-issues most urgently affecting the city, or were the needs of some stakeholder groups or pressing natural resource problems neglected?

1.3.6 Highlight problems and constraints faced during the setting of priorities and draw lessons of experience.

1.4 Clarifying the Issue or Sub-Issues

In this section, you should describe how stakeholders analysed the selected issue or priority sub-issues and to what extent this improved their understanding of the issue as a whole.

1.4.1 Which methodological approaches (problem trees, for example) were applied to analyse the issue or sub-issues? Was the gender perspective considered and if so, how?

1.4.2 What conceptual and methodological themes emerged as the result of the analysis?

1.4.3 Describe the underlying causes of the issue or sub-issues and the associated cause-effect relationships as analysed by the working groups.

1.4.4 How was the issue or sub-issue perceived from the perspective of the different stakeholders? Did stakeholders identify their own development needs and how they contributed to environmental problems?

1.4.5 What conflicts of interest between different stakeholders were observed, and how were these resolved?

1.4.6 Was a workshop or mini-consultation organised to clarify and analyse the issue or sub-issues? What role did such a workshop or mini-consultation play in moving the process forward? Describe the design/structure and mechanics of such a workshop or mini-consultation and attach the programme.

1.4.7 Was a proposition paper presented and discussed at such a workshop or mini-consultation? How useful was such a proposition paper? Describe the way a proposition paper was prepared and presented and attach a summary or annotated outline.

1.4.8 Highlight problems and constraints faced during the clarification and analysis of the selected priority issues and draw lessons of experience.

C2 Improving Environmental Strategies and Decision Making

2.1 Clarifying Policy Options

Here you should describe how stakeholders identified and clarified policy options for sub-issue.

2.1.1 Was a workshop or mini-consultation organised to clarify policy options? What role did such a workshop or mini-consultation play in moving the process forward? Describe the design/structure and mechanics of such a workshop or mini-consultation and attach the programme.

2.1.2 Describe the proposed options and their pros and cons as analysed by the stakeholders. How did stakeholders compare the various options?

2.1.3 To what extent did stakeholders participate in meetings and working groups organised to clarify policy options? How regular and substantive were their contributions?

2.1.4 With hindsight, do you think that you involved all the relevant stakeholders and fully considered the impacts of each policy option upon them?

2.1.5 Highlight problems and constraints faced during clarification of different issue-specific policy options and draw lessons of experience.

2.2 Considering Implementation Options and Resources

In this section, describe how you explored the implementation options for each issue-specific policy alternative.

2.2.1 List the potential sources that you considered and approached. Did you consider all the implementation options and resources: financial, economic, technical, administrative, physical?

2.2.2 Did you consider the use of investments?

2.2.3 Did you consider the use of information campaigns and public education?

2.2.4 Did you consider the use of economic incentive mechanisms?

2.2.5 Did you consider the use of laws and regulatory mechanisms?

2.2.6 Who was involved in considering implementation options and resources? Were these the same stakeholders as those controlling the resources?

2.2.7 Give the estimated cost of implementation options, by programme area.

2.2.8 Were some implementation options seen to be particularly useful or problematic? Why?

2.2.9 Highlight problems and constraints faced during consideration of different implementation options and draw lessons of experience.

2.3 Building Broad-based Consensus on Issue Specific Objectives and Strategies

In this section you should describe how you moved from a set of possible policies and implementation options, to commonly accepted strategy, and explain how stakeholders reached agreement on these strategies.

2.3.1 Was a workshop or mini-consultation organised to decide upon objectives and strategies? What role did such a workshop or mini-consultation play in moving the process forward? Describe the design/structure and mechanics of such a workshop or mini-consultation and attach the programme.

2.3.2 Were maps or other techniques used to facilitate negotiations on strategies? If so, describe how they were used and how they helped stakeholders to highlight and resolve their differences.

2.3.3 Describe the positions taken by the different stakeholders on the strategies, and the rationale behind them. If their positions changed, what induced the changes? Did any particular strategies stand out as having clear advantages for the majority of the city's inhabitants, or were the issues not so clear-cut? Describe the negotiations and how agreement was facilitated and obtained.

2.3.4 Describe the results of the negotiations and the agreed policies and strategies. Why were these options chosen and did all stakeholders agree? With hindsight, do you think you chose the most effective strategy to tackle the problem?

2.3.5 Were the strategies gender-sensitive? Explain.

2.3.6 List the methods and/or criteria used to prioritise strategy interventions.

2.3.7 Highlight problems and constraints faced during considering strategy options, negotiating and agreeing on strategies and draw lessons of experience.

2.4 Coordinating Environmental and Other Development Strategies

Describe how you identified existing strategies and attempted to coordinate them with issue-specific strategies developed using the EPM approach.

2.4.1 Did you identify existing development strategies? What were they?

2.4.2 Did you review and clarify existing development strategies?

2.4.3 What mechanism was used to formalise strategies agreed in working groups and to communicate them to the relevant institutions? How smooth and coherent was this linkage between the working groups and institutions?

2.4.4 Did you attempt to co-ordinate issue-specific strategies with existing development strategies? If so, what mechanisms were put in place to coordinate implementation of strategies at various levels, such as at strategy/policy decision-making level, at resource allocation level and work programming level?

2.4.5 How effective were these mechanisms? How closely did agencies collaborate on strategy coordination?

2.4.6 Highlight problems and constraints faced during coordination of strategies and draw lessons of experience.

C3 Improving Effective Implementation of Strategies

3.1 Applying the Full Range of Implementation Capabilities

In this section, you should document each stakeholder's capacity for implementation and the extent to which this was applied in implementing the agreed strategies.

3.1.1 List the implementation instruments available to each stakeholder - including laws and regulations, fiscal and economic incentives, public information, etc. Did you attempt to mobilise previously unused implementation capacities, such as untapped human resources or private sector finance?

3.1.2 Did you apply the use of investments?

3.1.3 Did you apply the use of information campaigns and public education?

3.1.4 Did you apply the use of economic incentive mechanisms?

3.1.5 Did you apply the use of laws and regulatory mechanisms?

3.1.6 What implementation instruments were applied in tackling the problem? Why were these particular instruments chosen instead of other possible options?

3.1.7 How effective were these implementation instruments? If they were not effective, say why and describe how you think their effectiveness could be improved.

3.1.8 Particularly explain how CBOs in target communities participated in implementation. What impact did this have in terms of enhancing their implementation capacities?

3.1.9 Highlight problems and constraints faced during application of implementation capabilities and draw lessons of experience.

3.2 Agreeing on Action Plans for Implementation

In this section, you should document the processes whereby action plans were prepared, document the action plans themselves, and consider the extent to which they were implemented.

3.2.1 How were action plans prepared? How participatory and consultative were the mechanisms used, and were the stakeholders or agencies involved the same as those involved in strategy formulation? How smooth was the transition from strategy to action plan?

3.2.2 How were the action plans formulated? Who was responsible for implementation and what were their respective roles? Did the action plans include agreements for each stakeholder's or agency's commitments, including allocation of staff time and resources, financial resources for investment/operation/maintenance, geographic focus, etc? How clear and detailed were these agreements, and what time frame was agreed for implementing them? Attach the action plans, preferably by actor or sub-issue.

3.2.3 How committed were the different actors in implementing the action plans? How closely did they keep to the agreements, in terms of time, resources, geographic focus, etc. and if they did not honour their commitments, can you explain what went wrong?

3.2.4 Which concrete actions and projects were actually implemented?

3.2.5 What was behind the selection of these concrete actions and projects?

3.2.6 How much did they cost eventually and who paid for them?

3.2.7 What final outputs resulted or are expected to result from the implemented action plans and projects?

3.2.8 Highlight technical/managerial and institutional/political constraints faced during implementation and how they were addressed, and draw lessons of experience.

3.3 Developing Packages of Mutually Supportive Interventions

In this section, you should describe how different interventions were planned to support each other, and how far this actually worked in practice.

3.1.1 How did you try to ensure that interventions were linked and supported each other? How far did agencies and stakeholders collaborate in this process?

3.3.2 In practice, how mutually supportive were the different implementation instruments and interventions?

3.3.3 Highlight problems and constraints faced during development of mutually supportive packages of interventions and draw lessons of experience.

3.4 Reconfirming Political Support and Mobilising Resources

Here you should document your strategy for obtaining political support and funding.

3.4.1 Describe the strategies for mobilising resources within each programme area.

3.4.2 Resources pledged and mobilised by source.

3.4.3 Elaborate on contributions (sweat equity, cash and others) of CBOs or target community groups involved in the process, and how this has taken place?

3.4.4 What political, social, or institutional factors played a part in influencing the outcome of the resource mobilisation process and in what ways? (Do not shy away from being critical!)

3.4.5 Did you have a strategy for obtaining and maintaining political support, and if so, how successful was it?

3.4.6 Highlight problems and constraints faced during resource mobilisation and reconfirming political support and draw lessons of experience.

C4 Institutionalising Environmental Planning and Management

4.1 Strengthening System-Wide Capacities for EPM

In this section, you should document the extent to which the EPM process, in addressing this particular issue or sub-issues, helped to build environmental management capacity in stakeholders and institutions.

4.1.1 List the capacity building activities undertaken.

4.1.2 What did participating partners gain from the process in terms of strengthened capacities and achieving their objectives?

4.1.3 How actively were CBOs and NGOs involved in the process and how did this strengthen their respective capacities?

4.1.4 Has the resolution of the issues required introducing new management functions or strengthening existing functions, or has it necessitated changes in roles and relationships between the different stakeholders? Describe system wide changes and capacity improvements induced by the process, in the public, private and popular sectors, with examples.

4.1.5 Has accommodating such changes required new skills or expertise, institutional structures, legislative amendments, new hard and

software, new information systems or database, etc? How were these requirements addressed?

4.1.6 What discernible improvements in capacity or in management style/approach have resulted from addressing the issue or sub-issues? Please cite examples.

4.1.7 What knowledge spillovers and attitudinal changes have resulted from the initiatives? Among whom, where and in what ways do these changes manifest themselves? Give anecdotal examples.

4.1.8 Has the issue/ sub-issues got better attention and focus within the city's corporate management? How does this manifest itself in resource allocation and work programmes?

4.1.9 What other long term institutional and capacity improvements and changes have taken place as the result of the initiatives?

4.1.10 What new conceptual understanding, methodological frameworks or implementation modalities came out of the process?

4.1.11 Highlight problems and constraints faced during the strengthening of system-wide capacities for EPM and draw lessons of experience.

4.2 Institutionalising Broad-Based Participatory Approaches to Decision-Making

In this section you should describe how participatory approaches and partnerships are becoming integrated into the management process and consider the sustainability of these achievements.

4.2.1 What measures were taken throughout the process of addressing the issue (legal, organisational, etc.) in order to institutionalise participatory approaches? How successful do you think they were?

4.2.2 How far are participatory approaches integrated into the corporate management structure and strategies of the city, or what is the prospect for this to happen?

4.2.3 Which actors have been involved as partners in implementing the institutional strategies?

4.2.4 How actively were the private sector, CBOs and NGOs involved in partnership initiatives resulting from the process of addressing the issue? Explain.

4.2.5 What induced them to enter into partnership and how did the partnership evolve? What tensions were experienced during its operationalisation? What made it work?

4.2.6 How complementary were the contributions of the different stakeholders? Explain with examples.

4.2.7 What financial, managerial and political commitments are required to sustain the projects, actions and institutionalisation process?

4.2.8 Who has borne these commitments and in what ways are these commitments formalised? What mechanisms have been put in place to ensure that these commitments are realised?

4.2.9 Highlight problems and constraints faced in institutionalising participatory approaches and in sustaining achievements, and draw lessons of experience.

4.3 Institutionalising Cross-Sectoral and Inter-Organisational Coordination

In this section you should document the coordination mechanisms that were set up between sectors and institutions while the issue was being addressed, changes in the extent of collaboration resulting from EPM, and other changes which enabled institutions to work together more effectively.

4.3.1 What new legislative, organisational and administrative changes or modifications were required to improve coordination in order to effectively implement the projects?

4.3.2 Which of these desirable changes or modifications did take place and by whom and when?

4.3.3 What social and political pressures and tensions were experienced in effecting such changes?

4.3.4 What discernible improvement in the level of coordination and changes in attitude and management approaches have resulted from the process of addressing the issue? Please cite examples. If you expected such changes to happen and they did not, can you explain why?

4.3.5 What other long term institutional and capacity improvements and changes have taken place as the result of the initiatives?

4.3.6 What mechanisms were put in place to sustain these achievements and how successful have they been?

4.3.7 Highlight problems and constraints faced in institutionalising cross-sectoral and inter-organisational coordination and in sustaining achievements and draw lessons of experience.

4.4 Monitoring, Evaluating and Adjusting the EPM System

In this section you should elaborate upon the mechanisms for monitoring and evaluation that have been put in place and document the overall results of your efforts to tackle the issue.

4.4.1 Did you attempt to monitor progress at each stage of addressing the issue?

4.4.2 Who was involved in monitoring progress?

4.4.2 What factors contributed to success in implementation? What mechanism was used to track progress in implementation and to report results to stakeholders? How regularly was this done?

4.4.3 Who and how many people/households or which institutions and sectors benefited or are expected to benefit from the initiatives?

4.4.4 What impact did these initiatives have or are expected to have on the beneficiaries? How do you measure such impacts? Who is measuring them and with what frequency?

4.4.5 How widely are these initiatives known by the public? How have they been publicised?

4.4.6 What indicators would show that the initiatives are sustainable and that the process is being institutionalised?

4.4.7 What indicators would show that attitudinal changes and knowledge spillovers have taken place? Illustrate.

4.4.8 How do you justify or substantiate that these changes and achievements are the result of the initiatives carried out through the EPM process?

4.4.9 How successful has been the process in addressing the issue from the perspectives of the key stakeholders? Who feels what?

4.4.10 Where was it necessary to adjust the EPM process and in what ways?

4.4.11 Highlight problems and constraints faced in monitoring, evaluating and adjusting the EPM system and draw lessons of experience.

C5 Making Efficient Use of Resources for Effecting Change

5.1 Utilising Special Opportunities

In this section, you should describe how you capitalised on special opportunities in order to initiate fast track actions and effect change

5.1.1 List the special opportunities that arose, if any, during your attempts to tackle the issue: changes in institutional or political structures, crisis conditions due to industrial accidents or collapses in management capacity, environmental disasters.

5.1.2 What fast track actions were initiated as a result of these special opportunities (location, cost, who funded them, who implemented them, what has been achieved) ? How did you capitalise on special opportunities to set up these fast-track initiatives?

5.1.3 How has the EPM process facilitated the speeding-up of decision making and the mobilisation of resources for fast-track implementation? How quickly were the initiatives accomplished?

5.1.4 What specific EPM principles did you apply to your fast track action such as multi stakeholders intervention, mobilisation of non traditional resources for implementation?

5.1.5 Who benefited from the fast-track actions, in what ways and by how much?

5.1.6 What was the role of CBOs and community groups in implementing fast-track actions? Was the capacity of CBOs or community groups a factor in selecting geographic areas for fast track actions and if so, what attributes or aspects of capacity were considered, and how did the CBOs and community groups fare on those scores?

5.1.7 Apart from their direct benefits to the target groups, how far did fast track actions help to mobilise social and political support to the process? Give anecdotal examples to illustrate this.

5.1.8 Highlight problems and constraints faced during identification of special opportunities and initiation and implementation of fast-track actions and draw lessons of experience.

5.2 Applying Specific Leveraging Strategies

In this section, you should discuss how you developed and applied specific strategies for leveraging your activities, such as demonstration projects for replication and scaling up.

5.2.1 What demonstration projects have been initiated, where, when, and at what cost? Who was involved in them?

5.2.2 Were they consciously designed as demonstration projects? What made them considered as demonstration projects and what do they demonstrate?

5.2.3 What mechanisms were put in place to track their success as demonstration projects, to filter lessons of experience and to promote the use of the extracted lessons of experience in future programme/project designs and strategy formulation?

5.2.4 Were the projects viable (financially and otherwise) for replicability and scaling-up? What methods of analysis were developed and/or applied to scrutinise the replicability of demonstration projects?

5.2.5 What strategies and mechanisms are have been put in place or what factors are in play for facilitating replicability and scaling-up?

5.2.6 What role did CBOs and community groups play, or what roles can they play in replicating demonstration projects? Give examples.

5.2.7 Highlight problems and constraints faced during identification, design, implementation and replication (if any) of demonstration projects, and draw lessons of experience.

5.2.8 Which lessons of experience can be replicated and where or under what conditions?

5.3 Networking Among Cities

In this section, you should describe experience and know-how was shared with or gained from other cities.

5.3.1 Did you set up any systems for swapping expertise with another city: meetings, working with consultants or experts, twinning arrangements, technical assistance programmes, etc? If so, describe how they worked. In which areas did this help you to gain expertise, and in which areas was your expertise required by another city?

5.3.2 How successful do you think these systems were? If not, why not?

5.3.3 Did you provide or obtain technical assistance from another city? If so, how useful was this assistance?

5.3.4 Which stakeholders from your city were involved in networking?

5.3.5 Highlight problems and constraints faced during the networking process and draw lessons of experience.

5.4 Making Strategic Use of External Support

Describe how external aid and technical know-how supported your efforts to address the issue.

5.4.1 List the sources, amount and type of external support that you received (capital investment, technical assistance, expertise, etc.)

5.4.2 Over what time period did this support enter the project? Did the timing of support affect its usefulness, and in what ways?

5.4.3 Did you work out a role for external support by matching the city's needs with external capabilities? If so, how did you proceed and who was involved in working out this role?

5.4.4 Did you attempt to ensure that external support was directed to building local capacities rather than substituting for them? If so, how successful was this process?

5.4.5 How did you ensure that the influx of resources matched the capacity of local institutions to make full use of them?

5.4.6 How useful was the external support you received? Are there any projects which would not have been possible without it, or which would have been better off without it? If so, why?

5.4.7 Highlight problems and constraints faced while making use of external support and draw lessons of experience.

Part D: Overall Reflections

Looking back.....

D1 If the issue was to be addressed today, in what ways would you approach it differently?

D2 Regarding a particular issue, what changed as a result of the process and what did not?

Part E: Checklist of Attachments

- E1** Base line data tables and maps.
- E2** List of stakeholders by sector (public, private, CBOs, NGO) and functional role (expertise, information, decision making, implementation) and time/stage (when during the process) of their involvement.
- E3** Profile (a page for each) of key stakeholders including CBOs and NGOs.
- E4** Time line of working groups highlighting key moments in their metamorphosis (establishment of core group, expansion of core group, creation of sub-groups, creation of action group, etc...).
- E5** Problem trees and other techniques used.
- E6** Programmes of workshops and mini-consultations held at the various stages of the process.
- E7** Annotated outline and/or summary of proposition papers written on the issue.
- E8** Strategy maps.
- E9** Resources pledged and mobilised by source.
- E10** Action plans and implementation work programmes.
- E11** Project profiles (a page for each project covered in the action plan).
- E12** Methodological framework for assessing impact of action plans and projects.
- E13** Profiles of demonstration projects (location, scale, beneficiaries, demonstration objectives and parameters).
- E14** Maps and photos reporting on implementation of fast track activities and demonstration projects.
- E15** Worksheets and illustrations measuring sustainability using indicators.
- E16** List of documents produced during the entire process with remarks on to whom they were distributed and the language used.
- E17** Complete list of source of information (including names of interviewed persons) for compiling the case study.

C4

Guidelines and Outlines for Synthesising Lessons of Experience Captured in Issue-Specific Case Studies

1. What is new?: In what ways was the EPM process as shown in the case studies different from previous experiences or situations?
2. Changes across EPM elements/phases: What specific changes have taken place or are taking place due to the process in relation to the following EPM elements/phases? Compare the pre-process and the post-process situation and give concrete examples in each case.
 - Expertise and information
 - Prioritisation, negotiating strategies and decision making
 - Implementing strategies
 - Mobilising and efficient use of resources
3. Difference in changes across EPM elements/phases: If the changes were not of similar magnitude or intensity and scope across the above listed different phases of the EPM process, where has been the relative emphasis and visibility of change and where has been the relative lag or lack of change? And how do you explain the difference?
4. Difference in changes across issues: If the changes were not of similar magnitude or intensity and scope across the different issues, which issues showed relative progress in effecting change, and which ones lagged? and what factors-technical and managerial, institutional and political, social and cultural-do explain these differences? Use examples for each explanatory factor.
5. Positive and negative factors in overall change: What factors have in general influenced the changes - their pace and scope - positively or negatively? You can among others consider political support, active involvement and support of most important actors and stakeholders, public awareness, publicity and popular support, role and vibrancy of the civil society, existence of change-agents in sufficient number and in key institutions and at key positions, attitudes and understandings of principal actors, degree of simplicity or complexity of the process, mobilisation and effective utilisation of private resources, financial incentives, clear understanding of potential benefits, unofficial political and financial influence(corruption), impact and influence of external development assistance and support, impact of particular disasters or emergencies, public attitudes toward paying for services, changes in economic policy, political decentralisation, success in demonstration projects and fast track actions, etc.
6. Improvement in system wide capacity: What improvement has the EPM process brought about in the capacity of the different stakeholders in the public, private and popular sectors? Describe effected capacity improvements by key stakeholders and by EPM elements (see question

number 2 above) and analyse how such capacities affected or will affect the city wide EPM.

7. Institutional changes: Changes in Has the EPM process brought about a discernible change in role and functions, in internal and external institutional relationships and attitudes? if yes what kind and how do these changes manifest themselves in the day-to-day decision making process?
8. Sustaining institutional changes: Has sustaining these changes required or will require new skills and expertise, institutional structures and mandates, legislative modifications, equipment and financial resources? If yes explain specifically what and how they have been (or could be) met?
9. Creating and promoting Partnerships: What new models and examples of partnership between and within the public, private and popular sectors have resulted through or have been successfully promoted by the EPM process?
10. Changes in resource mobilisation: What discernible changes have taken place due to the process in the relative role of local and national resources, in the allocation and sectoral distribution of development budget, in the mobilisation of external funds and in the collection of municipal revenues?
11. Improvement in implementation: What discernible changes have taken place that show improvement in the performance of implementation measured in terms of cost effectiveness, length of project cycle, level of coordination, level of complementarity and mutual reinforcement of different interventions, etc.
12. Improvement in coordination: What discernible changes have taken place due to the process in improving the coordination of different support programmes within the city? What future perspectives that strengthen this trend are in the making? (Such could be the creation of a city wide development framework which allows to effectively coordinate programmes and projects or institutional mechanisms that support and promote inter-agency and inter-programme coordination.)
13. Tools, procedures and models: What tools, procedures and models have emerged or are emerging to effectively support better information collection and exchange, prioritisation, stakeholders participation in decision making, negotiation and conflict resolution, implementation and resource mobilisation and its efficient use?
14. Replicating demonstration projects: What institutional mechanisms are built into existing demonstration projects to facilitate replicability and how effective such mechanisms are or are likely to be?
15. Overall impact: What overall impact on productivity, efficiency and equity can be discerned from the achievements so far or can be expected from the on-going and in-pipe line initiatives ? If one has to see the overall impact of the process what are the indicators one has to look for?

C5

Terms of Reference Related to Working Groups (from the Sustainable Katowice Project)

Reproduced below are two Terms of Reference which were used in the Sustainable Katowice (Poland) Project in relation to the Working Groups.

Advisor for the Working Groups on Water

This TOR is for contracting a short-term consultant to assist in organising and setting-up the Working Groups on Water-Related Issues and to support their initial stages of operation. (A similar TOR was prepared for the organising and setting-up of Working Groups on Land-Related topics.)

Supporting Consultant for Preparation of Pilot Project Study Documents for the Working Group on Integrated Waste Management

This TOR is for contracting a short-term consultant to help prepare documentation for two pilot projects being developed by one of the Working Groups.

TERMS OF REFERENCE:

(01 December 1994)

Short-Term Consultancy to Assist the Establishment of Project Working Groups on Water-Related Issues

Country:	Poland
Project Title:	Managing Sustainable Development in the Upper Silesia Agglomeration
Project Number:	POL/94/002
Post Title:	Advisor for the Working Groups on Water
Post Number:	
Duty Station:	Upper Silesia, Poland
Expected Start:	early December 1994

Duration: Two work-months of input over a five month period from early December 1994 to early May 1995.

Purpose: To assist in organising and setting-up the Working Groups on Water-Related Issues and to support their initial stages of operation.

DUTIES & TASKS:

The basic task is assist in the setting-up and initial organisation of the Working Groups dealing with Water-Related Issues, including all tasks and activities necessary to establish the Working Groups and enable them to perform their work effectively and efficiently. The consultant will work in close collaboration with the Project Manager, to whom the consultant will be directly responsible. The duties and tasks will be executed in accordance with the draft Work Plan for establishment of Working Groups. Specifically, the following tasks are foreseen:

- (1) To advise initially on potential members for the Over-all Working Group, and later to advise on appropriate membership for the individual Issue Working Groups, working with the Project Manager to identify and involve suitably-qualified persons who will represent the full range of organisations and interests ("stakeholders") required:

- those whose interests are affected
- those who possess relevant information and expertise
- those who control relevant implementation instruments.

Thus, potential members will have to be identified from the public sector (especially at the local level), from the private sector (especially the business community), and from the popular sector (especially community groups and NGOs).

- (2) To advise the Project Manager on suitable Moderators for the various Working Groups and to assist in their briefing.

- (3) Prepare an initial "Issues and Proposition Paper", which will summarise the known situation in water-related aspects of urban environmental management in the agglomeration, clearly placed within the overall context of urban development and environmental management issues of the agglomeration, and will focus on the key issues and questions which should be addressed. This paper will be based upon the Environmental Profile and upon the work done at the August 1993 Consultations. The purpose of this paper is to provide the Over-all Working Group with an initial "status report", which will:

- give all members a common starting point and make clear the nature of the Working Group's activities
- place the water-related issues in a broader context which relates to the whole range of urban environmental management issues and activities
- establish a basis from which the Working Group can swiftly proceed to its initial activities of identifying and agreeing priority issues and tasks. This Paper should be written at the beginning of the consultancy assignment and be ready for the late-December regular meeting of the full Working Group.

- (4) To prepare, in close consultation with the Project Manager and if possible the designated Moderators, an initial specification of appropriate procedures and working methods for the Working Groups. This will focus on formal and informal procedural aspects, with particular concern for the working methods most likely

to be effective, in the local situation, in assisting the members of the Working Groups to develop new and more effective forms of collaboration and cooperation. Thus, due concern will have to be given to the Group Dynamics aspects and to the requirements for group learning and, if appropriate, training in new approaches. These working methods and procedures will be progressively modified through experience in the early stages of activity of the Working Groups, and this process should be guided and supported (and if appropriate, documented) by the consultant.

- (5) Together with the Project Team and the Moderators, further detail and elaborate the draft Work Plans for the Issue Working Groups, to identify the tasks, activities, outputs, and time-schedule for the first year. The Work Plans should be structured in accord with the activities as given in the Project Document, with phases of work and outputs closely keyed to those specifications. The Work Plans should be clearly based on the over-all SCP approach and should give clear guidance to for the activities of the Working Group and of its members, as well as indicate appropriate review points for the project management.
- (6) Attend all meetings of the various Working Groups during the period of this assignment, and after each meeting discuss together with the Project Team and the Moderators the results of the meeting; propose and elaborate any modifications in working procedures, membership, or Work Plans which may be agreed as appropriate.
- (7) Assist the Project Team and the Moderators in preparations for, and execution of, the mini-consultations scheduled for March 1995.
- (8) Undertake any other tasks, which fall within the framework of these Terms of Reference, which are judged by the Project Manager to be necessary for the successful establishment of the Working Group.

EXPECTED OUTPUTS:

- (1) A concise "Issues and Proposition Paper" (see point (3) under Duties, above), which will summarise the known situation in water-related aspects of urban environmental management in the agglomeration, within the over-all context of urban development and environmental management, and will focus on the key issues and questions which should be addressed. The paper will be prepared during the first two weeks of this consultancy assignment; after approval by the Project Manager, the draft paper (in the Polish language) will be made available for the December meeting of the Over-all Working Group. Subsequently, after discussion in the Working Group and with the Project Manager, the paper will be revised accordingly and copies prepared in both Polish and English.
- (2) A summary paper on "Working Methods and Procedures" for the Working Group (see point (3) under Duties, above) focused on the formal and informal procedural aspects of Working Group activities. Developed in close collaboration with the Project Manager and the Working Group Moderators, these papers will be available in draft form, in the Polish language, by the time of the appropriate meeting of the Over-all Working Group. Subsequently, after discussion in the Working Group and with the Project Manager and the Working Group Moderators, the paper will be revised accordingly and copies prepared in both Polish and English.
- (3) The consultant will submit three copies of the draft versions of each of the outputs (in Polish), and then five copies each (Polish and English) of the finalised

version of each of the three outputs. In addition, the consultant will submit each document on computer file on 3.5 inch diskettes.

- (4) All documents produced through this assignment shall be the property of the Project and subject to the control of the Project Manager and the UNCHS (Habitat).

QUALIFICATIONS:

The consultant will be a senior professional with not less than 15 years experience, and an academic training and qualification in, an appropriate field (such as environmental planning, urban management, economics, environmental engineering, etc). Extensive knowledge of the local situation and familiarity with local institutions is essential. Prior experience with, and knowledge of, the SCP and/or the present project is highly desirable. The consultant must be wholly fluent in Polish and also be able to communicate technical material in English.

TERMS OF REFERENCE

(November 1995)

Short-Term Consultancy to Support Preparation of Pilot Project Documents for the Working Group on Integrated Waste Management

Country:	Poland
Project Title:	Managing Sustainable Development in the Upper Silesia Agglomeration
Project Number:	POL/94/002/A/01/56
Post Title:	Supporting Consultant for Preparation of Pilot Project Study Documents for the Working Group on Integrated Waste Management
Duty Station:	Upper Silesia, Poland
Start Date:	01 December 1995
Duration:	One person-month of input over the period from early-December 1995 to late-January 1996.
Purpose:	To support the preparation of documentation to guide and implement Pre-Investment studies for two proposed pilot projects, on Integrated Communal Waste Management for Piekary Slaskie Municipality and for Zabrze Municipality.

DUTIES & TASKS:

The consultant will work in close cooperation with the Working Group Consultant and under the general supervision of the Project Manager.

The basic task is to support the activities of the Working Group on Integrated Waste Management in preparing the various documents which may be required to formulate, guide and implement Pre-Investment Studies for the two proposed Pilot Projects.

The following tasks are foreseen:

- (1) To work out, in close cooperation with the Consultant for the Working Group and based on information prepared through the Working Group activities, the basic outline and specification of parameters for the proposed Pilot Project Pre-Investment Studies. This should include all relevant aspects, including such as:
 - specification of purposes and goals of the Studies
 - specification of the rationale, structure, content, and outputs of the Studies
 - methodology and approach for identifying the most favourable waste management system, taking into account existing and planned facilities, institutions, technical resources, and other relevant factors
 - methodology and technique for executing various elements of the Studies
 - framework for legal and institutional issues, including mobilisation of resources, realisation of investment, and operation and maintenance of system
 - main lines of concern for social issues (including for example public awareness and involvement) which affect the desired outcomes
 - estimation of appropriate time-frame for preparation of the Studies
 - estimation of costs for executing the Studies
 - specification of appropriate qualifications for firms/organisations to undertake the Studies.
- (2) To participate fully in the deliberations of the Working Group, and in discussions with representatives of Piekary Slaskie and Zabrze, as necessary to ensure that all partners and participants understand and are in accord with the main approaches specified for the two Studies.
- (3) The consultant shall undertake other tasks, which fall within the scope of these Terms of Reference and which are judged by the Project Manager to be necessary for the successful accomplishment of the basic purpose of this consultancy.

EXPECTED OUTPUTS:

- (1) Two reports will be produced, each fully documenting the proposed Pilot Project Study and covering the aspects noted under Task (1) above:

- (A) "Design and Specification of Pre-Investment Studies for Pilot Project in Integrated Waste Management for Piekary Slaskie Municipality"
- (B) "Design and Specification of Pre-Investment Studies for Pilot Project in Integrated Waste Management for Zabrze Municipality"

- (2) Each document will be written in the Polish language, with an English-language summary. The consultant will submit three clearly-printed copies each of all documents prepared (main documents and summaries), together with the complete computer files on diskette by mid-January 1996.
- (3) All documents produced through this assignment shall be the property of the Project and subject to the control of the Project Manager and the UNCHS (Habitat).

QUALIFICATIONS:

The consultant will be an established professional with not less than 10 years working experience, and with academic training and qualification in an appropriate field or fields. Sound knowledge of the relevant institutional and technical aspects of waste management in Upper Silesia is essential. Prior experience with project formulation and project analysis is desirable. The consultant must be fluent in Polish and also able to communicate basic information in the English language.

C6

Terms of Reference Related to Working Groups (from the Sustainable Ismailia Project)

TERMS OF REFERENCE For Sub-Contract for National Consultancy on Technical Support to Working Groups

Background:

A. Location of Activities

The location of activities is Ismailia and Cairo in The Arab Republic of Egypt. The project is "Sustainable Ismailia Project" (SIP)(EGY/91/030).

B. The Sustainable City Project

The Sustainable Cities Programme (SCP) is UNCHS (Habitat's) facility for bringing to practical application the achievements of the Urban Management Programme (UMP), focusing on the environmental component. The UMP is a partnership of UNDP, the World Bank and UNCHS, the latter being the executing agency. The Sustainable Ismailia Project Document was signed in June 1992, between the Governorate of Ismailia, UNDP and UNCHS. The Governorate of Ismailia is the Executing Agency and UNCHS is the Cooperating Agency.

The project supports environmentally sustainable development and growth through (i) strengthening the local capacity to plan, coordinate and manage environmental development interactions in a framework of broad-based participatory systems; (ii) promoting integrated and dynamically updated development plans and sector investment strategies; and (iii) training and building national capacity. This assignment follows the first City Consultation (5-8 July '93). It intends to enhance the momentum already generated and assists the timely attainment of SIP objectives.

C. Main Purpose

The overall project purpose is to manage the sustainable growth and development in Ismailia while preserving its environment. The more specific purpose of this assignment is to assist and advise the National Project Manager (NPM) in setting up issue specific working groups with cross-cutting representation in close collaboration with the concerned officials in Ismailia.

D. Existing Material and Related Activities

NPM will provide the consultants with copies of:

- SIP Project Document;
- SIP City Environmental Profile.

The Sustainable Cities Project for Ismailia, while free-standing, will be closely linked to related activities supported by other organisations. The project will complement, use and build upon relevant information already collected and development strategies already established. It will bring to the current efforts a

dimension that is specific to the overall orientation and thrust of the Sustainable Cities process. Important among these related activities and institutions are the following:

- The Strategy Document for Sustainable Development in Egypt.
- The WB-funded project "Establishment of an Environmental Management Unit for the Governorates of Ismailia and Sharkia in Egypt."
- METAP initiatives.
- The Centre for Development of Third Region (CDTR).
- The Egyptian Environmental Affairs Agency (EEAA) and the Environmental Affairs Departmental in Ismailia.
- The Suez Canal University and the Canal Authority.

Scope and Services of this Sub-Contract

E. Duties to be performed by the Sub-contractor.

In close collaboration with the National Project Manager (NPM), concerned officials in Ismailia Governorate and other government agencies, and project personnel; and under the general guidance of the Senior Monitoring Consultant (SMC), the Consultants are expected to undertake the following responsibilities and to carry out the tasks outlined hereafter:

- (1) Become familiar with the Sustainable Cities Programme (SCP) general concept, and the Sustainable Ismailia Project (SIP) in particular.
- (2) Collect appropriate data through documents either made available by the NPM, SMC, or directly obtained by the Consultants.
- (3) Conduct regular visits to Ismailia according to a plan jointly prepared and agreed to by the NPM and SMC and cleared by UNCHS.
- (4) Attend meetings of the Project Working Groups in the capacity of facilitator.
- (5) Assist and advise the NPM on all aspects of the activities of the Working Groups, including but not limited to their formation and number of members, making recommendations on organisational structure, operational matters and functions, work methodology, reporting routine, and inter-group coordination.
- (6) Advise the NPM on mechanisms for identifying needs (inputs, studies, consultancies) to support the Working Groups' strategic planning and action plans.
- (7) Advise the NPM on input needs to support detailed project development identified through the activities of the Working Groups.
- (8) Assist the NPM in all aspects of the preparation for the 2nd City Consultation, tentatively scheduled for early 1994, on "Environmental Management Strategy (EMS) for Ismailia".
- (9) Assist and advise the NPM and the SMC during the Strategic Planning Period in identifying- issues which should be addressed at the national level, in preparation for a National Consultation, tentatively scheduled for the second half of 1994, on 'Urban Environmental Strategies in Egypt'. Furthermore, assist NPM and SMC in preparation. of the 3rd City Consultation on "funding of investment projects" tentatively scheduled towards the end of 1994.
- (10) Undertake any other relevant assignment, as might be requested by UNCHS, NPM, or SMC, so long as it is within the scope of these terms of reference.
- (11) As much as possible, all correspondence with UNCHS should be channelled through, and always copied to, the NPM. Copies should also be sent to the SMC.

F. Outputs to be Delivered

- (1) Inception Report (see Section G, last paragraph).
- (2) Quarterly progress reports on the work of the Working Groups, which highlight achievements, point out shortcomings, and suggest ways of improvement.
- (3) A detailed plan for the mechanics of the second City Consultation (Workshop on Strategies) to be submitted three weeks before it begins (expected in early 1994), and similarly a plan for the third City Consultation.
- (4) A report on the results of the Second City Consultation, jointly prepared with the National Project Manager (NPM).
- (5) A final report on the Working Groups, which summarises contributions of the Working Group process towards Project Objectives and makes recommendations on how a similar approach could be applied to other cities or Governorates in Egypt.

Documents should be submitted, in English, to UNCHS for review, endorsement and official distribution to the Government and UNDP field office.

However, the Consultant may unofficially submit drafts to the Government and UNDP, pending officiation.

Documents should be submitted in 10 copies. However, the Consultant may submit only 3 of each, provided that they are accompanied by a word processed electronic file on diskette. All particulars should be clearly indicated for easy retrieval of information.

G. Duration/Payments/Qualifications.

Expected start will be 15 October 1993.

Duration will be 3.5 person months spread over the remaining life of the Project (until December 1994), with at least 2.5 work months on location in Ismailia.

Payment Schedule:

- i) 25% upon signing of sub-contract and UNCHS's acceptance of Inception Report.
- ii) 35% upon completion and UNCHS's acceptance of report of the second City Consultation.
- iii) 40% upon UNCHS's acceptance of final report on the Working Groups and completion of preparations for third city consultation.

Qualifications: The sub-contract will require the services of highly qualified national personnel with professional back-round in planning, engineering, economics and sociology and extensive work experience from developing countries in the field of broad-based public administration and institutional development and with extensive knowledge of local development and environmental problems in Egypt. Experience in managing the involvement of the private sector, CBOs and NGOs in the provision of infrastructural services and Environment Planning. and Management is required. A full command of both English and Arabic languages (spoken and written) is required. Within the first month of contract the Consultants will produce an Inception Report with detailed proposed workplan and proposed composition of sub-contractor's team, with CVs of all key personnel to be involved.

C7

The Global Sustainable Cities Programme: Lessons of Experience

Background

Perhaps the greatest challenge for urban development policy-makers and practitioners is to ensure that our growing cities and towns remain economically, socially and environmentally sustainable. In most countries, rapid urban expansion has been accompanied by growing environmental problems, which not only seriously damage health and well-being (especially of the poor) but also damage the urban economy and threaten the sustainability of development gains.

Although urban expansion is commonly seen as the “cause” of environmental (and other) problems, experience and research alike show that the real causes are deeper. According to research from the Urban Management Programme¹, for example, the underlying causes of environmental degradation can be traced to “...inappropriate economic policies, inadequate investment in pollution control, deficient regulatory and institutional frameworks, weak management capacities, inadequate cost recovery, and insufficient political will and public awareness.”

In other words, it is *not* urban growth itself that “causes” environmental problems; instead, it is a series of policy and management weaknesses which mean that cities are generally not able to cope adequately with the physical and environmental consequences of growth and change.

In response to this situation, the United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-HABITAT)² in 1991 launched the global **Sustainable Cities Programme** (SCP), with the aim of helping city governments and their partners in the public, private and community sectors to develop the improved environmental planning and management capacities which they require in order to deal more effectively with the process of urban growth.

The Sustainable Cities Programme initiative was given a tremendous boost by the “Earth Summit” - the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED) in Rio de Janeiro in 1992. The “Earth Summit” focused the world’s attention on the crucial importance of environment for social and economic development and resulted in wide-spread adoption of the famous *Agenda 21*. Agenda 21 articulated a range of desirable policies and concepts, including an emphasis on cross-sectoral coordination, decentralisation of decision-making, and broad-based participatory approaches to development management. The potential of the SCP as a vehicle for implementing Agenda 21 at the city level was recognised - and supported - immediately, with this role being further strengthened at the “City Summit” in Istanbul in 1996 (the Second United Nations Conference on Human Settlements - Habitat 2) and through the *Habitat Agenda* which was then adopted.

In 1995, the governing bodies of UN-HABITAT and of UNEP (United Nations Environment Programme) decided to make the Sustainable Cities

¹ The Urban Management Programme (UMP) is a joint effort of UN-HABITAT, UNDP, and the World Bank. The Sustainable Cities Programme became the main operational arm of the UMP, which was otherwise focused on research, networking and information dissemination.

² UN-HABITAT is the specialised agency of the United Nations with specific responsibility for housing, planning, and urban development matters. Its mandate covers execution of technical cooperation projects in the field, as well as research. UN-HABITAT was established as a result of the First United Nations Conference on Human Settlements (Habitat I) in Vancouver in 1976. Its headquarters are in Nairobi, Kenya, supported by regional offices in Asia (Japan) and Latin America (Brazil).

Programme a **joint facility**, thereby pooling the mandates, resources, and capabilities of the two agencies and providing an even broader and more solid foundation for the work of the SCP. In 1996 and 1997, the SCP became the spearhead of the two agencies in operationalising a new development cooperation paradigm which is centred on partnership, mutual learning and mutual assistance, sharing of experience, with primary reliance on local resources supported by international programmes in the role of facilitator.³

The Sustainable Cities Programme Today

Since its inception, the SCP has grown from a very modest \$100,000 per year initiative to a \$30 million global programme which mobilising support from a wide variety of sources including UN-HABITAT, UNEP, UNDP, WHO, ILO, World Bank, the Netherlands, Denmark, Canada, France, Italy, the United Kingdom, and others.

The primary focus of the Sustainable Cities Programme, however, remains firmly at the *city level*; in its initial five years more than 95% of the resources mobilised for the SCP have been applied to city-level activities. The first SCP city demonstration project began in January 1992 in Dar es Salaam (Tanzania), and others soon followed: Accra (Ghana), Cagayan de Oro, Tagbilaran, and Lipa (Philippines), Concepcion (Chile), Dakar (Senegal), La Habana (Cuba), Ibadan (Nigeria), Ismailia (Egypt), Katowice (Poland), Lusaka (Zambia), Madras (India), Maputo & Nampula (Mozambique), Moscow & St Petersburg (Russia), Shenyang & Wuhan (China), and Tunis (Tunisia). In addition, numerous other cities are in various stages of preparing for and developing SCP demonstration projects, for example, Amman (Jordan), Asuncion (Paraguay), Belo Horizonte (Brazil), Gaza (Palestine), Harare (Zimbabwe), and Kampala (Uganda).

In Tanzania, the experience of the Dar es Salaam project is being extended to a variety of secondary cities (Dodoma, Moshi, Zanzibar, etc.) each of which is now initiating its own SCP project. In Egypt and in Chile, similar initiatives to replicate the SCP process in other cities are being developed. In the Philippines, the programme focuses initially upon SCP projects in three secondary cities, but a regionally-based replication process is built in so the SCP process can be extended to other cities.

The Sustainable Cities Programme is therefore global in scope but still firmly local in focus. Moreover, this large “family” of SCP project cities gives the SCP a tremendous foundation of “real-world” experiences through which the SCP approach and methodology is continuously tested, adapted, revised, and enhanced.⁴ Indeed, this is perhaps the greatest strength of the SCP approach: it is a robust general methodology which has been adapted to local circumstances and successfully applied in many different cities, each of which not only benefits from and learns from the SCP approach but also contributes directly to the further evolution and strengthening of the SCP concepts.

To supplement and support this energetic and growing base of participant cities, the Sustainable Cities Programme has more recently been developing its activities at the **regional** and global levels. At the regional level, efforts are underway to develop networks and mechanisms for sharing experiences,

³ This is in contrast to the older development assistance paradigm, which centres on top-down expert-determined solutions, typically technology or investment driven, and often relying on out-dated and inappropriate master-planning approaches.

⁴ The most recent Annual Meetings of the Sustainable Cities Programme, held in Shenyang (China) in Sept/Oct 1997 and in Moscow (Russia) in June 1998, each brought together 125-150 people representing more than 30 cities for three days of intensive discussion and exchange of experience

pooling resources and expertise, and developing regional information bases. This has progressed furthest in the Africa region, but initiatives are also underway for similar activities in North Africa and the Middle East. At the **global** level there is even greater recent progress; the SCP has mobilised substantial resources⁵ to increase the capacity of the SCP core team and its partners to:

- more effectively back-stop city projects and related activities at the city, national, and regional levels;
- develop and support networks and activities for sharing experiences and for mutual learning;
- capture lessons of experience, document good practices, and develop other means of systematically learning from the SCP family of cities;
- develop a variety of “tools” and guidelines to support the broader replication of the SCP process.

Because it provides a locally-adapted general framework for new approaches to urban environmental management, the SCP has proved in practice to be an ideal attraction for and vehicle for **inter-agency cooperation**. The flexibility of the SCP approach makes it possible to accommodate a wide variety of support interventions, while the operational structure of an SCP city project provides a good basis for proper coordination of efforts at the local level. As a result, the SCP is already collaborating with nearly 20 different international support programmes⁶, as well as with national and international NGOs and associations of local government, in the implementation of the various city demonstration projects. In addition to the extremely valuable extra support it gives - directly and indirectly - to SCP project implementation, this broad base of inter-agency cooperation provides an important stimulus to the mobilisation of follow-up resources, especially funds for priority capital investments.

Some Key Characteristics of the Sustainable Cities Programme

As emphasised earlier, the SCP does *not* view environmental deterioration as a necessary or inevitable consequence of rapid urban growth; equally, the SCP does *not* consider financial resource constraints to be the primary cause of environmental problems. Instead, the SCP considers environmental deterioration to be primarily caused by:

- inappropriate urban development policies and policy implementation;
- poorly planned and managed urban growth which does not adequately consider the constraints (and opportunities) of the natural environment;
- inadequate and inappropriate urban infrastructure, both in terms of investment and especially operations, maintenance and management; and
- lack of coordination and cooperation among key institutions and groups.

⁵ Special mention should be given to the generous support from the Netherlands and from Denmark.

⁶ Numerous UN-related programmes are active partners, such as UNEP's International Environmental Technology Centre (IETC), the Awareness and Preparedness for Emergencies at Local Level (APELL) programme, WHO's Healthy Cities Programme, the Urban Management Programme (UMP), the LIFE programme of UNDP, the UNEP/GRID programme, etc

Accordingly, the SCP focuses very explicitly on ***urban environmental planning and management (EPM)***; it works directly with local governments and their partners to develop and nurture local capacities, system-wide, for more effective and responsive local governance, highlighting:

- more relevant and more appropriately utilised environmental information and technical expertise;
- better identification and understanding of priority environmental issues, leading to more soundly-based decision-making about urban development and environment;
- improved processes and mechanisms for formulating coordinated environmental strategies and for implementing them effectively;
- enhanced and institutionalised managerial capacities in the public, private and community sector partners;
- more effective mobilisation and use of available technical and financial resources.

Similarly, the SCP is essentially concerned with the ***process*** of environmental planning and management - certainly *not* concerned with the production of plans and technical report and studies. Most cities are already well-endowed with master plans of various types, as well as numerous technical studies, often produced at great expense; but in most cities, these plans have had little effect on the reality of urban growth and development! Even in those few cases where such plans and reports have been (usually only partially) implemented, very often the consequences are quite different from what was originally foreseen or intended.

A key characteristic of the SCP is its emphasis on understanding the ***two-way relationship between environment and development***:

- urban development affects the environment (air pollution, exhaustion of ground water supplies, draining of wetlands, etc); *but*
- the environment in turn affects urban development (water supply shortages, flooding, land subsidence, etc).

The SCP also emphasises understanding the *long-term implications* of the environment-development relationships. Often, severe and lasting (perhaps even permanent) damage is done to the environment simply because the long-term consequences are not properly appreciated and are not properly incorporated into the planning and decision-making processes. This is particularly true when the short-term actions are taken in isolation by one activity sector (e.g. filling in marshes and wetlands for urban development) while the longer-term consequences are felt later by other activity sectors (flooding from water displaced to other areas, loss of wildlife, increased land erosion, etc.).

Almost everywhere in the world, urban government systems are organised in traditional hierarchical bureaucracies with vertical lines of communication and responsibility and fragmented into highly-compartmentalised departments and sections, themselves often separated by rigid sectoral and professional/

technical boundaries. These local government structures basically evolved for simple forms of administration and service delivery and are generally narrow and short-term in focus. This traditional type of government structure, however, is very poorly suited to the complex demands of urban development and environmental management in the modern world. Environmental issues generally cut across departmental and sector and professional boundaries, having complicated sets of short-term and especially long-term interactions in a wide variety of realms; these interactions, moreover, are often very inadequately understood. Hence, the development and strengthening of ***cross-sectoral and inter-institutional connectivity*** is a central feature of every SCP city project.

The Sustainable Cities Programme also has a central commitment to the ***widest possible range of participation*** in urban environmental planning and management. This commitment is not based on theory or ideology - but on the practical reality that effective and sustainable environmental management requires the active and meaningful involvement of all those different groups and organisations and interests whose cooperation is necessary for successful action and implementation. Environmental planning and management is *not* a task which can be accomplished by 'government' alone. On the contrary, ultimate success depends on proper involvement of:

- **the Public Sector** - focused particularly on the local or metropolitan level and including all the relevant agencies, departments, authorities, etc. - and involving politicians as well as officials;
- **the Private Sector** - the economic sectors (trade, business, industry), both large-scale modern participants and those in the "informal" sector; and
- **the Community Sector** - Non-Government Organisations, both local and national, Community Based Organisations, Private Voluntary Organisations, special environmental interest groups, etc.

The SCP approach accepts the reality that there are many different and often conflicting interests with respect to any particular environmental or development question. Indeed, the very existence, and the nature and severity, of environmental problems depends upon whose point of view - whose interest - is being adopted. One person's environmental opportunity (filling in a marsh for building land) is another person's environmental danger (displaced flooding). It is therefore quite unrealistic to search for "neutral" or purely "technical" solutions. It is much more important to understand the full range of costs and benefits, of advantages and disadvantages, and especially the distribution of likely gains and losses attached to alternative courses of action (or inaction).

For this reason, concerning any particular environmental issue the SCP approach insists that the ***full range of "stakeholders"*** (interested parties or groups) should be identified and incorporated properly into the environmental planning and management process. The range of stakeholders - from the public, private or community sectors - should include:

- those possess relevant information, knowledge, or expertise concerning the environmental issue;
- those who control or influence relevant instruments for intervention and implementation; and

- those whose interests are directly affected by, or whose activities affect, the particular environmental issue.

Finally, it is quite clear, from long and varied experience, that the SCP approach requires sustained and long-term commitment to change. There are no “easy answers” to urban environmental problems - deep-seated and structural difficulties are not resolved by extra dollops of capital investment or by discovery of a shiny new technology. The basic task is one of changing the ways in which people and organisations go about the business of urban development management. This can only be a slow, difficult, and challenging task.

The SCP approach is therefore flexible, pragmatic, and responsive. It is based on the premise that the environment is a critical ingredient for the success or failure of urban development, and that participatory management is the most effective response to environmental concerns. The SCP introduces a management approach that seeks to involve and reconcile, rather than exclude and restrict, the various stakeholders in urban development. Most important, the SCP is a general approach which is always adapted in application to the particular local circumstances.

The SCP Process in Summary

The SCP process has evolved through application and development in a wide variety of cities, and it is still changing in response to new knowledge, new experience. However, the basic approach of the Sustainable Cities Programme in a city-level demonstration project retains the same general form, which can be briefly summarised. Each SCP project typically passes through three broad, and typically over-lapping, phases:

- a six to nine month *Start-Up Phase*;
- a *Strategy and Action Planning Phase* of 15 to 24 months; and
- an open-ended *Follow-up and Consolidation Phase*.

During the *Start-up Phase* the foundations for the whole SCP project are laid, and therefore considerable effort goes into ensuring this is done carefully and successfully. The key activities during this phase are:

- establishing and organising the project team
- identifying and clarifying environmental issues
- assembling and analysing relevant information
- identifying and mobilising key stakeholders
- agreeing priority environmental issues to be taken up
- confirming broad-based support for the approach and the project.

Identifying and clarifying urban environmental issues, for example, is much more complex and difficult than it seems. To assist in this process, an SCP project will normally prepare an Environmental Profile, which is a special way of organising information to highlight environment-development interactions as well as illustrate critical management aspects. To assist in organising the necessary information (both for phase one and, especially, for phase two) it is common to establish a simplified GIS/EMIS system. Another critical task is the identification and the mobilisation and involvement of

relevant stakeholders. Extra effort is required to ensure that stakeholders who have not traditionally been involved can become active participants.

Phase One is normally concluded with a large-scale City Consultation, a three to five day workshop with 150 to 300+ people attending. At this Consultation, carefully structure review and discussion of the main environmental issues will lead to agreement on which are the priority issues to be taken up by the SCP project. In addition, the Consultation will confirm political support and consolidate stakeholder participation, as well as agree the institutional arrangements for the remainder of project activities, including the establishment of broad-based cross-sectoral Working Groups.

The *Second Phase* encompasses the main work period of the project, and in general it will involve the following activities:

- further clarification and assessment of environmental issues and sub-issues;
- negotiation of agreed issue-specific environmental management strategies;
- aggregating across issue for an over-all environmental strategy;
- developing agreed issue-specific environmental action plans;
- working out collaboration with other projects and programmes;
- agreeing and establishing monitoring systems;
- initiating capacity-building and institutional development;
- formulating capital investment and technical support project proposals.

At the City Consultation, Working Groups will have been set up for the agreed priority issues; there may be several topic-specific Working Groups in relation to each main issue.⁷ Each of these Working Groups will comprise members from the important stakeholders, for example from all the different municipal departments and agencies relevant for the topic and from private sector and NGO groups as well. The key point is that the Working Groups are issue-specific, rather than general, so as to encourage cross-sectoral cooperation on a more pragmatic “problem-solving” basis. These various Working Groups, supported by the SCP project team and aided by specialist resources made available through the project, carry out the main work of the SCP project.

These Working Groups will then undertake a variety of tasks. Reviewing the information available on the environmental issue and especially on the studies, strategies, and plans which have previously been prepared or considered, the Working Group will further clarify the issue and assess the various implications of alternative interventions. Out of this process will come a negotiated consensus on the basic environmental management strategies to be adopted for that particular issue. This will almost certainly differ from earlier strategies, because under the SCP this will have been done through a broad-based cross-sectoral forum through which differing interests and viewpoints can be discussed and reconciled.

Probably working through a special Coordinating Working Group, the SCP project will also work to aggregate the several issue-specific strategies into an over-all environmental management strategy, through which the crucial inter-linkages among environmental issues can be taken into account. This

⁷ The number of Working Groups varies greatly, from one SCP project to another - and even within one SCP project from one time to another. Typically, SCP projects will begin with a modest number, perhaps 4 or 5, and then expand to 8 or 10 or more as the project matures and gains experience. At one time, the Dar es Salaam project had over 25. In some cities, main issues have been broken down into sub-issues and into geographic sub-areas. There is no standard pattern.

will also provide a basis for a framework environmental management plan, as well as a foundation for developing a Local Agenda 21.

The Working Groups will also work on the translation of the agreed strategies into environmental action plans, embodying agreed time-schedules, resource commitments, coordination mechanisms, respective responsibilities, etc. Utilising the broad base of representation in the Working Groups, these action plans will develop packages of mutually supporting interventions using a full range of implementation instruments, together with agreed institutional plans to support implementation.⁸ At this point, the great advantage of broad-based Working Groups becomes more apparent, because it is then possible to mobilise support from private sector groups, NGOs, CBOs, and public sector departments not traditionally involved in decisions about this particular environmental issue.

Implementation of agreed action plans, including initiation of supporting implementation actions (such as policy and regulatory reforms, economic instruments, etc), should also begin during Phase Two.⁹ Typically this will occur in a phased manner, with some issues or sub-issues reaching this stage before others, depending upon local circumstances. Also, as Phase Two proceeds, it is likely that additional priority issues will be taken up: as the SCP project matures and gains experience, the capacity to handle additional issues will be built up, and in any case, over the life of the project priorities are likely to change.

To support the Working Groups - and the stakeholder organisations from which they draw their representation - a variety of training, awareness-raising and capacity-building activities will be undertaken.

Derived from the action plans and strategies there will be a number of capital investment and technical cooperation project proposals, collected into mutually-supporting “packages” where possible; these will be identified, agreed, and developed upon to “bankable” status and negotiations will be initiated with potential funding sources.

The *Final Phase* of the SCP project (which will overlap with some activities of the Second Phase) will include a number of activities:

- initiation of priority capital investment and technical support project;
- consolidation and extension of capacity-building initiatives;
- institutionalisation of SCP procedures and approaches;
- extension of monitoring systems and initiation of evaluation;
- initiation of steps for replicating the SCP process in other cities.

The capital investment and technical support projects which were formulated should be taken through to funding and implementation on the ground (although with the typical lead-times for funding agencies this typically only begins well into the Final Phase). The coordination and monitoring systems set up through the SCP project will be valuable here, to help promote not only effective investment implementation but also to provide back-up support for the essential operations, maintenance and management aspects.

Through the activities of the different Working Groups, and supported through the different capacity-building undertakings, the experience of doing the SCP

⁸ It should be emphasised that the Working Groups do not take formal or legal responsibility for interventions; this rests firmly, as it must, with the institutions which are represented on the Working Group. The Working Group acts as the forum through which institutions agree and coordinate actions, working through their representatives.

⁹ It is the experience of many SCP cities that the Working Groups and their activities provide a natural focus for collaboration with other special projects or programmes, and in many cases substantial other donor assistance has been channelled through or closely coordinated with the SCP Working Groups.

project will allow these new capabilities to be firmly rooted in the various local institutions. In this way, the SCP capabilities will be institutionalised in a lasting way.

Finally, through the capturing of lessons of experience of the SCP city project, supported by its monitoring mechanisms, and through the personal and institutional capabilities established through the project activities, the resources will be available for replication of the SCP process and its extension to other cities.

C8

Working Groups are the Core Ingredients Within the City's SCP Process Institutional Framework



