Chapter III

Practice Pointers in Participatory Pl anning and Decisionmaking

Photo by Ron Sawyer

I n chapter I, we shared our understanding of participatory development. In chapter II, we shared the experiences of a few selected Task Managers who have carried out the Bank's work using participatory approaches. In this chapter, we provide answers to questions Task Managers have about using participatory planning and decisionmaking processes in Bank-supported activities. We draw largely on chapter II examples to help readers identify how their colleagues have used participatory processes in their work. We also cite additional projects and World Bank activities that may not be described elsewhere in this document.

Getting Started

This section is about the first important step in starting participation: getting government support. In most of the *Sourcebook* examples, this was not a problem. In others, Task Managers used various means of persuasion, from initiating pilots and field visits to sustained dialogue, orientation workshops and building alliances with those who support participatory approaches. Sometimes Task Managers faced outright opposition. In these cases, some held firm to Bank policies supporting participation, others proceeded without participation. This section answers the questions of *when* and *how* you start participation.

When to Start

Start participation as soon as possible, remembering that it is never too early or too late to start, as indicated in the following examples:

Starting at Identification

In the **Chad Education** example, Chad's government developed an Educa-tion-Training-Employment Strategy for the next decade, in order to rebuild an education sector destroyed by war and disturbances during the 1980s. Chadians from many backgrounds and sectors and most major donors participated in creating the strategy. In 1991 the government decided to implement this strat-egy with the Bank's help. The minister of education requested that preparation of the new education project involve local stakeholders and respond to their needs and concerns from the beginning.

Starting in the Middle of Preparation

In the **Lao People's Democratic Republic (LPDR) Health** example, the de-signers and sponsors shifted from the external expert stance to the participa-tory stance mid-way through preparation. Although this was not the first Bank-supported project in the country, discussions with the vice minister of health revealed that he and his colleagues expected the Bank to implement the project. The Task Manager immediately shifted out of the external expert stance and into the participatory stance. He did this so that the appropriate stakeholders in Laos (who would have to implement the project) would help create, learn about, and take ownership of the project well before implementation began.

Starting during Implementation

In the **Brazil Municipalities** example, a Bank loan to a financial intermediary was on the verge of being canceled. The problem was clear—the component that was to provide water and sanitation to slum communities was not disburs-ing. The new Task Manager assigned to this project had previous experience working with poor farmers in the irrigation sector. He believed that the only way to save the loan was to take a participatory stance, involving the slum dwellers in the design and management of water systems. Working with like-minded allies in the Bank and Brazil, the Task Manager helped develop a new approach that enabled engineers, social organizers, and slum dwellers to col-laborate in designing effective, affordable water and sanitation services for some of the worst slums in the world. Three years into implementation, the Bank loan was resuscitated by initiating participatory planning and decisionmaking in subproject design.

Never Too Early, Never Too Late

These examples clearly indicate that it's never too early or too late to start participation. They also help us recognize that participation often begins in a nonparticipatory manner. A sponsor (the central government is usually the spon-sor for Bank activities) decides to pay attention to a particular geographic area within a country or to a particular development concern. So in a sense, when-ever participation begins it is *always a bit late* and always preceded by prior opinions, attitudes, and judgments of its sponsors.

Getting Government Support

Governments' stand on stakeholder participation is critical. Without govern-ment support, the Bank can do little to initiate, broaden, and sustain participa-tion. This does not imply that Bank Task Managers remain passive. It does mean, however, that Bank Task Managers must obtain government consent to work in a participatory manner. We now share some of the experiences that

Task Managers have encountered in getting government support for the participatory stance.

When the Government Is Supportive
In most of the *Sourcebook* examples, using the participatory stance instead of the traditional external expert stance was not a problem for government. Either Task Managers proposed the idea to a receptive government or vice versa. In the **Chad Education** example, the minister of education specifically asked that the project be prepared in a participatory manner. The problem for the joint country-Bank design team then became finding a participatory methodology. None had planned a project in a participatory manner, and now had to learn how.

Dealing with Skeptics
Sometimes government counterparts working on an activity with the Bank Task Manager are skeptical about participation and need convincing.

Encouraging Field Visits

In the **Benin Health** example, the Task Manager asked his government counterparts to keep an open mind until they met with the villagers. Participating in face-to-face interactions served to persuade the government officials that involving the local people in project preparation made good sense.

During preparation of the **India Forestry** example, officials from the Andhra Pradesh Forestry Department went on a field visit to review West Bengal's experience with participatory Forest Protection Committees. The head of the Forestry Department helped ensure that the team included skeptics as well as supporters of participatory approaches. All returned from the trip convinced of the value of participatory approaches to forestry. Not only had they seen local people earning income while conserving and helping regenerate the forest, but their West Bengal forestry peers told them the participatory approach made their work professionally rewarding and personally more satisfying. Whereas the West Bengal foresters once had an antagonistic relationship with the local people, they now work cooperatively with them and are welcomed and valued for their services. On returning home, the team shared what they had seen with their colleagues, thereby helping to sway other skeptics in Andhra Pradesh.

During the identification of the **Pakistan Privatization of Groundwater Development** project, the Task Manager organized a field trip to the Dominican Republic and Mexico for irrigation officials from the central and provincial government in Pakistan. The trip focused on one theme: the transfer of the management of irrigation systems to water user associations. The report of the group concluded, "In the Dominican Republic and Mexico, the process of transfer has been rather quick, and tangible results have surfaced even earlier than expected. The major reasons appear to be the will of the government, the highly committed efforts of the organizations assigned the job of transfer, the mental receptivity of the farmers, and other sociological factors. The successful programs of transferring the responsibility of irrigation management to the farmers' organizations in these two countries, along with the accruing benefits, are a source of encouragement for Pakistan to embark on a similar program."

Educating and Persuading

In the **Morocco Women in Development** example, officials wanted to restrict the dialogue to government circles instead of involving nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) and rural women. They believed participation would neither work nor add much to what they already knew. The Task Manager decided

POINTERS I

123

to avoid a hard sell for participatory processes. She visited all the concerned ministries personally and asked them to attend an informal gathering to discuss the issues. At the gathering, she laid out the pros and cons in a balanced manner for government to decide. At their request, she held a follow-up workshop to explain the specifics of the proposed participatory technique. Once the officials recognized that the decision was theirs to make, they decided to give participation a try, provided Moroccans did the work instead of foreign consultants.

Building Alliances   Although Task Managers initiated participation in many of our examples, none of them did it alone. Allies within the country were always needed. In the **Egypt Resource Management** example, a government official took personal responsibility for cutting through the red tape involved in making the project preparation grant effective. In the **Brazil Municipalities** example, disbursement rates were so poor three years into implementation that the loan was slated for cancellation. Implementation began in earnest only when the Task Manager and staff from the Bank's central Water and Sanitation Division collaboratively built a strong, personal relationship with the national project manager and his team in Brasilia. Together they sought out other Brazilian allies in the state water companies, consulting firms, and NGOs. All shared the common goal of providing sustainable services to slum communities. One lesson that can be drawn from the way alliances were built is that governments and societies are not monolithic. Almost always, someone in the country—sometimes many—support participation because it produces sustainable results.

Piloting   Piloting can be used to demonstrate the effectiveness of participatory planning in situations in which uncertainties exist and borrowers are accustomed to external expert means of project preparation. Pilots can be useful in convincing government skeptics that involving stakeholders in project planning is beneficial, that risks are manageable, and that potential exists for delivering a positive development impact.

The Task Manager in the **Albania Rural Poverty Alleviation** example decided to collaborate with rural farmers to test what would work in providing credit and rehabilitating infrastructure in their communities. Some of their government counterparts, however, believed that involving the local people in designing the project was a waste of time because villagers "knew nothing" about complex issues such as credit delivery mechanisms. Nevertheless, the Task Manager managed to build an alliance with a few like-minded government officials and obtain funding from the United Nations Development Programme and a French NGO to carry out a pre-pilot to experiment with ideas formulated in collaboration with local people. The Bank team, along with Albanian private consultants, worked with the villagers to design the pre-pilot, set criteria, and create implementation arrangements. The resulting social fund mechanism, which incorporated village credit committees and community-generated proposals for infrastructure funding, proved effective in reaching communities and building local ability for participatory decisionmaking. As a result, more and more officials in the government started to take notice. They became so interested in both the pre-pilot and its use of participatory approaches that they considered the pre-pilot as "appraisal" and pushed for approval of a larger Bank pilot project. The ensuing Bank-financed project was designed based on lessons learned from the participatory pilot.

Dealing with Opposition

Holding Firm In the **Mexico Hydroelectric** example, negotiations between the government and the Bank broke off—at least in part—over the government's unwillingness to prepare resettlement plans that met the requirements of Bank policy. Technical studies had not been completed, and levels of local participation had been insufficient in preparing the resettlement plans. The government withdrew the loan request and sought money elsewhere. The government, however, returned to the Bank seven months later to reinitiate the request and develop resettlement plans that were in keeping with the Bank's resettlement requirements, including participatory planning.

Waiting for the Right Moment There may not always be a "happy ending." Government may adamantly oppose the use of participatory processes. In that case, the choice is either to withdraw or proceed in the external expert stance and wait for the right moment. In the **Brazil Municipalities** example, participatory planning began in the third year of implementation, reminding us that it's never too late to begin.

Identifying Stakeholders

Once the government and the Bank jointly agree to work in a participatory stance, they can begin the process of identifying the appropriate stakeholders. Typically, Bank Task Managers have collaborated with government to identify relevant stakeholders by asking questions and seeking answers from both in-country and Bank sources. Often, the objective itself has defined the relevant actors. Sometimes, firsthand observation was used to identify appropriate stakeholders. In other cases, disseminating information about the proposed activity enabled interested stakeholders to show up by themselves.

Who Is a Stakeholder?
In the context of Bank-supported activities, stakeholders are those affected by the outcome—negatively or positively—or those who can affect the outcome of a proposed intervention. The examples in the *Sourcebook* reveal that determining the relevant stakeholders for any given concern depends on the situation and type of activity to be supported. Task Managers generally take the pragmatic position that the development concern being addressed identifies the stakeholders. Once a participatory stance is taken, getting the right stakeholders becomes essential to producing good results. Not all parties, however, can automatically be assumed relevant; in addition, for every development concern being addressed, a broad spectrum of stakeholders exists ranging from directly affected parties to individuals or institutions with indirect interests.

Government For the Bank, government is always a key stakeholder. In every case, central government officials were the obvious and first stakeholders that Bank Task Managers worked with. This is because the government is a Bank shareholder, the primary decisionmaker and implementer of policies and projects, and the one who repays the Bank loan or credit. Usually more than one central government institution has a stake in a Bank activity. A core ministry is always involved—finance, planning, the central bank, or a similar ministry. Depending on the activity, officials from other core and line ministries may have a stake in the activity as well. Officials from other levels of government, including state

or provincial authorities and local- or municipal-level officials, virtually always have a stake. Indeed, the Bank and the government must enter into a close partnership in which shared development objectives keep the partnership together. In general, Task Managers in the chapter II examples experienced little difficulty in identifying the relevant government stakeholders in preparation of Bank-supported operations.

Directly Affected Groups Those directly affected by a proposed intervention are clearly among the key stakeholders. They are the ones who stand to benefit or lose from Bank-supported operations or who warrant redress from any negative effects of such operations. The poor and marginalized are often among this group. It is these directly affected stakeholders, Task Managers tell us, who are the most difficult to identify and involve in participatory efforts.

Indirectly Affected Groups Many individuals or institutions may be indirectly involved or affected because of their technical expertise or public and private interest in Bank-supported policies or programs, or they may be linked in some way to those who are directly affected.

Such stakeholders may include NGOs, various intermediary or representative organizations, private sector businesses, and technical and professional bodies. Identifying and enlisting the right intermediary groups has proved tricky at times for Task Managers and in some situations turned out to be a process of trial and error.

In the **Philippines Integrated Protected Areas** example, a group of NGO consultants were hired to design a technical framework for biodiversity preservation as well as attend to the public participation component of the program. Although this group of scientists, academics, and forestry specialists were ideally suited to address technical issues, they had no experience with or linkages to directly affected groups. At appraisal, the Task Manager discovered that the real concerns of the people had been missed. To remedy this, a national legal services NGO, PANLIPI, was brought in to identify key local stakeholders and facilitate meetings between them and the government-Bank appraisal team. PANLIPI was respected by the head of the key government agency involved, who was a former human rights lawyer. PANLIPI had provided pro bono legal services to indigenous communities so they were known and trusted by the indigenous groups. PANLIPI also had links to other local NGOs, which were able to arrange meetings with local communities.

How to Identify Stakeholders

Trusting Your Judgment Much still needs to be learned about how to identify and involve stakeholders. No hard or fast rules exist to tell us whom to involve and how. What we do know is that stakeholder involvement is context-specific; what works in one situation may not be appropriate in another. Trusting and using one's judgment, therefore, may be the best advice Task Managers can give each other at this point in time.

In both the **LPDR Health** and **Yemen Education** examples, the in-country stakeholders in participatory events were limited to government employees, including low-level staff stationed away from headquarters. The Task Managers believed that involving field-level staff—who are among the "voiceless" within the bureaucracy—was the furthest down they could go at the time. Although a preference often exists for including directly affected stakeholders in

participatory events, this may not always be appropriate or possible. If design is proceeding from the participatory stance, then it is probably wisest to trust the judgment of those closest to the action—from the Bank's perspective, the Task Manager. After all, many of the participatory activities in the *Sourcebook* are first-time events for all concerned; some caution in not going too far or too fast may have been prudent.

A good way to identify appropriate stakeholders is to start by asking questions. Task Managers have shared with us the types of questions they ask themselves and then others. These questions are not an exhaustive list but rather a preliminary road map to guide Task Managers:

- Who might be affected (positively or negatively) by the development concern to be addressed?
- Who are the "voiceless" for whom special efforts may have to be made?
- Who are the representatives of those likely to be affected?
- Who is responsible for what is intended?
- Who is likely to mobilize for or against what is intended?
- Who can make what is intended more effective through their participation or less effective by their nonparticipation or outright opposition?
- Who can contribute financial and technical resources?
- Whose behavior has to change for the effort to succeed?

Observing Stakeholders No substitute exists for firsthand observation, even though it is rarely done in practice. In the **Brazil Municipalities** example, Bank and government sponsors were convinced that the only way to provide water and sewerage facilities to slum dwellers was to involve them in subproject design and implementation. Once in the participatory stance, the next question for the sponsors to address was how to identify the appropriate slum dwellers to involve? To answer this question, the first action taken by the design team was to learn about the slum dwellers: how they were organized and how they operated. To do this, the designers had to be present in the community when the people themselves were present—often on weekends and late at night. This helped them understand that the slum dwellers were associated with religious, sports, and other types of clubs. They discovered, however, that it was the women's clubs that were key. In a *favela*, more often than not, a woman is the actual head of the household. She is the permanent feature. The men tend to come and go. In a real sense, women were the local community and were the appropriate stakeholders for involvement in subproject design and implementation.

In-country resources

Seeking Help Many of the Bank's borrowers have national institutes or centers with information on the demography, cultural practices, and socioeconomic situation of the countries' stakeholder groups. Local social scientists, academics, NGOs, government officials, and resident mission staff can also help identify appropriate stakeholders.

In the **Egypt Resource Management** example, the designers created a small library of basic reference material about the Matruh Governorate and the Bedouins who live in it. A consulting team provided social scientists and other skilled people to work with the project design team to identify the local stakeholders and their relationships to one another and the government. Local authorities assisted the Task Manager in identifying Bedouin representatives to serve on a joint task force. In the **Morocco Women in Development** example, local con-

127

sultants from the university drew up lists of potential stakeholders from the NGO and academic communities to invite to an initial planning workshop.

Bank resources

Social assessment and other types of social science data can help Task Managers get answers to the questions noted above. For example, in several recent Global Environment Facility projects, stakeholder profiles have been prepared to help determine who should be involved in biodiversity conservation projects and how. A document showing how stakeholder profiles can be prepared is available from the Environment Department's Social Policy Division (ENVSP).

The Bank's regional technical departments and ENVSP include social scientists who can help design social assessments or help identify consultants to do so. Such consultants generally possess specific regional, country, and ethnic group knowledge.

The Bank's libraries also contain a wealth of information that may be helpful in identifying different stakeholder groups, determining their relationship to one another and understanding the social, cultural, and institutional factors (for example: gender, ethnicity, income level, social organization, and power relations) that affect the ability of stakeholders to participate. For example, one of the best sources of information on indigenous peoples is *The Encyclopedia of World Cultures*, edited by David Levinson (1993) and available in the Bank's library.

Sourcebook resources

The best way to learn about participation is to experience it directly. The second best way is vicariously, by seeing what others have done in the name of participation and then seeking their guidance. We encourage you to get in touch with the Task Managers and staff who have shared their experiences in chapter II and find out how they identified appropriate stakeholders for their operations.

Disseminating Information

The design team undertaking the **Sri Lanka National Environment Action Plan** convened an open public meeting, as is standard under environmental procedures. They developed a list of relevant stakeholders by seeking help from in-country and Bank resources but also advertised the meeting in the local newspapers. By making sure that information about the proposed activity was widely disseminated, the design team enabled interested stakeholders to show up on their own accord.

Photo by Debra Sequeira

Involving Stakeholders

Once stakeholders have been identified, the next step is to enlist their participation. After this, sponsors and designers have sought to work with affected stakeholders through a variety of approaches. But "special" measures are needed to ensure that groups that are normally excluded from the decisionmaking process have a voice. To achieve this, designers and sponsors have first organized the "voiceless," mandated their representation, held exclusive participatory sessions with them, employed "leveling" techniques that allow stakeholders at all levels to be heard, and used surrogates—intermediaries with close links to the affected stakeholders. But what happens when opposition exists? This section concludes with examples of this type of situation.

Building Trust

To many of the identified stakeholders, an outsider bringing offers of "participatory development" may seem suspect. Prior experience with public agencies, public servants, and donor projects has, in many places, created negative impressions that need to be rectified. In the chapter II examples, improving communication, engaging stakeholders in repeated interactions, and working through intermediaries who have ongoing relationships of trust with poor and vulnerable groups helped gain the participation of affected stakeholders.

Sharing Information In the **Benin Health** example, trust was built by sharing information about what was intended by the proposed project. The Bank Task Manager and a number of (then still skeptical) central government officials held a series of "town meetings" with groups of skeptical villagers. During these meetings, the villagers came to learn about the *hows* and *whys* of the possible project, while having the opportunity to express their expectations from government for primary health care. In so doing, wariness about outsiders faded as the villagers became convinced that they would not be giving up more than they might get in return. Once trust was established, village members were invited to form their own village committees and participate in project planning.

Interacting Repeatedly In the **Egypt Resource Management** example, intensive and repeated interaction between design teams and Bedouins during project preparation helped the Bedouins realize that the outsiders were not attempting, as in the past, to use them. As both sides developed a feel for and understanding of one another through iterative planning sessions, suspicion of each other began to dissipate and the basis for trust, respect, and cooperation was established.

In the **Brazil Municipalities** example, slum dwellers had learned from experience that the water companies were not interested in dealing with slums. They, in turn, did not pay their water bills and constructed illegal water connections. The sponsors of this project realized that building trust between the water companies and slum dwellers was going to take time and effort. The design teams spent weekends and nights in the slums learning about the community. The local people saw that the designers were making an effort and that they admired the local people's initiative and creativity in taking charge of their lives. In the process, the designers helped the community learn about and understand the water company: how it operated, what it could and could not do, and the basic hydraulics of water and sewerage. Joining the local stakeholders and learning together with them what was possible, what they

really wanted, and how much they were willing to change their behavior to get it, helped create mutual trust and cooperation between the designers and the slum dwellers.

Working through Intermediaries

In some instances distrust is so great that intermediaries may be required to bridge the gap. In the **Philippines Integrated Protected Areas** example a national NGO, which was respected by government, indigenous peoples, and local NGOs alike, was able to use its unique position to bring the different parties together. In one instance, PANLIPI used its influence to persuade two rival NGO groups to cosponsor a public meeting. They also persuaded a church mission group not to boycott the meeting but instead attend and participate. All these small steps led to the beginnings of a dialogue on the terms and conditions for future collaboration between the designers and local stakeholders.

Involving Directly Affected Stakeholders

A great deal can still be learned about how to work with directly affected stakeholders in Bank-supported operations once they have been identified and enlisted. The lessons of the chapter II examples point to several approaches for enabling intended beneficiaries—as well as those likely to be adversely affected—to participate in planning and decisionmaking.

Working with the Community

In the **Brazil Municipalities** example, it became apparent that the only way to save the Bank loan from cancellation was by the direct involvement of slum dwellers in the design of the subprojects. Consequently, several approaches were used to work with them. The most commonly used approaches were two different types of community negotiations. One started with the water company deciding the engineering design first and then negotiating it with the entire community along with issues of billing, operational responsibilities, and user contributions. The second started with community involvement from which the design emerged. Perhaps the word "negotiation" misses the essence of what really went on. It wasn't just the designers negotiating with the community but, more important, the community working together to take care of individual and communal needs and making commitments about what they were and were not willing to do.

Working with the Representatives

In the **Benin Health** example, town meetings with the entire community were followed by local communities being invited to form their own village health committees to represent them at future planning events. The rules of the game set for selecting committee members specified including at least one mother, someone good at handling money, another good at getting things done, and a person wise in the ways of village life. This ensured that the important functions that had to be undertaken at the village level to address health care needs were represented on the committee. Members of the village health committees collaboratively designed the project along with government officials and other stakeholders during three planning workshops. Through their representatives, each community was able to have input into the project.

Working with Surrogates

Another approach to involving directly affected stakeholders is through intermediaries or surrogates. Surrogates may be any group or individual who has close links to the affected population and is capable of representing their views

and interests during participatory planning. In the **Nigeria Women in Agriculture** example, female extension agents served as surrogates for farm women at a national planning workshop on women in agriculture. The objective of the workshop was to create three-year action plans for improving extension services for women. The transportation and time constraints involved in traveling to the capital combined with the fact that rural women needed the permission of their husbands to attend made direct involvement of women farmers difficult. The credibility of these female extension agents to speak on behalf of farm women was based on their daily interaction with them and the fact that these agents were from the same areas and many were farmers themselves. But the **Chad Education** experience warns us to exercise caution in selecting surrogates to speak for the directly affected. In this case, the Task Manager was surprised to find that NGOs invited to a planning session on behalf of the poor represented their own interests instead.

Photo by Gloria Davis

POINTERS I

Seeking Feedback

In cases in which stakeholders participate through their representatives or surrogates, Task Managers often follow the rule of thumb that one should trust those who speak for the ultimate clients but from time to time verify directly with those whose opinion really counts. The chapter II examples offer a number of approaches for follow-up and feedback. Apart from serving the cross-checking function, these approaches also facilitate broader ownership and commitment among those affected by the proposed intervention.

Making On-Site Visits In the **Egypt Resource Management** example, a local task force that included Bedouin representation prepared the Bank project report. During preparation missions, the Bank team—which could not attend all participatory rural assessment sessions (see Appendix I)—interacted directly with communities to ensure that their interests were being accurately represented in the project document. These exchanges occurred in both a formal and informal way. Formal sessions were arranged and facilitated by Bedouin representatives on the task force. Members of the task force reported to the community on the progress of project preparation. Open discussion followed in which local people expressed their opinions and asked questions. Their feedback, duly noted by the Bank

team, was later incorporated in the final project document. In addition to these formal meetings, the mission members went unannounced into random villages (usually prior to the scheduled meetings). They introduced themselves and asked farmers if they had heard about the project and what they thought of it. This informal feedback was compared with what the mission was hearing at the more formal meetings and at the task force sessions. It served as a way of verifying consistency and checking for biases. The Bank team always included a female member who was paired with a female Bedouin veterinarian to carry out the same formal and informal interactions with the Bedouin women.

Stakeholder Review of Documents

Another way Task Managers obtained feedback was by providing the opportunity for stakeholders to review and revise draft documents prepared by the design team. The **Egypt Resource Management, Morocco Women in Development,** and **Philippines Integrated Protected Areas** examples are all cases in which directly affected stakeholders provided information, ideas, solutions, and recommendations that were later incorporated into reports and project documents by the designers. In each instance, a follow-up was done during which the wider membership of the directly affected groups were able to review what was being said and proposed and make changes if necessary. Task Managers found this follow-up to be crucial in fostering broader ownership and commitment beyond just those who were present at the participatory planning events.

Photo by Curt Carnemark

Involving the Voiceless

Some groups—especially the very poor, women, indigenous people, or others who may not be fully mobilized—may not have the organizational or financial wherewithal to participate effectively. These are often the exact stakeholders whose interests are critical to the implementation success and sustainability of Bank-supported programs. Special efforts need to be made to level the disequilibrium of power, prestige, wealth, and knowledge when stronger and more established stakeholders are meant to collaborate with weaker, less organized groups.

Building Capacity

For instance, in the **India Forestry** example, the sponsors and designers helped local people form and strengthen their own organizations. During the lengthy organizing process—as much as nine months in West Bengal—the local people

learned how to work together to take care of their individual and communal needs. Once organized and having clarified their own interests, their willingness and ability to use the new power and skill of speaking with one, unified voice increased significantly.

In West Bengal, capacity was built by supporting a process through which forest dwellers could come up with their own decisionmaking structures. Rather than taking a rigid position about the right design for the local forestry protection committee, sufficient flexibility was allowed so that local forest dwellers could come up with their own processes for planning and negotiating.

Mandating Representation

In the **Benin Health** example, the sponsors and designers foresaw the possibility of women being left out. So they made participation of at least one mother on each village health committee a "rule of the game." In the **Chad Education** example, no special measures were taken in advance to mobilize and invite women. The result? None showed up at the national participatory planning workshop; by then it was too late in the process to do anything about it.

Organizing Separate Events

In designing the **Togo Urban Development** project, initial studies revealed that women had almost exclusive responsibility at the household level for the sanitary environment, providing water, managing waste, and family health. Yet, during the preappraisal mission, the first two meetings included no women. So the Bank team suggested holding a separate meeting at which the women could articulate their priorities and concerns. Their main concerns—which differed from those of the men—were men's unemployment, the need for standpipes and latrines in markets, providing central play space for children, access to drinking water, access to finance and credit, and training in management, hygiene, health, and literacy. The women's agenda was fully incorporated in the final project design, which included employment generation through labor-intensive public works and a training program in environmental management geared to the needs of a largely illiterate and mostly female population.

Similarly, in the **Philippines Integrated Protected Areas** example, PANLIPI, the NGO hired to conduct follow-up workshops with local stakeholder groups, discovered that the sessions were being dominated by local authorities and NGOs at the expense of indigenous communities. To let the voice of tribal people be heard, PANLIPI decided to hold exclusive workshops for the tribal groups and admit other parties as "observers" only.

Leveling Techniques

Power differences among stakeholders can be diminished through the use of participatory techniques. Skilled design and facilitation of participatory processes can promote "level" interactions. Small working groups, governed by facilitator-monitored "behavioral rules" that ensure that all participants speak and receive respect for their contributions, is one way of doing it. "Leveling" is facilitated when people listen to or observe quietly what others say without criticism or opposition. In the **Egypt Resource Management** example, outsiders watched respectfully as the Bedouins drew maps on the ground. Quiet observation encouraged the "voiceless" to express themselves through nonverbal representations. Similarly, role reversal, when the Bedouins led outsiders on transect walks instead of the other way around, helped level the playing field. Role-playing exercises, such as used in the **Colombia Energy** example, which helped sensitize powerful stakeholders to the lives others lead, are another means of leveling.

POINTERS I

133

Using Surrogates

The **Nigeria Women in Agriculture** example demonstrates the use of extension agents as surrogates for women farmers at a national planning workshop. The Task Manager wanted to ensure that farm women had a voice in formulating policies and programs targeted at them. Not only did it prove logistically infeasible to bring them to the capital, however, but power differences also had to be considered. It was thought that in making presentations to the minister and other senior government officials, women farmers might feel intimidated and overwhelmed and might not be able to articulate their needs effectively. Bringing in female extension workers provided a reasonable substitute. Although they were familiar with the situation of women farmers, they also had experience working with male bureaucrats and local government officials. It was therefore easier for them to speak to more powerful stakeholders and participate more equally in preparing action plans on behalf of farm women.

In the **Mexico Hydroelectric** example, community meetings in Zimapan between the national power company, CFE, and the communities included mostly women because their husbands were migrant laborers, working in the United States or other parts of Mexico for the agricultural harvests. This gave the women an opportunity to participate in the resettlement negotiations and express their needs, which included credit to start up sewing shops, bakeries, and other sorts of microenterprise activities. As the men began to return and reassert themselves in the meetings, however, women's participation began to drop off. Their voice in the process, however, was maintained by female social workers who continued to visit their homes and transmit the women's requests for schooling, health, and other services.

Involving the Opposition

Chapter II contains no examples in which the designers encountered sustained "opposition" when the participatory process started early and began with consideration of a broad development concern. This was so even when it was clear that harmony did not exist among the stakeholders before the project began. Sometimes collaboration among different stakeholders may not be possible, however. In these cases, either resources should not be committed to the proposed activity or a group of stakeholders may have to be left out, generally by modifying the concern being addressed.

Stakeholder conflict is often produced by the external expert stance. When external experts formulate a complete, fully developed proposal and present it to the people it affects, immense room exists for misunderstanding on the part of those who were not involved in preparing the proposal. In the **India Health and Family Welfare Sector Study,** NGOs invited to a forum with government unanimously rejected a preset agenda and action plan. They perceived the plan as a *fait accompli* and their participation in the workshop as a token gesture of collaboration. Instead, they wanted to start from scratch and come up with their *own* workshop agenda and action plan. The sponsors agreed to this request, and both NGOs and government broke up into small, mixed groups to devise a new action plan. This plan was adopted during a plenary session and was incorporated into the final report.

Starting Early and Broadly

In most instances, fully developed proposals are really "take-it-or-leave-it" propositions, no matter how much lip service is paid afterward to collaborative decisionmaking. After sponsors and designers spend millions of dollars and many years preparing a complete plan, they are not likely to be open to

significant changes. For those who perceive a loss for themselves in the proposal, outright opposition may appear to be the only possible stance; the greater the loss, the stronger the opposition is likely to be. As we know from sometimes bitter experience, once opposition mobilizes, it is difficult—if not impossible—to resolve the matter. The **Philippines Integrated Protected Areas** example illustrates well the mobilization of opposition that could not be overcome in one of the intended project areas. In the other three areas, however, initial opposition gave way when participatory implementation arrangements were used to give local stakeholders decisionmaking power in a formerly "top-down" project.

When all stakeholders collaborate in designing their collective future, it increases the chances of former differences being resolved and a new consensus emerging around issues everyone can agree on. This is probably so because people who have to live and work together can often find ways to agree if given the chance. Unfortunately, people do not often get the chance to work together to determine their collective future. Development projects prepared in the external expert stance do not provide that chance. The participatory process, however, facilitates working together. So participation can be a "conflict avoidance" process to the degree that it helps stakeholders with different interests explore and potentially find common interests.

Finding Common Ground In the **India Forestry** example, the foresters were shooting at the local people who were starting to shoot back before the participatory planning began. By focusing on common interests—how to protect the forests while ensuring economic survival for local people—the **West Bengal Forestry Project** eventually resulted in sustainable collaborative action. Through nine months of repeated dialogue and negotiations between the foresters and the local people, the forest dwellers agreed to take care of the shoots thrown up by Sal stumps so that they would become salable poles. When the poles were harvested, the forest dwellers got the culls, plus 25 percent of the revenues from the sale of good poles. The Sal stump growth subsequently became the main agent of reforestation, leading the foresters to proudly show off "their" forests.

Despite the success stories, consensus will sometimes be unattainable and no basis will exist for future action, especially in situations with a long history of entrenched conflict and divisiveness among the parties. In such cases, the result is no action, which is probably better than action that will fall apart during implementation for want of consensus. Although this strategy may not always lead to a Bank loan, it will, we believe, lead to making those loans that have a reasonably high probability of producing what they promise, that is, being implementable and sustainable. This point applies equally to the government and the Bank.

Dealing with Deadlock Alternatively, when strong opposition exists to a project from one set of stakeholders, a Task Manager may, in certain circumstances, proceed by leaving out that set of opposition stakeholders and working with the others. Employing this approach has many potential dangers, but it does happen from time to time and has worked. In the **Philippines Integrated Protected Areas** example, the decision to drop the entire island of Mindoro from the proposed national parks system was taken once it was clear that the local residents were unwilling to support such an initiative. Nevertheless, the project as a whole proceeded. The Task Manager felt that this outcome—however unexpected—was ultimately in the best interests of both the government and the Bank. The lack of commit-

ment from the people of Mindoro would have made implementation difficult and sustainability improbable. In this case, the participatory process saved the sponsors from committing scarce resources to a project component that would have performed poorly.

Photo by Kathryn Funk

Participatory Planning and Decisionmaking

Once appropriate stakeholders have been identified and measures taken to ensure their involvement, the next question to answer is how do stakeholders engage in participatory planning and decisionmaking? This section documents approaches that sponsors and designers have used to collaborate with other stakeholders in this process. Participatory planning and decisionmaking should start by creating a mood for learning rather than plunging directly into problem solving. The learning phase then sets the stage for strategic and tactical planning. The strategic planning stage in turn generates broad directions and priorities, which are operationalized into detailed implementation actions during tactical planning.

What Do Participatory Techniques Achieve?

The essential steps of project planning and replanning—setting objectives, creating strategies, and formulating tactics—can be carried out in both the external expert and participatory stances. The essential difference between the two is that, in the expert stance, undertaking these steps is the primary responsibility of the sponsors and designers; in the participatory stance, these steps are undertaken collaboratively with relevant stakeholders.

Participatory techniques (or methods or approaches) generate constructive collaboration among stakeholders who may not be used to working together, often come from different backgrounds, and may have different values and interests. This section documents approaches that designers and sponsors use to undertake participatory planning and decisionmaking with appropriate stakeholders collaboratively. To learn more about individual techniques, please turn to Appendix 1.

Creating a Learning Mood

In designing a participatory event, it is reasonable to assume that participants will arrive prepared to take action based on what they already know, or to take

POINTERS I

no action because they believe that change is impossible. Participatory planning and decisionmaking should start by changing this mood. Although techniques described may initially seem overly simple to Bank staff, Task Managers who have used them report that they have found them extremely useful.

Interrupting the Normal Mood

The **Mozambique Country Implementation Review** example used a "white card" exercise to enable participants to get acquainted with each other and break the normal mood of extreme formalism in work relationships. Each participant was given four blank cards and asked to write one important implementation problem on each card. The cards were shuffled and displayed on the floor. The participants picked up any four cards, except their own, and began a discussion with another participant they did not know. As a result the participants had to "engage a stranger" to get something done, an unusual way for a business meeting to take place in that country. Interaction among people who did not normally interact with one another broke the ice and resulted in establishing openness and informality for the participatory workshop.

In the **Egypt Resource Management** example, it was necessary to interrupt the distrustful, "no-action-possible" mood of the Bedouins toward outsiders. The designers achieved this through repeated sessions between themselves and Bedouin clients in which the clients did most of the talking and suggesting. A typical participatory session started with the Bedouins drawing maps on the ground with sticks and stones, while the outsiders respectfully watched the process. The outsiders noted what was drawn first, what was drawn disproportionately large, and so on. Maps usually led to transect walks, in which the Bedouins who had drawn the map led the outsiders in exploring spatial differences in the area. The reversal of roles put Bedouins in a leadership position in which their knowledge was valued and sought after.

Creating Common Purpose

In the **Colombia Energy** example, one-third of the time in the stakeholder workshop was devoted to creating a learning mood. Although the social and power differences among the participating stakeholders were not significant in this example, the potential for conflict among the competing interests in the energy sector was great. So the facilitator designed this phase to bring forth consensus among different stakeholders. He asked participants to envision and design an ideal future for the energy sector without thinking about constraints or setting any timelines for achieving this vision. Some participants expressed their visions orally whereas others chose to portray theirs visually through drawings. Participants were requested by the facilitator to appreciate everyone's contribution without criticism or opposition. It was during this stage that people began to realize that they weren't so far apart in their thinking after all and that nearly everyone wanted the same things for the energy sector in the long run. This unity of vision succeeded in creating a new—albeit temporary—community of people with shared understandings and goals. Motivated by the sense of a common mission, the group was temporarily able to form an effective planning community.

Opening up New Possibilities

Sometimes closed-circle brainstorming sessions can be preceded and improved by exposing individuals or groups to practices of groups elsewhere. The opportunity for the Andhra Pradesh Forestry Department officials in the **India Forestry** example to visit and see for themselves how forestry projects were being organized in West Bengal opened up a range of possibilities that were

POINTERS I

137

not seriously considered earlier. Bank staff and their colleagues possess a great deal of cross-cultural knowledge about what people in other countries or regions are doing to address similar concerns. Sharing this cross-national experience can open up possibilities for future action. The emphasis in the learning phase should be to expose stakeholders to a menu of options instead of limiting the horizon to any single way of doing things.

What Does the Learning Mood Produce?

When participatory techniques shift the normal mood and facilitate new, common learning they succeed in the following:

- Sharing information freely and broadly
- Drawing on the inherent possibilities of collaboration among stakeholders
- Bringing forth consensus (or making it clear that none exists)
- Setting the stage for action planning and collaboration that may be able to resolve former conflicts that previously paralyzed common action.

Strategic Planning

In this stage, decisions are made in pragmatic terms about the directions and priorities for action needed to change the current situation and reach the envisioned future. Effective strategic planning sessions are not free-for-alls or "gab fests." The use of participatory techniques during strategic planning serves to facilitate the formulation of group consensus in prioritizing objectives and inventing action possibilities for the future.

Prioritizing In the **Benin Health** example, stakeholders made a list of all the problems they could think of related to the state of the health care system. Listing everyone's concerns produced such a lengthy list that problems had to be clustered under broader headings such as buildings and facilities, medicine, staffing and skills, and so on. The categorization of problems helped develop a common view of health problems among such disparate stakeholders as village representatives and central ministry staff. Categorization also helped the different stakeholders see more clearly who owned a particular problem and who would have to change individual and institutional behavior to fix it.

In the **Yemen Education** example, about forty-five participants were each given three cards and asked to write down what they felt were the three biggest problems with the quality of education. During the plenary session, all these problems were noted on large flip charts. The facilitator helped narrow down the list of problems through a "bid allocation" scheme in which each participant had 100 points with which to bid. The participants were free to allocate the 100 points as they wished—to a single problem or any number of the problems that had been written on the flip-charts around the room. The problems that received the most points became the priorities for strategic and tactical planning.

Inventing Action Possibilities The ZOPP technique (see Appendix I) used in the **Chad Education** and **India Forestry** examples illustrates a strategic planning approach in which a problem tree is first created followed by a mirror-image objective tree. The very process of creating these diagrams, if well facilitated, can also promote information sharing and learning.

In the **Colombia Energy** example, the second phase of the AIC technique (see Appendix I) is called the "influence" stage. Here small work groups fol-

low a stylized, "looking-backward" technique to create strategies that would move the country toward an ideal situation. In this exercise, participants work back from their ideal future vision to the current realities of today, listing the key events that have to occur in terms of both personal and institutional changes along the way. These key events, in effect, represent priorities for change. In this way, it becomes clear to all participants what needs to change to reach future goals. The facilitator invites each person to share their important key events with other members and record them on a circle on a flip chart. Others are invited to discuss and debate the importance of these events. What happens is that the key events tend to build on one another and concentrate on a particular segment on the circle rather than getting randomly dispersed. This then becomes the basis of the group's strategic plan.

Tactical Planning

Tactics are the detailed implementation and operational steps that permit action in the short and medium term. These steps have to be modified and adjusted during implementation based on information and new developments. Deviations from tactical plans will always and inevitably occur. When these occur, some degree of replanning will be required. This is the time to regather the stakeholders and replan tactics based on what was learned by all during implementation.

Budgets, staffing, recruitment plans, organizational design, blueprints, other specifications for physical construction, social marketing programs, accounting system design, capacity-building mechanisms, benchmarks for success, and so forth fall under tactical planning. These are the specific arrangements that produce action on the ground during the implementation phase. Tactical planning, our chapter II examples indicate, is largely the domain of experts. Although experts should be given time and space to design plans, it should be made certain that all stakeholders review and approve tactical plans.

Using Government Expertise Often, the government officials who participate as stakeholders in participatory planning take on the job of tactical planning. The **Benin Health** example indicates that a group of government officials (health experts) did the detailed tactical planning and report writing. Following this, the full body of stakeholders—including village representatives—reconvened to review and endorse (or modify) the plans.

Using Local Expertise In the **Egypt Resource Management** example, the sponsors engaged a social development-oriented consulting firm to help design the project. The firm was familiar with the way the Bank operates and knowledgeable about participatory planning. They worked with the joint government-Bedouin project design team to devise the tactics for implementation. Interestingly and quite appropriately, the specific tactics for environmentally sound natural resource management were created by committees of people from each local Bedouin community. Not only was doing this consistent with local cultural practices, but it also relied on the best available experts on Bedouin behavior—the Bedouins themselves.

Using Bank Expertise In the **India Watershed Development** project, the Bank Task Manager helped his Indian counterparts find technical solutions to operationalize their strategic plans. Once the local stakeholders decided to use vegetative conservation methods as opposed to mechanical methods, the Bank Task Manager brought the

139

highly drought-resistant vettier grass to their attention. Not only did it prevent erosion, it helped feed hungry cattle. Bank staff can provide other types of expertise, including sharing their cross-national experience about implementation arrangements that have been used to enable poor people to influence development decisions and resources that affect them. We have highlighted such arrangements, based on a review of Bank experience to date, in chapter IV.

Using Existing Power

In the **Colombia Energy** example, the tactical planning phase was structured so that clear outcomes and commitments would emerge. Subgroups were formed around the strategic options agreed on during the preceding phases. Individuals with the real power to implement recommendations headed the subgroups. Workshop participants joined each subgroup depending on their technical competence and ability to influence the outcome. Each subgroup negotiated their recommendations with every other subgroup to prepare their part of a nationwide plan. During the final session, the participants selected individuals from among the group to form a National Power Board that coordinated the different plans and drafted a report summarizing the tactical plan. A series of follow-up stakeholder workshops reviewed the plans, which were then presented to the Colombian Parliament. In between these workshops, participating stakeholders shared the draft document with their constituencies for feedback and approval. This resulted in wider ownership of and commitment to the tactical plans.

Task Manager Roles

Task managers new to participation ask what role they should play in an activity being planned and decided in a participatory way. Another—and perhaps more straightforward—way of asking this might be, "Isn't it true that I have no role to play in participatory processes? Don't I just have to go along with what the in-country stakeholders want?" The answer is a clear and resounding "No!" Just as Task Managers play multiple roles when working in the external expert stance, they also play multiple roles in the participatory stance. The chapter II examples indicate that Task Managers have played the role of initiating, facilitating, participating, sharing expertise, observing, navigating, and nurturing.

Initiating

In theory, the government sponsor of an activity should choose the design stance. In the majority of the chapter II examples, however, the Task Manager decided to work in the participatory stance. In addition, Task Managers often took on the job of finding allies, arranging financing, convincing skeptics in the country and the Bank, identifying and involving stakeholders, inventing techniques, and building in-country participatory capacity. In the future, the participatory stance may be standard practice in borrowing countries, as in the **Philippines Irrigation** example, or government sponsors could always ask that the participatory stance be taken, as in the **Chad Education** example. But until this time, Task Managers will have to continue to initiate participation in many situations. The Task Managers to whom we have spoken see this role as a welcomed and satisfying one.

Facilitating

Only in one instance—the **Yemen Education** example—did the Task Manager take on the facilitator role, because he happened to be a skilled, experi-

enced trainer. In several instances, Bank staff with facilitation skills served as facilitators, while the Task Manager and other Bank staff were participant-observers. In other cases, local consultants or government staff played this role, sometimes after being specifically trained for it through programs organized by the Task Manager. In the **Egypt Resource Management** and **Morocco Women in Development** examples special training was provided to government officials and others in the country to play this role with resources organized by the Task Manager.

Participating

The job of the facilitator is to design and carefully manage a process that ensures that all those involved can and do become fully engaged with the substantive matters under consideration. Facilitators need to remain "substance-neutral" to do their job. They have to concentrate on processes that ensure that the "voiceless" are heard, that other norms of collaboration are followed, that learning occurs, and that practical results are produced. Task Managers, however, are not—and should not try to be—"substance-neutral."

Task Managers represent the Bank's stake in each and every activity. They may have to take an advocacy stance from time to time—within the rules of the game enforced by the facilitator—in keeping with the Bank's mission, policy, and objectives. They bring expertise to the process that may not exist among the local stakeholders. By participating, rather than facilitating, these experts share what they know with the other stakeholders (as the other stakeholders share their expert knowledge with them) through the social interaction of participation. Experts cannot teach other participants all they know during the participatory process. Instead what they can do—and do more effectively than with written reports—is open possibilities for action that may not otherwise be imagined by other stakeholders.

Bank staff and their external colleagues can share with local stakeholders their worldwide knowledge about what other people are doing to handle similar concerns. Sometimes, as indicated in the **India Forestry** example, experts may be sharing what they learned elsewhere in the same country. Although Bank staff have had much experience in operating in the external expert stance, more and more firsthand experience in supporting participatory planning processes is being amassed. Similarly, learning and other information is being generated about arrangements that build local capacity through participation (see Chapter IV). Bank staff can share this cross-national experience with local stakeholders to open up possibilities for future action.

Sharing Expertise

Participation does not eliminate the role of experts in the field of development. It just changes the way experts communicate their expertise to the other stakeholders. It also increases their effectiveness. Local stakeholders do not know everything. Experts of all types—engineers, social scientists, economists, sector specialists, institutional specialists, and more—need to contribute what they know. In a participatory stance, what development experts have to offer has a much better chance of being accepted and used than when they rely on reports and briefings to share their expertise. Chapter II examples show no signs that experts or their expertise will soon be extinct in the field of development. In fact, biases favoring expert knowledge show up in several of our examples.

POINTERS I

141

Participation allows local people to speak for themselves. After all, they are the "experts" on what they want and need. Through participation, experts may open up other possibilities for local people for incorporation into their own expertise. Local people are also uniquely expert on what they are willing to change, to what extent, and how. The challenge for Task Managers is to find ways to bring this local expertise into Bank-supported activities.

Observing

In addition to sharing expertise and helping get the balance right between technical and local expertise, Task Managers also have to play an "observer" role in participatory processes. One result to look for, or "observation target," is a rather straightforward matter: "Are the technologies and methods the stakeholders intend to use sufficiently effective and efficient to make the project a worthwhile investment?" In other words, will the internal and economic rates of return support the investment? A related observation target is if the stakeholder's decisions are acceptable to the Bank with regard to its objectives and policies.

A relatively new observation target—one of immense importance for poverty alleviation—is if project implementation arrangements build local capacity so that the poor can sustain and build on the benefits of the development activity. Traditional engineering, economics, and sector expertise do not include everything needed to build local capacity. Social scientists have much to contribute in this area, as indicated in the **Mexico Hydroelectric** example.

Other observation targets are consensus and commitment. Put simply, the consensus target is when a sufficient number of key stakeholders freely agree on the content, strategy, and tactics of the proposed project. This is, of course, a matter of judgment. But observers of participatory processes are in an especially good position to make well-grounded judgments of the degree and breadth of freely reached consensus.

The final observation target is commitment. Bank staff and others tend to understand commitment as something that can only be seen clearly after the fact from what people actually have done. The participatory stance offers a different but practical interpretation of commitment. This interpretation moves commitment into the domain of observable human action and enables Bank and government staff to make assessments on the ground about the presence or absence of commitment before approving a project and beginning implementation. When in the participatory stance, Task Managers can observe "commitment" as action taken by speaking (or writing) a promise to do something in the future. Commitments can be trusted as reasonable indicators of future action when they are made under the following conditions:

- People are free to make whatever commitments they choose, including the decision to take no new action at all.
- People make their commitments publicly in the presence of other stakeholders.
- People understand what it will take to fulfill the commitment.
- People have or believe they can get the means and competence to fulfill the commitment.

Commitments—including contracts and formal agreements—cannot be trusted when made under duress or in secret in the absence of full information and understanding or resources and the ability to act.

Navigating

Another important role that needs to be played in many but not all circumstances is that of navigator. Many obstacles to participation currently exist in the way governments and bureaucracies—including the Bank—operate in the field of development. In almost all our Chapter II examples, Task Managers have exerted considerable effort to adapt external expert rules, principles, and practices when working in the participatory stance.

In the **Philippines Irrigation** example, after verifying that participation was a standard practice of the National Irrigation Administration (NIA), the Task Manager spent most of his time helping NIA work in partnership with the central government and the Bank. For instance, NIA had trouble getting the core budgetary agency of the central government to release funds in a timely manner. The Task Manager liaised between this agency and NIA to ensure timely disbursement of funds. The Task Manager also persuaded Bank colleagues to avoid setting specific, long-term targets for creating new irrigation associations. The Task Manager argued that it was unrealistic for NIA to try to predict the time needed to create and build the capacity of new associations. Also, targets set and imposed from the outside tended to undermine the farmers' authority and control over their irrigation systems. The desired flexibility was achieved by NIA committing its work program one year at a time, depending on progress in the previous year. This change in Bank requirements permitted NIA to build on existing irrigation associations instead of rushing to meet predetermined targets for creating new ones.

Nurturing

Nurturing may sound like an especially soft and passive role for Bank Task Managers and others to play in the field of development, which has such pressing and urgent needs. It may also be a difficult role for Bank staff to learn how to do with ease, skill, and comfort, given their education and experience and working in a culture of power and control. Nevertheless, it may be the role that produces the greatest results. Nurturers build on existing participatory capacity and help strengthen it. The Bank's in-country counterparts ought to be the ones who are participating with their clients and the other stakeholders. After all they—not the Bank Task Managers—have the responsibility to serve the ultimate clients. While in this role, Task Managers can nurture the collaborative possibilities that arise naturally in the culture. In so doing, they should be careful to avoid snuffing out the start of potentially healthy and desirable possibilities for social change. This role was played by the Bank Task Manager in the **Philippines Irrigation** example. The Task Manager first ascertained for himself that NIA was indeed working collaboratively with the farmer-run irrigation systems. Then he helped provide a way the Bank could support and strengthen NIA's existing participatory approach.

blank