



Planning and stakeholder engagement tools

By: Claire J. Ogali, Jonathan Davies, and Razingrim Ouedraogo

NB – to ILRI.... We are not sure about the audience of this document. If this is a standalone document, then it might need more work. However, if it is part of a wider document then it can be used as it is.

Introduction

There are concerns on the rate of land degradation globally. Recent comparative reviews of global land degradation assessments estimate the total degraded area as varying from less than 1 billion hectares to over 6 billion hectares (Le et al 2017)¹. Water, land and ecosystem quality is thought to be degrading over substantial areas. Yet many areas face serious pressures from increasing rural and urban populations, compounded by the threat of global climate change. Rangeland resources are numerous but the ecosystems require appropriate management strategies to ensure sustainable productivity. Changes in these landscapes will be brought about through individual decisions. But for change to be sustainable it must be systemic, facilitated and directed by institutions that support communities of women and men.

Developing resource management plans at the community level requires an inclusive approach that is participatory in nature to ensure that management plans are integrated at the district or county level planning systems. In identifying ecosystem services and developing their management plans, this project adopted the Community Environmental Action Planning (CEAP) approach². CEAP is an empowering participatory approach that has been used to improve local governance over land, land use and natural resources planning and management in communities. By adopting a participatory approach in developing the action plans for implementing ecosystem services management options, there is greater assurance that decisions arrived at are acceptable to the stakeholders developing them. This is intended to increase ownership of actions agreed on and to ensure sustainability³. CEAP is an iterative process that begins with identifying the stakeholders to include in the planning process. Once the right stakeholders have been identified, a visioning exercise is carried out to determine the past, the current and the desired state of natural resources within the desired area. A road map from the current to the

¹ Le, Q.B., Mirzabaev, A., Nkonya, E., Lynden, G.W.J. (2017). The extent and cost of land degradation (Chapter 4). pp. 40-47. In: Vlek, P.L.G. et al. (Eds.). The Threat of Land Degradation to Realizing the SDGs and Its Remedies. Book Manuscript. CGIAR Research Program on Dryland Systems and Center for Tropical Agricultural Research (CIAT). 72 pp.

² https://www.iucn.org/sites/dev/files/content/documents/ceap_guide_iucn.pdf

³ Luyet et al. (2012). A framework to implement Stakeholder participation in environmental projects. Journal of Environmental Management 111 (2012) 213e219

desired future is then outlined with actions to achieve the desired future being detailed in action plans. Monitoring and evaluation procedures are then established and lessons from the exercise shared.

CEAP was founded in process-oriented approaches that encourage “interactive participation” whereby people participate in joint analysis, which eventually leads to locally formulated action plans. The CEAP process is therefore guided by a set values and principles that ensure participation enables local people themselves to assume ownership and accountability for activities, which they have identified and developed with the support of local government, or a project or donor. The key principles and core values are outlined in this section.

The benefits of participatory approaches

The World Bank (1996)⁴ defines participation as “a process through which stakeholders’ influence and share control over development initiatives and the decision and resources which affect them” (Luyet et al 2012). Participatory approaches are gaining significance in national and international environmental policy as decision makers recognize the need to understand who is affected by the decisions and actions they take, and who has the power to influence their outcome. Different participatory approaches have been developed over the years all with the main objective on ensuring public/community participation in resource planning and use. The Community Environmental Action Planning (CEAP) is one of such participatory approaches that was developed by IUCN. CEAP was initially used in developing environmental restoration plans in refugee hosting areas but it has since evolved to include development of community plans for restoration and management of wider landscapes.

Establishing CEAPs is an important contribution towards enhanced environmental management particularly as people have greater commitment to caring for their environment. There is sufficient evidence that CEAP processes have contributed positively to the level of awareness and involvement of local community in natural resource management. People’s livelihoods have improved and ecosystems appear to be more sustainably managed or are healing through restoration efforts.

CEAPs, if adequately applied to address the existing gaps, have the potential to make a shift from conventional, centrally planned and implemented projects to becoming institutionalized as an accepted model of management, which embraces local communities as rightful planners and managers, and stewards of their natural resources. The implementation of these people-oriented environmental management plans would represent a great shift in the orientation of donor and government policy from the traditional ready-made assistance package towards a more developmental, people and service-oriented approach.

CEAP offers an alternative to the top-down approaches that have characterized natural resources management in the past and proved unsustainable. CEAPs allow for community participation in planning and managing of their resources. This enables the community to share in the benefits derived from their natural resource base while at the same time maintaining the integrity of the local ecosystems. In

⁴ World Bank, 1996. The World Bank Participation Sourcebook. World Bank, Washington

addition it has contributed to improved and efficient natural resource management through a more participatory and devolved arrangement of regulations regarding resource use. The approach allows an increase in community participation, but is simple enough to realistically be adopted by local government institutions and can therefore be useful in scaling up participatory principles and values country-wide.

CEAP principles

- Involve all relevant stakeholders including marginalized groups within the community.
- Create local ownership by ensuring the process is understood by all stakeholders.
- Develop a common vision based on consensus by all relevant stakeholders.
- Be aware of policies and laws that might impact on the process positively and negatively. Aim to strengthen existing policies.
- Use and build on existing structures and institutions e.g. appropriate government structures.
- Be sensitive to the community's seasonal and daily calendar.
- Seek to enhance traditional natural resource management systems by building on local indigenous knowledge.
- Encourage active community participation and ownership.
- Promote the culture of learning by doing.
- Ensure the process is empowering and devolves power to the people.
- Provide added value to the community by responding to natural resource management and livelihoods.
- Use a phased approach – scoping, planning and implementation.
- Adapt approaches to the local context and needs.
- Incorporate quick actions for quick benefits.

Adopting the CEAP approach to identify ecosystem services, develop ecosystem service management options and action plans

There are several steps that are typically followed in the CEAP Process. The project adopted these steps in identifying ecosystem services, developing management options and action plans for ecosystem services in the two project sites of Tana River County and Yatenga province. The project however incorporated a scientific modelling analysis of some specific ecosystem services management options that were identified by the stakeholders. The process adopted by the project is summarized in Table 1 below.

Table 1 Adapted CEAP Process

<p>Step 1: Baseline and stakeholder analysis</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Collect baseline information among the target community• Collect and collate scientific information as a backup to the baseline,• Conduct a stakeholder analysis to identify key stakeholders who can influence or can be influenced by the process. (Involve government, community and civil society organizations),
--

Step 2: Mapping and developing management options and action plans

- Conduct a mapping exercise to identify the current situation of ecosystem services and Map out the future desired vision,
- Identify positive and negative impacts on the ecosystem services and reach a consensus with stakeholders,
- Develop a CEAP using the information collected. It should include:
 - The approach of achieving the vision (management plans for the ecosystem services),
 - Commitments, roles and responsibilities of the different stakeholders,
 - Resource mobilization to carry out the management plans,
 - Monitoring and Evaluation.
- Prioritization of identified management options.

Step 3: External analysis to analyze the action plans identified

- Scientific modelling of prioritized management option.
- Determining the right combination of management options
- Presentation of results of the scientific modelling.

Step 4: Revision of action plans

- Revision of the action plans to incorporate results of the scientific modeling.

Step 1: Baseline and stakeholder analysis

A baseline analysis is conducted to determine the baseline information in the target landscape and community. This can involve collection both primary and secondary information. General information of the landscape and its people is gathered. This forms a basis for which the entire CEAP process will be carried out.

A preliminary stakeholder analysis is also done to identify the key rights holders and other actors in the target landscape and how they interact among themselves and with the landscape. The stakeholders could also be useful in influencing the process. The aim is however to ensure that all representatives of the major stakeholders in the target area are in agreement with the process and are able to take on the results from the work in their planning and decision making processes.

This step involves meetings at the county / provincial level with government officials and the target community. These meetings could also be used to introduce the idea to the key stakeholders and sought their views. This step should end with a round table meeting where all stakeholders consulted meet and agree on the way forward.

Step 2: Mapping and developing management options and action plans

Mapping to identify the current ecosystem services in study area

A mapping exercise is conducted to identify the current ecosystem services in the study area. This enables all participants to actively participate and in this way it helps empower people and allows everyone to participate. Maps are a quick way for people to share what they feel that their village lands look like, where the important features and resources are, and start to identify some of the problems and opportunities. This mapping exercise allows participants an easy and friendly way of discussing such issues as: a good thing, who does what where, problems etc. Depending on time and resources different

groups can draw their maps – men, women, different stakeholder groups (e.g. pastoralists, non-pastoralists, government officers, CSOs) in the village.

Visioning maps (Desired Future)

After the different groups have presented their “present situation” maps, they can start to think about their “vision” for their landscapes and environment for the future (for instance in 5-10 years’ time). Participants can think about what they would like their “desired future to be”. This allows participants to think about how their lives, land and environment would be in the future.

Vision mapping is a fun way to look to the desired future, and provides a good basis for discussion about: why a community wants that vision; how they will actually achieve their vision; what needs to be put in place; the problems and opportunities they may have. (See also 3.3.5)

The combination of these two maps (present situation and vision) provides the foundation (or the building blocks) for CEAP. It is the basis for discussing problems and opportunities, for doing more detailed stakeholder and resource use analysis, identifying activities that need to be implemented and starting to look at issues relating to institutions, rules and regulations, and how the landscapes are actually managed.

While the maps by themselves are important, it is the discussions about the maps and how to get to the vision that is more important. In addition such maps can, with time, be used to more definitely agree and identify where all the resources etc. are using a GPS.

Opportunities and Problems in the Landscape

The mapping exercise provides an easy way to start discussing the problems and opportunities in the target area. These problems and opportunities are discussed and analyzed in more detail as opportunities are one way to solve problems. As the problems are analyzed and discussed, it also provides an avenue to start to think about short and long term solutions, which can then form part of the action plan

Resource Use and Stakeholder Analysis

Once the important ecosystem services have been identified and the opportunities and challenges outlined, the next step is to try and understand the different users of the ecosystem services and why they use them. This is an initial and introductory part of stakeholder analysis, which coupled with the resource use analysis will help us understand in more detail the problems and opportunities around.

Developing the management options and action plans

Once the present and future maps have been developed, opportunities and challenges outlined, the next step is identifying management options and developing the action plans. Management options are a set of broader activities which would be implemented to attain the future desired future of ecosystem services in the target area. Action plans on the other hand are the specific activities that would be implemented to attain the management options. Action plans also include the rationale for selecting the activities identified, a time frame for implementation of the activities, the cost involved and the people responsible for implementing the activities. The action plans developed at this stage is the draft plan which would be refined at a later stage.

Monitoring and Evaluation

Monitoring and evaluation includes both following up on the action plans to ensure they are implemented as planned and learning from the successes and identifying and addressing challenges in the process. The lessons learnt could also be issued in informing future process.

Step 3: External analysis to analyze the action plans identified

After identifying the different management options and action plans, there is need to determine how the different management options identified would be combined to attain the desired future of the target area. There are different ways in which external analysis could be done. For this project, scientific modelling was used to analyze the management options identified for the target area.

Model development is normally a long process that incorporates various variables. There is always a need to prioritize the variables to include in the model. Priority is usually given to larger effect variables as compared to those that would have minimal effect. A model is also expected to act as a guide to help in decision making and not a conclusive tool. There is no perfect model but with a model, the community and decision makers can be able to understand possible outcomes and different cause effect situations. A model could also be used to test the best ideas that suit the stakeholder's goals.

Results of the models are usually presented to the 'same' audience who developed the action plans. The audience is able to vet and critique the model to ensure that the results of the model are realistic to the scenarios on the ground. With the results from the model, the participants are expected to refine the action plans.

Step 4: Revision of action plans

Once the participants have vetted and critiqued the model, that then revise the draft action plans they had developed in step 2. Results from the external analysis are expected to guide the revision of action plans by the stakeholders. It is expected that the same participants that developed the action plans would be the ones revising and refining them to ensure consistency.

Experiences from adopting the CEAP approach in the field

Experiences in Tana River County, Kenya

The incorporation of the scientific modelling step in the CEAP approach required that the modelling approach is introduced from the initial step of the CEAP approach. This ensured that the stakeholders involved were in agreement with the process and the results from the modelling exercise.

The results of the modelling work were generally acceptable to stakeholders especially because the model results were in agreement with the traditional grazing patterns of the pastoral community in Tana River.

The model was unable to model all the management options identified by stakeholders. This was mainly because the model focused on fodder production and consumption and water recharge. Stakeholders in

the county were however in agreement that the model is meant to act as a guide for decision making on what management options are ideal for the county.

There is need to improve some aspects of the model to ensure it reflects the reality in the study area. This is because some of the results of the modelling exercise were in contradiction to what the stakeholders deemed as normal. Some of the issues raised included the livestock density in the wet season and dry season grazing areas and ground water recharge.

The results of the modelling work were useful in guiding the stakeholders to review the action plans they had previously developed. It was however not certain whether other factors could have contributed to this. For instance, the period of time between when the previous plans were developed and currently or maybe they might have had a greater understanding of the management option currently than they had before. The composition of the participants from both periods remained the same and it is unlikely that this could have influenced the discussions.

The results from the model are also expected to guide decision making at the county level as mentioned by the different county sectors present at the workshop. There is however need to follow up and monitor how this is reflected in county planning and decision making.

Experiences in Yatenga Province Burkina Faso

The modeling exercise with Thiou community in Yatenga province in Burkina Faso was generally good. The community appreciated the participatory approach used to lead them to define their action plan to conserving their rangelands and enhancing ecosystem services. The modelling step was important and has help to focus on some management options that have potential in term of forage production and are in agreement with their local knowledge.

In Yatenga province, the model scenarios were focused on pastoral zones (ZPs), including creation of new ZPs similar to the one already existing in the area. The main questions that scnarios tried to respond includ mainly the managemet options in pastoral zones that are able to increase forage production and water infiltration.

The community trusted in general in the modelling and among the various scenarios presented to them, they were specifically convinced by 2 two scenarios that are must more practical and in agreement with their local knowledge and they are willing to test and scaled up. Those scenarios are:

- (i) *2weeks ban: a no access for grassing for 2 weeks, and that must happen during the month it is raining well and the grass has potential for growing. In the case of Yatenga and Thiou, the month of August seems the best based on the rainfall data of 25 years of survey.*
- (ii) *1 month ban: a no access for grassing for 1 month and that month should be the month that grass has potential for growing. The month of August seems still the best for Yatenga and Thiou.*

Participants agreed with these options and highlighted the importance of getting another pastoral zone in the region. Indeed, in order to put the convincing scenarios in practice, they need a second pastoral

zone, so that during the ban period in one pastoral zone herds can be grazed in the other one. The area has many land users such as pastoralists; agriculturalists and currently the landscape present a mosaic of uses. The pastoral zones are great ways to preserve grazing areas and to practice positive management options highlighted in the scenarios. .

The community was in agreement that the modelling constitute a decision making tool on what management options are ideal. Government representatives at provincial level and Thiou commune local authorities such as the Mayor of Thiou participated in all the CEAP process and are also convinced that it is a great tool for engaging decision makers and communities to reflect on best options to conserving and protecting sustainably rangelands in the region and to increase their various environmental benefits. The Mayor of Thiou personally committed to use the outcomes of the CEAP process and engage all stakeholders of his commune in protecting rangelands and specifically the issue of pastoral zones.

In terms of gaps, the community mentioned the fact that it is hard to comprehensively understand the modelling, especially when dealing with a rural community. The conclusion come to the same as mentioned above in Tana River experience: the modelling approach should be introduced from the initial step of the CEAP approach for better understanding of the whole process. In addition, the modelling should take into consideration some qualitative variables. Many comments of participants during the workshop went towards qualitative variables such as the quality of grass. Indeed, according to them, it is good to increase the forage production in terms of quality, but it is also important so reflect on the quality – thing that the model does not take into account. Some of the issues raised included the number of livestock that was taken into account for the scenarios. The scenarios of 2 weeks and 1 months ban can be very strong if it takes into account the real livestock potential of the area. Otherwise, if the livestock number is too high during the allowed grazing period the risk of degradation will still be high.

In conclusion, the modelling workshop in Yatenga province was good and participants were generally satisfied with by whole CEAP process. Participants requested that such workshop takes enough time to allow people to discuss in details the scenarios. Such process needs quite a number of workshops and action plans refinement discussions based on modelling results.

Key lessons of using this methodology

- Involving local governments in the design of action plans is a key success factor in terms of supporting implementation and ensuring sustainability.
- For the process to be effective it has to be facilitated in a way that identifies and addresses key underlying issues such as governance, tenure, livelihoods and it should allow community decision on the best approaches that can lead to the attainment of their priorities.
- The devolution of resource management functions and power to grassroots level increases the sense of value and ownership of the natural resources in addition to raising awareness.

- There is need to find a balance between engaging at community level and involving government officials so that the process is not hijacked or undermined by the people who are not the key stakeholders.
- The process of developing action plans requires time and patience in order to elicit the required results and benefits of the targeted stakeholders.
- There is need to find a balance between using detailed scientific analysis to complement community baselines in order to support /justify actions to other stakeholders.
- There is need to ensure proper vetting of models is done to ensure that the results presented are reflective of the scenarios on the ground.
- The results of the models should be comprehensive and be able to incorporate the different aspects of the target area to ensure they are useful to the target community.
- More resources need to be dedicated to the implementation of action plans. What is planned is normally ambitious compared to what is actually implemented. There are normally very high expectations during planning but resources are limiting.
- It is important to integrate other sectors in the action plans such health, education, water and infrastructure in addition to the environment so that the final document is holistic. In this way resources from probable donors in different sectors can be sought and utilized effectively to uplift the livelihoods of the community without compromising ecosystem integrity.

Challenges

- When planning for CEAPs in different countries it is important to accommodate the local calendars (e.g. rainy or harvesting season, festivities etc.) and on the other hand find available dates with all the other involved stakeholders including the facilitators.
- If budgets are not included for implementation of CEAPs, community motivation may wane, but conversely if budgets are available, this may affect the motivation of communities to implement action plans autonomously.
- Most of the communities in the project area are mobile and this can affect their participation and commitment to the process.
- Low capacities of communities to influence decisions regarding resource use especially where there is conflict and competition with stakeholders who wield more political power can become a challenge to the planning and implementation of CEAPs.
- Long term sustainability of participation requires institutionalization in government processes, and CEAP should be conducted in close partnership with government institutions from the outset to avoid project-dependency and to identify policy options to support continuation.

Conclusion

Using participatory approaches to conduct research raises questions about who is participating with whom and what the real aim of the participation is: how much it is about empowering people and to what extent it is a tool for gathering rich information. By breaking the linear mode of conventional research, adopting a participatory approach in research ensures that local knowledge and perspectives are not only acknowledged but form the basis for research and planning. When done appropriately, this

could empower the communities and other stakeholders involved in the participatory process. Alternatively, if not appropriately done, it could disempower the participants and create mistrust.

Participatory approaches if adequately applied in research can improve the quality of research. Community and local government involvement ensures that local knowledge is well incorporated in the research process and that research findings and recommendations are relevant to the local situations. As such, research findings may be more capable of influencing decision making. To be able to assess this however requires time for follow up and monitoring to know if the research findings have been incorporated in the local planning processes. It could also benefit from establishing clearer standards of participation according to different objectives.

For local governments that would like to adopt routine participatory planning and desire to integrate science and other evidence in their decision making processes, the main lesson learnt from this work is that adequate time is required to be able to gather the scientific evidence that would inform the participatory planning processes. There is also need to set aside funds that would be used to pilot some of the research findings to ensure that they are feasible in the local situations. Participatory research offers interesting benefits, but those benefits may be greater and have more positive knock on effects if the research is firmly embedded in sustainable development initiatives and the research methodologies are identified according to local needs.