

CHALEYA CK

SLC 1621.

**STUDY OF THE INTEGRATED RURAL DEVELOPMENT
PROGRAMMES (IRDPS) IN ZAMBIA**

Report prepared for the Government of the
Republic of Zambia under the auspices of the
Agriculture Sector Investment Programme (ASIP)

By

M A Sikabanze (Team Leader)

O Mulenga

P M Chipulu

B M Siakanomba

**Ministry of Agriculture Food and Fisheries
(MAFF)**

Lusaka. January, 1994.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This report is a result of the efforts by the Ministry of Agriculture Food and Fisheries (MAFF) to come up with effective policy changes within the agricultural sector. The team that prepared the report was asked to examine the past policies on the IRDPs and to recommend the future direction of rural and agricultural development programmes in Zambia. This task would have been very difficult were it not for the many people who provided the background materials and also those who were so willingly interviewed during the preparation of the report. Their assistance is warmly acknowledged and much appreciated.

The opinions contained in this report are solely those of the team members and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Government of Zambia or the Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Fisheries or indeed those organisations which assisted CRZ finance the study.

Title Page	i
Authors	ii
Acknowledgement	iii
Table of contents	iv
List of Abbreviations and Acronyms	vi
Executive Summary	vii

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
1.0 INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1 Rationale of the Study.....	1
1.2 Recent Policy and Structural Reforms.....	2
1.3 Objectives of the Study.....	3
1.4 Methodology of the Study.....	4
1.5 Structure of the Report.....	4
2.0 LITERATURE REVIEW.....	5
3.0 RURAL DEVELOPMENT IN ZAMBIA.....	9
3.1 Rural development programs.....	9
3.1.1 Intensive Development Zones (IDZs).....	10
3.1.2 Integrated Rural Development Programmes (IRDPs).....	10
3.1.3 Other Area Development Programmes.....	12
3.2 District Support Programmes.....	12
3.2.1 Serenje/Mpika/Chinsali/IRDP District Development Programme.....	13
3.2.2 Central Province District Development Programme (CPDDP).....	15
3.2.3 Village Agricultural Programme/District Support Programme.....	16
4.0 ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAMMES AND IMPLEMENTATION.....	19
4.1 Policy Framework.....	19
4.2 Programme Organization and Management.....	20
4.3 Monitoring and Evaluation.....	24
4.3.1 District Support Programmes.....	24
4.3.2 Eastern and Northern Province IRDPs.....	25
4.3.3 North-Western Province IRDP.....	25
4.4 Programme Financing.....	26
4.4.1 District Support Programmes.....	27
4.4.2 Eastern and Northern Province IRDPs.....	28
4.4.3 North-Western Province IRDP.....	28
4.5 Programme Components.....	29
5.0 Conclusions and Recommendations.....	32
5.1 Policy Framework.....	32
5.1.1 Conclusion.....	32
5.1.2 Recommendation.....	33

5.2	Programme Organization and Management.....	35
5.2.1	Conclusions.....	35
5.2.2	Recommendation.....	36
5.3	Monitoring and Evaluation.....	39
5.3.1	Conclusion.....	39
5.3.2	Recommendation.....	40
5.4	Programme Financing.....	41
5.4.1	Conclusions.....	41
5.4.1	Recommendations.....	42
5.5	Programme Components.....	42
5.5.1	Conclusions.....	42
5.5.2	Recommendations.....	43
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....		45
APPENDICES.....		50
Appendix 1	Terms of References.....	51
Appendix 2	List of People Interviewed.....	53
Appendix 3	Map of Integrated Rural Development Programmes (IRDPs) in Zambia.....	55

List of Abbreviations and Acronyms

ADP	Area Development Programme
CPDDP	Central Province District Development Programme
DDF	District Development Fund
DDCC	District Development Coordination Committee
DDP	District Develevement Programme
DDSP	District Development Support Programme
DDSP	District Development Support Committee
DPU	District Planning Unit
DR	District Representative
DSP	District Support Programme
EEC	European Economic Comission
FINNIDA	Finnish International Development Agency
FNDP	First National Development Plan
GRZ	Government of the Republic of Zambia
GTZ	Germany Technical Assistance
IBRD	International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (World Bank)
IDZ	Intensive Development Zone
IFAD	International Fund for International Development
IMF	International Monetary Fund
IRDP	Integrated Rural Development Programme
MAWD	Ministry of Agriculture & Water Development (Now Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Fisheries - MAFF)
M & E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MLGH	Ministry of Local government and Housing
MOF	Ministry of Finance
MSU	Management Services Unit
NCDP	National Commission for Development Planning
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
NORAD	Norwegian Agency for International Development
ODA	Overseas Development Administration
PDCC	Provincial District Co-ordinating Committee
PDSP	Provincial and District Support Programme
PPU	Provincial Planning Unit
PSRP	Public Sector Reform Programme
SIDA	Swedish international Development Agency
SNDP	Second National Development Plan
TNDP	Third National Development Plan
VAP	Village Agricultural Programme
ZCF	Zambia Cooperative Federation

Executive Summary

POLICY FRAMEWORK

1 Conclusions

- i The IRDP policy and strategy that emerged after the abandonment of the IDZ in 1978, lacked clear objectives and goals which are measurable and verifiable. The criteria used to choose target groups and development areas was vague and therefore subject to different interpretations with donor policies having a strong influence on the selection criteria.
- ii The planning and implementation model that DDSP and CPDDP put in place in Northern and Central Provinces seem to have been the most effective way of implementing an integrated approach to rural and local development programme and as such the current "Public Sector Reform Programme" needs to take in account the positive aspects of the Mpika model.
- iii The traditional IRDP approach that sought an integrated approach from the national level is unsustainable as various sector ministries have their own specific mandates and there is no one single Ministry that can combine the other ministries in terms of policy formulation and implementation.
- vi In both approaches (viz-a-viz IRDP and district support) there was an unwarranted use of expatriate personnel.

2 Recommendations

- i At national level, sector specific integrated rural development programmes be adopted, where sub-sector projects will be the main focus of integration.
- ii At district level, an integrated rural development programme be adopted on the lines of CPDDP in Central Province. For this to be effective it is recommended that GRZ implements a local government system that legalises such coordinating bodies as PDCCs and DDCCs for each and every province and district respectively.
- iii In both the sector specific and district integrated rural development programmes, it is recommended that the employment of Zambian professional officers and support staff be a matter of policy priority.

PROGRAM ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT

2.1 Conclusions

- i Different management and organizational structures have characterised IRDPs in Zambia.
- ii In general, the IRDPs operated their own management systems parallel to the existing government institutions which was contrally to the preferred government policy of institutional capacity building for sustainable management of rural development programmes.
- iii The IRDP Central Unit and the Department of Agriculture failed to provide the necessary policy guidance to programme management. Subsequently, this resulted in ineffective co-ordination in the implementation and monitoring of rural development programmes.

2.2 Recommendations

For the new management and organizational structure of the future rural development programme in Zambia, we recommend that GRZ takes a two pronged approach:

- A. A restructured and strengthened IRDP through a sector specific IRDP
- B. Shift the resources and responsibilities from the sector ministries to the provinces and districts with a pronounced district focus.

MONITORING AND EVALUATION

3.1 Conclusion

The general trend in all the IRDPs and the related area development programmes is that none of them stands out to have established well fledged and efficient monitoring and evaluation system. Whereas attempts were made to establish monitoring systems in some IRDPs these never worked to expectations. None of the systems evolved focused on detailed assessment of performance in relation to the programme goals and objectives. The monitoring and evaluation systems failed to tackle the issue of sustainability because of lack of coherence in the approach.

3.2 Recommendations

- i For effective and efficient monitoring and evaluation system in the future the following should be undertaken:
 - a A common monitoring and evaluation system applicable to all the related rural development programmes should be developed. This should be a question of national policy as it will provide guidelines and methodology to follow.

The programme shall have a monitoring and evaluation unit at programme level to monitor all project activities and carry out on-going evaluation to ensure that programme goals and objectives are being attained. The sector level M&E shall monitor and evaluate the programme from a sectoral point of view. Thus the objectives of monitoring and evaluation at this level will be quite different from the programme level monitoring and evaluation.

- b The proposed national steering committee on rural development should work out the future M&E system that tackles the critical issues of long-term sustainability in the programme activities.
- c Both qualitative and quantitative indicators should be used to indicate the improvement in project performance on a quaterly basis.

PROGRAMME FINANCING

4.1 Conclusion

In terms of programme financing the District Support Programmes to a great extent seem to have effectively channelled their funding through the local institutions. This equally applies to the IRDPs located in the Eastern and Northern Provinces. Their system of financing seems to have been more closer to the objective of sustainability since it allowed rational allocation of resources and monitoring of programmes' performance. Despite this, however, caution must be taken because no evaluation of the viability and sustainability of the monitoring systems employed was made.

4.2 Recommendation

- i Regarding the programme financing, the system applied in the District Support Programmes as experienced under the GRZ/ODA sponsored programme in Central Province should be adopted as the most appropriate system of project financial management.
- ii It is recommended that initially, donor financing should be higher with a correspondingly lower GRZ contribution. However, GRZ contribution should progressively increase up to the time of donor phase out. To enhance GRZ contribution and continuation of programme activities a revolving fund should be established in appropriate components.
- iii It is recommended that funds should be channelled directly to the special programme account at the district. The provincial permanent secretary should only be informed of the disbursements. In this way PDCC will oversee the implementation.

PROGRAM COMPONENTS

5.1 Conclusions

- i Programme components in most IRDPs tended to cut across sectors thereby negatively affecting overall programme performance.
- ii Training was successful in improving the capacity of district council and line department staff to do their work. It also helped to impart some technical and vocational skills in the target group. However, the high turnover of staff in district councils affected the smooth operation of programme activities.
- iii The Women's Programme component was clearly lacking in most programmes. Thus it is easy to understand why women participation in the programme activities was very low.
- iv The oxenization component was not successfully implemented in most programmes. However, oxenization was relatively successful in IRDP North-Western Province. As a result of oxenization the area under cultivation increased resulting in increased output. Also, oxen were and are still used for rural transportation.

5.2 Recommendations

- i Apart from a good general policy on rural development there is need for specific guidelines for undertaking various components. For instance, the agricultural component should have guidelines on production technology, choice and combination of food and cash crops, maintenance of soil fertility etc.
- ii Future agriculture IRDPs should include the following components: agricultural extension, farm credit, manpower, training, rural agro-industries, agricultural marketing, small-scale irrigation and women and nutrition. Thus future agricultural IRDPs will limit the number of components to those that they can effectively handle.
- iii Future programmes should firstly address the problem of household food security before embarking on other programme activities.
- iv Women are a disadvantage group in our society. Future programme should therefore have a component on women and nutritional issues.
- v In future programme designs should take into account the ecological effects on the environment.

INTRODUCTION

RATIONALE OF THE STUDY

The concept of Integrated Rural Development (IRD) was a cross-sectoral approach to rural development. It was a response to rather unsatisfactory results of efforts in the area of cultural and rural development over the past few decades. The IRD was based on the principles of poverty orientation, target orientation, participation and sustainability. The IRD was developed at a situation where the population of a rural region are put in a position on the basis of achieving a more productive utilization of local resources so as to improve their socio-economic situation on a sustainable basis.

In Zambia the IRDs were a result of the rural development policies that emanated from the Second National Development Plans. The Second National Development Plan (1972-76) came up with a development strategy known as the Intensive Development Zone Programme (IDZ). The IDZ concept sought to raise rural living standards and incomes by concentrating resources in areas where rural conditions were favourable for the expansion of economic activities. The IDZ programme emphasized the "spread effects" to the pull effects from areas outside the selected Zones. Over the three years experience (1972-74) indicated that the IDZ programme suffered from too much professional expatriate planning, insufficient implementation as the implementation was based on control by non Zambians. Thus implementors were like a contracting company with the central Zambian Government as the client and not the intended local beneficiaries nor even the district and provincial authorities. This led to increased resentment by local government staff towards the affluent externally funded and autonomous IDZ body. On the other hand farmers in the neighbouring areas became indignant of an increasing discrepancy between themselves and the IDZ areas. The IDZ was therefore at one time seen as an inappropriate policy as a tool of rural development, consequently in 1978 a Commission was set up to evaluate the programme. The joint GRZ/SIDA review of IDZs proposed changes that replaced the IDZ strategy with the IRD one in both Southern and Northern Provinces. The IRD strategy continued to place emphasis on reduction in economic disparities between rural and urban areas but there was also added objectives of reducing disparities between areas within each region which contradicted the objective of giving high priority to the less developed areas of proven potential.

By the second year of TNDP (1982) the number of IRDs increased to six but due to vague GRZ policy guidelines the development areas, target groups and development approaches were selected differently in accordance with each donor's policies.

s situation created some operational problems, consequently in mid 1980s efforts were made to come up with a clear policy on approach to implement IRDPs. At that time the Ministry of culture in line with the policy of Decentralization found the approach "Mpika Model" to be more favourable. This approach aimed at strengthening the local authorities carry out their functions instead of IRDP personnel working directly with the target groups. Some of these projects are now in the process of being left in the hands of the local authority as the donors are scaling up their activities and funding.

RECENT POLICY AND STRUCTURAL REFORMS

Zambia's economic policies in the last two decades before 1992 characterised by strong administrative controls in the determination of commodity prices, interest rates, foreign exchange rates and the ownership structure of commercial and industrial enterprises. In view of these policies the public sector was increasingly assigned a leading role from the late 1960s such that in 1970 government expenditure reached 41% of GDP.

Another feature of the past two decades was the nationalization policy which sought to increase the public sector and reduce the private sector in the Zambian economy. The number of parastatals increased from 14 in the early 1970s to 147 by the end of the decade. This was a result of nationalizing foreign companies that operated in Zambia and the creation of certain parastatals which were to address certain key problems that arose as a result of discouraging private investment in general and foreign investment in particular.

Zambia like many developing countries contracted a number of loans on the international market during the boom days of the 1960s and the early 1970s. In the case of Zambia, however, most of these loans were obtained on a commercial basis resulting into heavy debt service obligations especially in the mid 1980s when high interest rates prevailed in Western Europe and North America. As a result, Zambia has been grappling with problems of debt service from the late 1970s. In 1978 the first standby arrangement was made with the International Monetary Fund. The record of Zambia's relationships with these institutions has not been good in that most agreements reached were never seen to their logical conclusions due to the unwillingness of the then Zambian Government to do away with policies that tended to lay a heavy burden on government expenditure and that encouraged fiscal indiscipline. To date Zambia's debt burden stands at about USA \$7 Billion.

The debt burden discussed above and the heavy expenditure on subsidies to the parastatals compelled the government in 1983 to carry out a wide-ranging re-examination of economic policies and institutions at the macro and sector levels.

ies were carried out on a variety of key issues so that a number of policy packages could be formulated over a number of years. Between 1983 and 1986 a number of stand by arrangements and loan agreements were made between the government, the IMF and the World Bank. As already mentioned above all of these agreements were not fully implemented as the government was unable to meet agreed benchmarks. Consequently, in May 1987 the government suspended the programme with the IMF and the World Bank and limited debt service to 10% of export earnings. However, by 1988 the crisis had deepened leading to government to reopen negotiations with the IMF and the World Bank. A new programme was worked out 1989. This programme was half-heartedly implemented by the government until the second republic government was voted out of power in October 1991.

In 1992, the new government prepared a plan of action for economic recovery on the basis of the programme that the previous government had agreed with the IMF and the World Bank. Measures were put in place to liberalize the exchange rates, trade, interest rates, commodity prices, etc.

In the agricultural sector the reforms included:

Expenditure reforms that give priority to development of smallholder agriculture through enhancement of research and extension services; strengthening agricultural credit; improving rural infrastructures and agro-processing facilities; and providing adequate maize storage facilities.

Market reforms that:

a vary farm-gate price inversely with transport costs so as to eliminate subsidies on maize transportation;

b continue the promotion of wide-spread use of hammermills

c develop programmes to enhance the private sector's involvement in marketing, processing and export;

d reduce the dependence of the agricultural credit system on government funding.

i land policies that:

a renew leases under leasehold system; and

b accelerate the land survey programme to reduce the backlog in the issuance of title deeds.