

## **RMI COUNTRY COORDINATORS' MEETING**

**LUSAKA, ZAMBIA**

**SEPTEMBER 19-20, 2001.**

Of 11 country coordinators who had indicated they would attend eventually 6 representing Guinea, Malawi, Tanzania, Uganda, Zambia and Zimbabwe gathered for the start of proceedings at Mulungushi Conference Center at 09.00 hours on Wednesday September 19. Apologies received in advance from the coordinators from Cameroon, Madagascar and Mozambique. Also present for the meeting were the RMI Team Leader, the RMI Transport Economist and for the first part of the morning the RTTP Regional Adviser.

The discussions were based on a modified version of the agenda circulated in advance as follows:

- Session 1 – Holistic Approach to SSATP
- Session 2 – Terms of Reference and Membership Criteria
- Session 3 – Interim Work Program
- Session 4 – Medium Term Objectives

Sessions were chaired respectively by the coordinators for Zambia, Malawi, Tanzania and Zimbabwe. The RMI HQ team acted as facilitators.

### **Session 1**

After brief introductory remarks from the RMI Team Leader focusing on developments since the Saly meeting, the RMI Transport Economist opened a discussion on the holistic approach to SSATP in the light of the likely recommendation to take this route for the future SSATP strategy. Two alternative ways of looking at holism were pointed out – though not necessarily mutually exclusive, i.e. development of an integrated transport policy through closer working or eventual fusion of the components of SSATP, including RMI; ensuring the transport component of national development and poverty reduction strategy was better integrated.

In the discussion, coordinators clearly recognized and agreed that: poverty reduction should be the anchor of any interventions made; the transport contribution did need to be better integrated; more attention had to be given to overarching transport policy and master plans; imbalances and lack of intermodal connectivity needed to be addressed. The program's principal contribution to poverty reduction would be through reduced transport costs and improved access to address isolation and lack of access to economic opportunities.

As to the role of RMI, many coordinators believed that it could play a leading role in the integration process given: the existence of the coordinators network, this not being true for all SSATP components; the predominance of road transport in the systems of all countries. There was a need however to guard against a loss of focus, so coordinators accepted that a separate identify for RMI was sensible for the short term at least. A final but very important point made was that the integration process needed to be driven at the county level with the local stakeholders in the lead.

Any suggestion that the process was being managed or led by SSATP or the donors would undermine the chances of success.

## Session 2

Here was considered draft RMI coordinator terms of reference and performance indicators as well as the proposed RMI membership criteria. Drafts had been prepared in advance by the coordinator representatives (Guinea, Zambia) and had been commented on by the RMI Team Leader.

In the preliminary and overarching discussion, the importance of the following was spelled out - Who appoints the coordinator? Where is he/she located? Who finances the position? The RMI National Steering Committee should take the lead in the appointment but would be expected to get the approval of the minister concerned for transport as well as the RMI Team Leader. It was agreed that added to the proposed locations should be a senior government official in a ministry with responsibility for policy or implementation in the sector. Regardless of location, it was agreed that the coordinator required the seniority and the interpersonal skills to be listed to by ministers and stakeholders. It was accepted that the salary and recurrent expenses incurred by the coordinator would have to be locally sourced – external funding could pick up specific projects and “ad hoc” initiatives such as the proposed IT upgrading.

As far as the terms of reference are concerned the following reflects the discussions held. Coordinators were in agreement that facilitation was the major role to be played and asked that this be reflected in the revised “purpose of the job”. Reporting procedures were clarified with the primacy of the link to the RMI National Steering Committee being established. There was some discussion about the frequency of reporting – it was agreed that it should be on a quarterly basis although for many performance indicators it was understood that a detailed reporting on an annual basis would be sufficient and appropriate. Parties with whom the coordinator would need to liaise would specifically include ministries. Wording of a number of the “key tasks” was changed but the substance was unaltered. It was accepted that the balance of effort between the various tasks would vary given country situation. “Performance indicators” were adopted with some minor modifications. It was accepted however that the range of indicators would need to be revisited from time to time. In answer to concerns about cross-country comparability, it was mentioned that the initial value of these indicators would be to track progress in the countries in relation to their own past performance. Attention would also need to be given to verification procedures. Agreed criteria for RMI membership and Terms of Reference for RMI Coordinators including performance indicators are enclosed as **Annex 2 & 3**.

*Follow up: Coordinator representatives agreed to pilot the production of a common reporting format for the quarterly reports.*

The RMI membership criteria were adopted with only one modification – to add in the obligations of associate membership, including all that is expected of full members with the exception of the collection and dissemination of performance and impact indicators. The RMI Team Leader however reminded coordinators that the SSATP AGM has a final formal say on admittance of Coventry to the SSATP or any of its components. Thus Senegal and Chad remain as associates

pending this decision even if each has met the requirements for full membership. Guinea has indicated that its formal request for membership has now been submitted to HQ.

### **Session 3**

The RMI Team Leader introduced the discussion in mentioning that the emerging thinking of SSATP management that the interim work program period was now expected to last for up to the end of 2003. It was expected that the resource availability for the different SSATP components in this period would be known after the forthcoming AGM. As of now it remained the case, as revealed at Saly, that there were no resources in addition to those on hand to complete actions underway or near to completion this year – a total amount of about US\$405,000 all of which is essentially committed. The Team Leader recalled the action plan agreed at Saly and indicated that it was the task of the meeting to try to prioritize these actions and clearly link them to objectives and outputs. This would provide the input for the HQ team to help prepare an RMI log frame, which could then be used as a basis for the county program log frames, which have already been requested.

The Team Leader recalled that three priority areas for RMI interventions had been identified at Saly – advocacy, good governance and ownership; building capacity and resources; and monitor, evaluate and disseminate lessons of experience. It was necessary to review the fit to these areas of some of the actions agree, i.e. completing the “Pinard” report and developing an advocacy toolkit on that basis; deepening the work that had been started on Road Funds with an emphasis on “Francophone” issues; strengthening and extending partnerships with regional associations and organizations; fully review country programs for clarity of objectives and outputs. It was noted that action was already underway or achieved on all the other points in the Saly action plan.

Some time was spent to respond to coordinators’ concerns that the current program was insufficiently linked to the poverty reduction super goal – which would take precedence at this time over commercialization of roads as the primary driving force of RMI. After discussion of possible elements of a log frame, a possible structure emerged that it was agreed the RMI HQ team would further develop and then consult with the coordinator representatives, i.e. poverty reduction (super goal) to reduce transport costs and increase access and mobility (SSATP goal) to better maintained roads (RMI goal) to three specific output areas, i.e.: allocation of adequate funding for maintenance; efficient management of resources made available; and prioritization of maintenance. It was already clear in the discussion that activities under the three priority areas could address some or all of these outputs.

In further discussion, some coordinators reemphasized the need for follow up on Road Funds, an essential tool for the realization of the first output area as well as on ties with regional organizations which could be critical to disseminating information for improved maintenance. On the review of country programs, some coordinators mentioned that submissions had been made at Saly and that action on these was outstanding. The Team Leader undertook that HQ would factor this into the present process to review all programs.

#### Session 4

In order to bring the discussions back to the implications for the RMI program of the emerging holistic approach for SSATP discussed in the morning, the RMI Transport Economist introduced a discussion on the vision to 2006. Where did the coordinators want or expect their countries to be by then? What would this imply for the role that RMI coordinators would be expected bearing in mind the likely change in program management arrangements, which may be introduced in the medium term.

Coordinators felt that the holistic approach required that all countries have their transport sectors properly based in policy and master plans and that this should be the priority area for intervention. In some countries policies had already been adopted or were about to be – in other cases it was seen as a priority by 2002 that all countries should have achieved this step. Transport master plans on the basis of such policies should be launched by 2003 and completed if not yet approved by 2006. Note was taken however of two concerns here: first to take full cognizance of past experience and avoid pitfalls of earlier master planning exercises; second to balance process goals with impact achievements on the ground which would materially improve the lot of the poor, i.e. access (length, time) to nearer public, maintained road; availability of means of transport in every household. Also revised road maintenance targets should be included. There was some debate as to what objective indicators would be for 2006 and it was recognized that further reflection was needed – also to avoid the negative impact of the prior experience of the Yaounde Declaration whose stated targets for road maintenance have not been met.

The coordinators anticipated that RMI would be best placed – in most countries – to take the lead in managing the evolution of program interventions towards a holistic approach. This might have implications for how program management was to be organized – to this end the coordinator representatives distributed a paper with some suggestions.

RMI Coordinators agreed that the way forward was to adopt a holistic approach to transport development. The Coordinators therefore proposed the following action plan:

- i. RMI Coordinators should call for a meeting of all other sub-sector coordinators to sensitize them of the need for a coordinated and holistic approach to transport sector issues.
- ii. Member Countries should form Transport Management Sector Committees to kick off the process.
- iii. RMI Coordinators should spearhead the formulation of integrated transport master plan by 2003.
- iv. And thereafter implement Transport Sector Investment Policy through Transport Sector Investment Plan (TRANSIP) by 2006.

Country level efforts would need to be married to the roll out at regional level in order to have consistent policies and plans at this level to guide the development of cross-border infrastructure and services. To this end RMI Coordinators resolved to recommend the formulation of a Regional

Transport Sector Investment Policy, a regional Transport Master Plan and a Regional Transport Investment Program. Collaborating partners would include the African Union at regional level, ECOWAS and SADC at the sub-regional level,

In the concluding session, the coordinators reminded themselves that they – or at least those who have yet to do so – need to submit responses to SSATP management requests in regard to: IT survey; stakeholder analysis; and log frame preparation and the country programs. In evaluating the meeting, it was determined that all objectives and most outputs had been met and that the experience was a very positive one for fostering partnership and for giving the coordinators an opportunity to take a more leading role in the development of the RMI program.

The meeting came to a close at 20.15 hours.

The coordinators attended the ROADSIP 2002 Annual Work Program Seminar on September 20, 2001 as an opportunity for dissemination of practice in Zambia for the information of the other countries. The Seminar attended by about 250 participants representing the key players and stakeholders in the Road Sector as part of the planning and dissemination process was appreciated by the RMI Coordinators. Some of them expressed the need to adopt this approach in RMI countries to promote greater transparency and efficiency in the management of the Road Sector. The meeting continued in the afternoon with further discussions on work program priorities for a nominated subgroup of the coordinators whereas another group undertook a field trip to Livingstone inter alia to review road projects in Southern Province as detailed in **Annex I**.

### **In attendance**

Ahmadou Gueye  
Daupin Makako  
Willey Lyatuu  
William Musumba  
Nadarajah Gananadha  
Nelson Kudenga  
Stephen Brushett  
Torben Larsen  
George Banjo

RMI Coordinators meeting  
Lusaka – September 2001 note

Stephen Brushett