



REPORT OF THE WORKSHOP ON INCEPTION PLANNING FOR THE JOINT SUPPORT PROGRAMME 4th and 5th January, 2010, Paro, Bhutan

Introduction

The Joint Support Programme (JSP) ‘Capacity Development for Mainstreaming Environment, Climate Change and Poverty Concerns in Policies, Plans and Programmes’ has been formulated to: (a) develop the national capacity to mainstream environment-climate-poverty (ECP) concerns and responses to them in national and sectoral development policies, plans, and programmes, especially those of relevance to local governance; and (b) based on the national ECP framework, develop the capacity of *dzongkhag* and *gewog* administrations to mainstream ECP concerns and responses to them in local development plans and programmes, and for monitoring and evaluation to enhance the responsiveness to ECP challenges.

The JSP is supported by the Government of Denmark, United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), and United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP). It consists of Component 2 “Capacity development to mainstream environment” of the Danish-supported Sustainable Environment Support Programme (SESP) and UNDP/ UNEP-supported Poverty Environment Initiative (PEI) Phase II. The SESP is to succeed the ongoing Danish-supported Environment and Urban Sector Programme Support (EUSPS) which is now scheduled to conclude in June 2010. The UNDP/UNEP PEI is implemented in two phases. Phase I (July 2008-December 2009) focused on capacity development to address poverty and environment in an integrated manner and to influence national policies on rural livelihoods in an environmentally sustainable manner. Phase II will focus on capacity development, including institutional and policy mechanisms, to mainstream poverty-environment linkages into development plans and programmes.

The Gross National Happiness Commission Secretariat (GNHCS), in coordination with the development partners (LoD, UNDP/UNEP, UNCDF), organized an inception planning workshop to orientate stakeholder agencies to the programmatic context of the JSP, develop work programme for the initial 18 months of the JSP, and decide next steps to operationalize the JSP. *Annex 2 outlines the agenda of the workshop.*

The workshop, held at Paro on 4th and 5th January, 2010, was attended by 35 participants representing central government planning, finance and environmental agencies, *dzongkhag* and *gewog* administrations, civil society organizations (CSOs), and international development partner agencies namely the Liaison Office of Denmark (LOD), United Nations Capital Development Fund (UNCDF), UNDP, and UNEP. *Annex 3 lists the names and organizations of the participants.*

Presentations and Discussions

Overview of Joint Support Programme-Outcome 1

Mr. Phuntsho Wangyel of GNHCS outlined the outputs, activities and budget outlay for outcome 1 of the JSP. To realize outcome 1, which is stated in the programme document as ‘ECP mainstreamed in policies, plans and programmes,’ the JSP has defined five outputs.

The first output ‘ECP mainstreaming guidelines and outputs’ envisaged: establishment of preliminary ECP indicators; refinement of GNH indicators and screening tools; development of work on public environmental expenditure review (PEER) and modalities for Green Accounting; development of environmental baseline data at *dzongkhag* and *gewog* levels; and review of Planning and Monitoring System (PlAMS) for introduction of ECP indicators into the system.

The second output ‘Poverty-environment linkages demonstrated and benefit-sharing policies and strategies developed accordingly’ envisaged: integrated ecosystem assessments and other studies; economic analyses related to key poverty-environment linkage issues; continuation of PEER; study of international experience on benefit sharing; policy recommendation to allow benefit sharing at local levels; and development of trial benefit-sharing activities in conjunction with CSOs.

Activities envisaged for the third output ‘Staff and modules available for ECP mainstreaming trainings at all levels in relevant educational and training institutes’ included: review of ECP related capacity development needs of training institutes; development of partnerships between the Royal Institute of Management (RIM) and other relevant Bhutanese training institutes to coordinate and develop an integrated training package for applying ECP mainstreaming guidelines; development of partnerships between RIM and regional/international training institutes; training of trainers (ToT) on use of ECP mainstreaming guidelines; specific capacity development of National Environment Commission Secretariat (NECS), Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA) and other relevant agencies to assist with international climate change negotiations; development of training module for ECP mainstreaming in local development plans; and development of research capacity of College of Natural Resources (CNR), Ugyen Wangchuck Institute for Conservation and Environment (UWICE), and Regional RNR Research Centres.

The fourth output ‘Competent staff available in all sectors including the proposed Help Desk to mainstream ECP’ envisaged: training of policy and planning staff of all ministries and relevant autonomous agencies and constitutional bodies in the application of ECP mainstreaming guidelines; capacity development of NECS/Inter-institutional Help Desk; institutional strengthening of the newly created Watershed Management Division (WMD) within the Department of Forests, Ministry of Agriculture (MoA); capacity development for Department of Public Accounts, National Statistics Bureau and other agencies on PEER and Green Accounting; production of the next Bhutan Environmental Outlook; and bi-annual environmental workshops for parliamentarians preceding the Parliamentary Sessions.

The fifth output ‘Competent staff available in other sectors to mainstream ECP’ relates primarily to the private sector and CSOs. Envisaged activities for this output include: capacity development of CSOs to contribute to area-wide planning and forest planning; development of targeted ‘update’ short courses for environmental consultants; development of linkages between the private sector and capacity building within NECS and MFA to assist with international climate change negotiations; design and implementation of an extensive capacity building programme with CSOs focusing on environmental management at the village level; seed funding for CSO activities in areas of eco-efficient house design and construction; assistance for CSOs to research alternative means of dealing with human-wildlife conflict and also to better understand benefit sharing approaches; and assistance to proposed Environmental Resource Centre planned by the Royal Society for Protection of Nature (RSPN).

The following discussions ensued from the presentation:

- ◆ There is a need to clarify benefit sharing in the context of JSP. Is it similar to payment of environment services?
- ◆ At the broader conceptual level, benefit sharing may be akin to payment of environmental services. However, in the context of poverty-environment mainstreaming at the local level it more specifically relates to economic incentives, e.g. returns from eco-tourism, to the local communities who have kept their environment in healthy state or providing economic compensation to the local communities who directly bear the costs of environmental conservation, e.g. crop depredation due to wildlife incursions.
- ◆ For Outcome 1, there is a need to include output pertaining to monitoring of ECP mainstreaming as done in the case of Outcome 2.
- ◆ There is the danger of having an overabundance of indicators. The Centre of Bhutan Studies (CBS) has been working on GNH indicators and already some 72 GNH indicators have been identified. The ECP indicators would only add to the plethora and intricacy of indicators, thus confusing development planners and managers.
- ◆ The ECP are elements of GNH, which stresses on environmental sustainability and equitable socio-economic growth. Hence, the ECP indicators are not to be additional indicators but to add value and complement the GNH and PlaMS indicators.

Overview of LGSP and its Links to JSP

Mr. Karma Jamtsho of GNHCS gave an overview of the Local Governance Support Programme (LGSP) and its links to JSP. His presentation highlighted the following points:

- ◆ The LGSP has been conceived with the intended outcome as “Local governments provide efficient poverty reduction services based on local input.” The expected outputs are: effective and transparent financing mechanism for local government service delivery in place and well functioning; inclusive, efficient and accountable public expenditure management procedures for local government established and being used; effective national support/training mechanism for local government personnel and elected people in place;

central government's policy, regulatory, technical support and supervision functions strengthened; and effective models for integrated public service and information delivery at local levels.

- ◆ The national partner agencies of LGSP include the Ministry of Finance, Ministry of Home and Cultural Affairs (MoHCA), RIM and other in-country training institutes, and *dzongkhag* and *gewog* administrations. The international development partners are LOD, UNDP, UNCDF, Austrian Coordination Office, Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC)/ Helvetas, Netherlands Development Organization (SNV), and Japan International Cooperation Agency.
- ◆ Component 1 of the SESP, which constitutes annual capital grants for investments in the *gewogs*, will augment and consolidate annual capital grants system – the inter-governmental fiscal transfer mechanism – which relates to output 1 of the LGSP.
- ◆ Component 2 of the SESP constitutes the JSP, Outcome 2 of which specifically focuses on ECP mainstreaming in local development plans and programmes and capacity development of *dzongkhag* and *gewog* administrations to do so. The JSP will, therefore, supplement capacity development under LGSP and preparation of guidelines/tools for local-level development planning and management.

The following discussions ensued from the presentation:

- ◆ Local government representation is not explicit in the JSP programme document although outcome 2 specifically is about capacity development of *dzongkhag* and *gewog* administrations for ECP mainstreaming in their plans and programmes. Although the terms of reference (ToR) for the JSP-Steering Committee (JSP-SC) include local government representation, there is need to reflect the representation and role of local government institutions upfront in the main text related to programme management and organization in the JSP programme document.
- ◆ The Ministry of Economic Affairs (MoEA) has an important role to play in reducing poverty through micro and small rural enterprises but there is no outcome and output associated to it. There is a need to look at the role of MoEA in the context of poverty-environment mainstreaming in economic development policies, plans and programmes.

Local Government, Climate Change and Strategic Planning

Mr. David Jackson, Head of the UNCDF Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific, gave a presentation on 'Local Government, Climate Change and Strategic Planning'. The presentation highlighted the following key points:

- ◆ There are broadly three types of planning: needs-based, strategic, and scenario-based. Needs-based planning looks at priorities and often focuses on individual projects and actions. Strategic planning essentially focuses on overall objectives and has a longer term horizon. Scenario-based planning looks at various possibilities in the future and requires a break from existing assumptions.

- ◆ Needs based planning and strategic planning are generally based on existing information but scenario-based planning often requires the introduction of new information.
- ◆ Medium term financial frameworks (for local government), functional assignments and fiscal decentralisation will help move from needs based planning to more strategic planning. The Local Governance Support Programme (LGSP) is moving in this direction.
- ◆ For local governments to make contributions to GNH and Millennium Development Goals (MDG), a more strategic approach to the planning process will be required. For example a local government may choose to focus on a particular MDG (related to the GNH index) and then develop a strategy to meet that MDG.
- ◆ Climate change adaptation planning needs to look at various scenarios that may occur over the long term. For example, what if temperatures increased by two percent over the next 10 years? In Bhutan, climate change adaptation planning will be an enormous challenge as the country is characterized by numerous micro-climates shaped by varying local environments. It is, therefore, critical that climate change adaptation planning and actions take place at the local level. There are several global evidences that show that local-level resources and responses to climate change concerns are more effective than those that emanate from central agencies. Examples include Katrina Hurricane, United States, of 2005 (central response) versus California wildfires 2007 (local response).
- ◆ Mainstreaming climate change in local governance requires a clear assignment of functions between central and local governments and much greater coordination between agencies than is usual. It does not always require new institutions; it more often requires better inter-institutional coordination and synergy, and additional resources (financial, technical, human).
- ◆ Climate change adaptation planning often involves changing what exists but people are generally inclined to plan for something new based on short-term needs. Consequently, there is generally inadvertent resistance or reluctance to plan for and invest in climate change adaptation.
- ◆ Local holistic response to climate change challenges may involve more than one government. It would more often involve local coordination of various agencies with different mandates to deliver smart responses.
- ◆ Whilst the global challenge of climate change adaptation is large. Its local reality is varied and highly specific. In some cases it requires a local disaster risk reduction / disaster management capacity, in other areas it requires new infrastructure such as small dams etc. In yet others it may require relocation of households. There are multiple configurations of these requirements and they do not easily fit into sector or ministerial boxes. For example, whilst the skills and resources of the Ministry of Health may be relevant in one case, the skills of a different agency are needed elsewhere. Likewise, climate change challenges do not confine to administrative boundaries. For example, they may affect three local government jurisdictions along a river bank, but not affect others on higher ground in the same jurisdictions.

Poverty-Environment Mainstreaming Guideline

Mr. Phuntsho Wangyel of the GNHCS made a presentation on the ‘Poverty-Environment Mainstreaming Guideline.’ The presentation highlighted the following key points:

- ◆ Poverty-environment mainstreaming is the integration of poverty-environment linkages into development planning processes for pro-poor growth in environmentally sustainable ways.
- ◆ It was important to promote poverty-environment mainstreaming because there are evidences that poverty reduction and environmental management have positive linkages and can be pursued in mutually-reinforcing ways. The poor depend the most on environmental goods and services for their subsistence and to break out of the poverty cycle; consequently, it is the poor who are affected the most when environmental degradation occurs.
- ◆ Poverty-environment mainstreaming is highly relevant in the Bhutanese context as nearly 70 per cent of the Bhutanese population live in the rural areas, primarily depending on the natural environment to sustain and enhance crop and livestock production, and for a wide range of services and goods including fuelwood, timber, medicinal and aromatic plants, farmyard manure, and water. Furthermore, more than 90 per cent of the country’s poor live in the rural areas, the renewable natural resources sector (agriculture, livestock production and forestry) account for about one-third of the Gross Domestic Product (GDP), and major revenue-generating sources such as hydropower and tourism are dependent on the health of the environment.
- ◆ The central objective of the ongoing 10th Five Year Plan is poverty reduction. While it recognizes that protecting and conserving the environment will require greater attention in view of the accelerating pace of socio-economic development, it also emphasizes the need to use the country’s environmental resources as a development asset for economic growth and poverty reduction within sustainable limits.
- ◆ The poverty-environment mainstreaming guideline has been produced by the GNHCS as a part of the UNDP/UNEP Phase I support. It has been finalized through a consultative process and is ready for publication. The guideline is structured in four parts. Part A provides the national context and rationale of poverty-environment linkages; Part B explains the concept, institutional requirements, and some key tools of poverty-environment mainstreaming; Part C discusses poverty-environment linkages in the context of 10th FYP and public expenditure, and illustrates indicators that can be used for monitoring poverty-environment mainstreaming; and Part D looks into poverty-environment linkages by sector and provides recommendations on how it is possible to mainstream poverty-environment during the implementation of programmes and activities of various sectors. The sectors covered in Part D are grouped as: (a) Natural Resources Sector; (b) Trade, Industry, Energy, Mines and Tourism Sector; (c) Infrastructure and Urban Development Sector; and (d) Health Sector.

REAP Strategic Framework and Village Development Plan

Mr. Phuntsho Wangyel of GNHCS gave presentations on the strategic framework of Rural Economic Advancement Programme (REAP) and the outline of Village Development Plan (VDP). His presentations highlighted the following points:

- ◆ The REAP provides the overall framework for development and implementation of RGoB's rural economic growth and poverty reduction programmes during the 10th FYP period, contributing to the reduction of poverty. It focuses on the reduction of extreme poverty and is targeting the poorest *gewogs* in the country and trying to do so in a coordinated and sustainable manner. It endeavors to take into consideration the special needs of the poor, who have not benefited much from broad-based poverty reduction and economic growth interventions, and to address them specifically through targeted interventions coming in addition to the mainstream development efforts.
- ◆ The implementation of the REAP is anchored at the local level, benefiting from the technical support of the various sectors, while the coordination of its implementation and the monitoring of its progress will be carried out by the GNHCS.
- ◆ The REAP interventions are categorized in relation to various forms of capital: human (population, knowledge, education, skills, health); social (community networks, relationships and cohesion); natural (land, livestock, forests, water), physical (basic infrastructure, facilities and services), and financial (savings and credit, liquid assets and cash income).
- ◆ VDPs have been prepared for 10 villages, one each in the 10 poorest *gewogs*. Of these 10 *gewogs*, eight are located inside protected areas. The VDP is derived through a participatory process which involves mobilization of opinions of all segments of the local communities on the common challenges and potential interventions to reduce poverty.
- ◆ The institutional modality for REAP consists of a strategic committee made up of senior officials from key stakeholder agencies. The Research and Evaluation Division is tasked with technical backstopping, coordination and monitoring while the implementation is to be done by the *dzongkhag* and *gewog* administrations in partnership with relevant CSOs. Lead agency at the local level is assigned as per the relevance of the planned activities. For funding support, the VDPs could be linked to three key sources: local development grants; interventions under central programmes; and Target Poverty Intervention programme.

The Framework for Financial Management, Work Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation of JSP

Mr. Tashi Dorji of UNDP Bhutan Country Office outlined the framework for financial management, preparation of work plans and for monitoring and evaluation of the JSP. His presentation stressed the following points:

- ◆ The JSP will be monitored based on the RGoB indicators and monitoring and evaluation (M&E) system. The JSP M&E system will take place at four levels: national, sector,

dzongkhag, and *gewog*, and integrate into PlaMS, Multi-Year Rolling Budget (MYRB), and Public Expenditure Management System (PEMS).

- ◆ The JSP M&E procedures will correspondingly follow the procedures established by the National Monitoring and Evaluation System (NMES) and its guidance manual and progress reporting shall comply with the formats in PlaMS and FRR. Reporting of JSP implementation performance is to be done on a half-yearly basis in progress reports to the JSP-Steering Committee and quarterly progress reports focusing on key achievements and impacts are to be submitted on the 15th of April, July, October, and January. The project managers will compile the progress reports from all relevant agencies and submit to the LOD and UNDP.
- ◆ The 18-month rolling work plans will be subjected to Annual Programme Reviews. Mid-term evaluation is scheduled in 2011 and a terminal review of lessons learned from the JSP will be undertaken towards the end of 2013.
- ◆ With regards to fund flow, RGoB procedures for financial management and procurement are to be followed. Danish and PEI funds will be channeled to GNHCS, which in turn will route the funds to the Department of Public Accounts and respective national and local government agencies. Local government and relevant agencies will prepare annual work plans and budgets based on proposed capacity development activities, which GNHCS will compile for prioritization and approval by JSP-SC. Funding support to the private sector and CSOs will be provided to the CSO Authority through GNHCS.
- ◆ RGoB auditing procedures will be applied. The Royal Audit Authority will audit the accounts of public institutions including *dzongkhags* on an annual basis and *gewogs* at least every second year. Annual audited financial statements shall be submitted to LOD and UNDP after they are endorsed by the Parliament.
- ◆ At the higher UN programmatic level, the JSP will contribute to Outcome 5 of the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF), which is “By 2012, national capacity for environmental sustainability and disaster management strengthened (MDG 7).” Within the UNDAF Outcome 5, the JSP will relate directly to Country Team (CT) Outcome 1 “National capacity to address current environmental challenges and mainstream environmental concerns into policies, plans and programs enhanced” and CT Output 1.1 “Capacity of national and local authorities/agencies to mainstream environmental concerns strengthened.”

The JSP Results and Resources Framework and the Results Matrix for Sub-outputs

Mr. Ugen P. Norbu of Norbu Samyul Consulting presented the Results and Resources Framework (RRF) of the JSP and the draft Results Matrix for the sub-outputs. The presentation outlined the relative focus of the donors – Denmark (SESP) and UNDP/UNEP (PEI Phase 2) – and their budgetary allocation as given in the programme document of the JSP. The RRF indicated SESP’s relative focus was high for integration of ECP concerns into the Local Development Planning Manual, capacity development of local administrative and elected bodies, and monitoring of ECP contents of annual local development plans. The PEI Phase 2’s

relative focus was high for ECP mainstreaming guidelines, demonstration of poverty-environment linkages, and development and field-testing of benefit sharing policies and strategies in addition to sharing SESP's high focus for integration of ECP concerns into the Local Development Planning Manual and capacity development of local administrative and elected bodies.

It was pointed out that while the programme document of JSP described the indicators and targets for the outcomes and outputs, there were no indicators and targets for the sub-outputs. A presentation of the draft indicators, baselines and targets was made for discussion at the workshop. *The draft results matrix for the JSP outputs is provided in Annex 4.*

The following discussions ensued from the presentation of the RRF and draft results matrix for the sub-outputs:

- ◆ Indicators will be required to assess changes brought about by the JSP. However, at the sub-output level, indicators may generally be limited to physical targets (e.g. number of ECP trainings held, number of sectoral policies mainstreamed with ECP concerns). It is at the objective and outcome level that indicators for assessment of changes (e.g. improved policies and plans integrating ECP concerns, enhanced capacity for ECP mainstreaming) brought about by the achievement of physical targets would be required.
- ◆ It is critical to develop the RRF and the indicators and targets conscientiously as they will have considerable bearing on M&E, including mid-term evaluation, terminal reviews and outcome evaluations.
- ◆ The draft results matrix of the sub-outputs is a rough sketch of the indicators and targets developed provisionally to generate discussion among the participants. It needs to be reviewed and refined by a small group of people representing key stakeholder agencies. A major point to consider while formulating the indicators and targets is their expediency in terms of whether they will be measurable and achievable.

Group Work and Plenaries

The workshop participants were divided into two groups. The Outcome 1 group consisted of participants from NECS, MoA, MoEA, Department of Public Accounts, Department of Local Governance, GNHCS's Plan Monitoring and Coordination Division (PMCD), CSOs, CNR, UWICE, UNDP and UNEP. The Outcome 2 group was made up of participants from *dzongkhag* and *gewog* administrations, CSOs, Department of Local Governance, GNHCS's Local Development Division (LDD), UNCDF, and UNDP.

The groups were given two tasks: (a) to review and provide recommendations on the programmatic contexts of the JSP outcomes; and (b) to discuss and decide activities, implementation schedule and provisional budget for the initial 18 months of the JSP. *Information produced through the group work are provided in Annexes 5 and 6.*

The following discussions occurred during the plenaries:

Plenary on Task 1 (Programmatic Context of JSP Outcomes):

- ◆ ECP mainstreaming guideline has been proposed to be tested during the mid-term review of the 10th FYP for mainly two reasons. One, to assess to what extent ECP mainstreaming has taken place in the 10th FYP and, two, to enlist feedback on the practicability and efficacy of the ECP mainstreaming guideline at the national and sectoral levels.
- ◆ Capacity development of training institutions should not be only limited to training capacity but also for academic work on poverty-environment linkages based on field case studies and research.
- ◆ ECP mainstreaming Help Desk needs elaboration in terms of the form and shape it is to develop into. Help Desk may not be the only option. There may be other options, e.g. ECP mainstreaming core group which provides technical backstopping and guidance to the sectoral agencies, and *dzongkhag* and *gewog* administrations.
- ◆ The proposed Help Desk is to be sort of a virtual institution to respond to critical questions and guidance needs that arise during the course of ECP mainstreaming. It may be made up of the group of people who worked on the interim environmental mainstreaming guidelines and had received ECP mainstreaming training.
- ◆ Although the JSP includes climate change as an issue for mainstreaming, the programme document has little on activities related to address climate change concerns. Through the EUSPS, the MoEA has made considerable headway in promoting Clean Technology and Environmental Management (CTEM) in the industry sector. The gains made on the CTEM need to be further consolidated and this could be pursued through the JSP.
- ◆ The JSP is a partnership programme; so, what to include and what not to will have to be based on consensus between the partners. CTEM is a potential activity to mainstream climate change concerns in economic development. However, the JSP is programmatically designed to focus on capacity development (institutional mechanisms, training, planning, M&E, etc) and not to finance procurement of technological hardware, which may be the case in CTEM.
- ◆ The JSP is intended to primarily promote pro-poor growth that is environmentally sustainable. Therefore, there is a need to look at re-introducing environmental criterion in the resource allocation formula adopted by the GNHCS and Ministry of Finance.
- ◆ Environmental criterion earlier applied for resource allocation was based on forest coverage. This, somehow, provided a skewed picture and was strongly disputed by the Parliament/ National Assembly. Consequently, it was removed from the resource allocation formula.

Plenary on Task 2 (18-month Rolling Work Plan):

- ◆ The budget provisionally worked out for Outcome 1 exceeds the available budget; so, there is a need to prioritize. Prioritization will need to take place with an ‘ECP mainstreaming lens’ and to contribute ultimately to local capacity development.

- ◆ Awareness creation appears to be a major activity for ECP mainstreaming. However, the role of media and capacity development of media personnel are inconspicuous in the JSP.
- ◆ Media will have an important role in the dissemination of ECP information produced through JSP. Media personnel can be involved in ECP awareness programmes as participants. However, capacity development of media agencies for ECP mainstreaming may be a different ballgame altogether.
- ◆ Screening and sequencing of activities would be required to synchronize Outcome 1 and 2 work plans especially considering that several Outcome 2 activities are dependent on the progress of Outcome 1 activities.
- ◆ Technical assistance (TA) budgets could be removed from outcome work plans as there is separate TA budget of USD 364,000 from SESP over and above the budgets reflected for the JSP Outcomes. There is also unallocated budget which can be tapped for activities such as the proposed annual sector coordination meeting on solid waste management.
- ◆ Some of the activities like organizational development of WMD and seismic hazard zoning of the country are full-scale programmes by themselves with possibly significant budget requirements. The JSP may be able to take up some key elements of organizational development of WMD but to take up the organizational development of WMD in its totality may be too ambitious.
- ◆ Almost in every project, there is a tendency to plan for pilot activities. There is a need to examine past local-level environmental management initiatives and draw lessons that can be used to scale up field activities and inform policy-making. The JSP intends to engage in such studies besides new demonstration activities.
- ◆ Outcome 2 is dependent on the progress of Outcome 1, so the work plan for Outcome 2 is not to be too ambitious in the first year. Outcome 2 will also depend on the progress of the LGSP which became operational in July 2009.
- ◆ Is support to CSOs limited to RSPN and Tarayana Foundation? There is a need to engage other CSOs although in the context of ECP mainstreaming RSPN and Tarayana Foundation appear to be the most relevant and forthcoming CSOs.
- ◆ Flow of funds for CSOs through several layers of government bureaucracy can tie up CSOs to the intricacy of government system for planning, budgeting and reporting. This may affect the efficacy and independence of CSOs for programme implementation.

Management and Implementation Issues

The final session of the workshop focused on management and implementation issues. The following discussions and decisions took place at this session:

- ◆ The Programme Management Group (PMG) will need to include focal points from the MoEA and CSO Authority.

- ◆ The Head of Development Cooperation Division (DCD), GNHCS, should be the chair of the PMG and not the Head of LDD, GNHCS, as reflected in the ToR of PMG (Annex E.2).
- ◆ Representation of Sustainable Land Management Project (SLMP) in the PMG may not be necessary as there are no SLMP-related activities in the JSP.
- ◆ SLMP was included in the PMG as it is a collaborative project supported through EUSPS (which will be succeeded by the SESP) and there was need for harmonization of SLMP-EUSPS activities. Nevertheless, the inclusion of the Policy and Planning Division, MoA, in the PMG would serve the purpose should harmonization with SLMP be an issue. Moreover, a representative from SLMP could be invited to PMG meetings as observer as and when their inputs are felt necessary.
- ◆ The agreed composition of the PMG is: Head of DCD, GNHCS, as chair; Head of LDD, GNHCS; Head of PMCD, GNHCS; JSP Programme Manager as member secretary; Head of PPD, NECS, or focal point; Head of PPD, MoA, or focal point; Chief Programme Officer of Department of Local Governance, MoHCA, or focal point; Head or Programme Officer of UNDP Bhutan Environment Unit; Programme Officer of LOD; and CSO focal persons.
- ◆ The JSP Outcome Managers will be Mr. Wangchuk Namgay, PMCD, GNHCS, for Outcome 1 and Mr. Karma Jamtsho (or another nominated person) from LDD, GNHCS for Outcome 2.
- ◆ Harmonization of donors' requirements for planning and reporting is required to reduce administrative burden. For instance, annual work planning is a UNDP-specific requirement whereas inception phase is a LOD-specific requirement.
- ◆ Is inception phase necessary for JSP? – It is not mandatory but is felt desirable for quality assurance of work plans and results/M&E frameworks.
- ◆ Can GNHCS sign the work plan by 15th January, 2010, so as to enable UNDP to release the funds in the first quarter of 2010? – This may be difficult as the work plan will have to be first finalized and then presented to the JSP-SC for review and approval. A JSP-SC meeting in January would be improbable due to other planned commitments of GNHCS. Nevertheless, the GNHCS-JSP managers will discuss the matter with the Honorable Secretary of GNHCS regarding the possibility of convening the first JSP-PSC meeting before 15th January, 2010, and respond to UNDP accordingly.

Close of the Workshop

The workshop concluded with closing remarks from Mr. Karma Jamtsho, GNHCS, on behalf of the government agencies and Mr. Sanath Ranawana, UNEP Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific, on behalf of the international development partners. Mr. Karma Jamtsho thanked the participants for the interactive sessions and inputs to workshop process. Mr. Sanath Ranawana expressed that he anticipated enormous challenges in the planning exercise but was satisfied with the proceedings and results of the workshop.

Annex 1: Acronyms and Glossary of Bhutanese Terms

Acronyms

CBS	Centre for Bhutan Studies
CNR	College of Natural Resources
CSO	Civil Society Organization
CT	Country Team (of the UN System)
DCD	Development Cooperation Division (of the GNHCS)
ECF	Environment-climate-poverty
EUSPS	Environment and Urban Sector Programme Support
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
GNH	Gross National Happiness
GNHCS	Gross National Happiness Commission Secretariat
JSP	Joint Support Programme
JSP-SC	Joint Support Programme-Steering Committee
LDD	Local Development Division (of the GNHCS)
LGSP	Local Governance Support Programme
MDG	Millennium Development Goal
MFA	Ministry of Foreign Affairs
MoA	Ministry of Agriculture
MoEA	Ministry of Economic Affairs
MoHCA	Ministry of Home and Cultural Affairs
MYRB	Multi-Year Rolling Budget
NECS	National Environment Commission Secretariat
NMES	National Monitoring and Evaluation System
PEER	Public Environment Expenditure Review
PEI	Poverty-Environment Initiative of UNDP and UNEP
PEMS	Public Expenditure Management System
PlaMS	Planning and Monitoring System
PMCD	Plan Monitoring and Coordination Division (of the GNHCS)
PMG	Programme Management Group
LGSP	Local Governance Support Programme
LOD	Liaison Office of Denmark

REAP	Rural Economic Advancement Programme
RGoB	Royal Government of Bhutan
RIM	Royal Institute of Management
RNR	Renewable Natural Resources
RRF	Results and Resources Framework
RSPN	Royal Society for Protection of Nature
SDC	Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation
SESP	Sustainable Environment Support Programme
SLMP	Sustainable Land Management Project (of MoA supported by World Bank and Global Environment Facility)
SNV	Netherlands Development Organization
TA	Technical assistance
ToR	Terms of Reference
ToT	Training of trainers
UNCDF	United Nations Capital Development Fund
UNDAF	United Nations Development Assistance Framework
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNEP	United Nations Development Programme
UWICE	Ugyen Wangchuck Institute for Conservation and Environment
VDP	Village Development Plan
WMD	Watershed Management Division, Department of Forests

Bhutanese Terms

Dzongkhag: A district. At the present, there are altogether 20 *dzongkhags* in the country.

Gewog: A county, smallest geographical unit for public administration, made up of a group of villages. There are a total of 205 *gewogs* in the country

Annex 2: Workshop Agenda

Day 1: 4th January, 2010

Time	Activity	Responsible Person(s)
08:30-09:00 hrs	Registration of participants and distribution of workshop materials	Participants and Ms. Kinley Choden
09:00 hrs	SESSION I: OPENING AND PRESENTATIONS	Session Chair: Mr. Karma Jamtsho, GNHCS
09:00-09:10 hrs	Welcome address	Mr. Sangay Penjor, GNHCS
09:10-09:40 hrs	Overview of the Joint Support Programme-Outcome 1 component	Mr. Phuntsho Wangyel, GNHCS
09:40-10:10 hrs	Overview of the Joint Support Programme-Outcome 2 component and links to Local Governance Support Programme	Mr. Karma Jamtsho, GNHCS
10:10-10:30 hrs	Climate Change Adaptation Strategic Planning and Local Governance	Mr. David Jackson, UNCDF Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific
10:30-10:45 hrs	Tea break	
10:45-11:45 hrs	Presentations on Poverty-Environment Mainstreaming Guideline and Village Development Plan	Mr. Phuntsho Wangyel, GNHCS
11:45-12:05 hrs	Presentation on work plan and monitoring and evaluation format	Mr. Tashi Dorji, UNDP Bhutan Country Office
12:05-12:45 hrs	Joint Support Results and Resources Framework, and Results Matrix for Sub-outputs	Mr. Ugen P. Norbu, Norbu Samyul Consulting
12:45-13:00 hrs	Discussions	
13:00-14:00 hrs	Lunch break	
14:00 hrs	SESSION II: GROUP WORK AND PLENARIES	Session Chair: Mr. Sanath Ranawana, UNEP Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific
14:00-14:20 hrs	Introduction to the Group Work	Mr. Sanath Ranawana, UNEP Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific

Time	Activity	Responsible Person(s)
14:20-16:00 hrs	Group Work on Programmatic Frameworks of the JSP outcomes	Facilitators: Mr. Sanath Ranawana for Outcome 1 Group, and Mr. Karma Jamtsho for Outcome 2 Group
16:00-17:30 hrs	Group presentations and plenaries on programmatic frameworks of the JSP outcomes	Participants
17:30 hrs	Close of Day 1	

Day 2: 5th January, 2010

09:00-13:00 hrs	Group work on work programmes for the JSP outcomes	Facilitators: Mr. Sanath Ranawana for Outcome 1 Group, and Mr. Karma Jamtsho for Outcome 2 Group
13:00-14:00 hrs	Lunch break	
14:00-14:30 hrs	Continuation of group work on work programmes for the JSP outcomes	
14:30-16:30 hrs	Group discussions and plenaries on work programmes	Participants
16:30-18:00 hrs	Discussion on management and implementation issues	Chair: Mr. Karma Jamtsho
18:00 hrs	Close of the workshop	
19:00-20:00 hrs	Closing dinner for workshop participants	

Annex 3: List of Participants

(listed in alphabetical order)

1. Budhiman Rai, Senior Accounts Officer, Department of Public Accounts, Ministry of Finance (*e-mail: budhiman@mof.gov.bt*)
2. Chencho G. Dorjee, Programme Officer, UNCDF Bhutan Office (*e-mail: chencho.dorjee@uncdf.org*)
3. David Jackson, Head, UNCDF Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific (*e-mail: david.jackson@uncdf.org*)
4. Dechen Wangmo, Gewog Administrative Officer, Thedtsho gewog, Wangdue dzongkhag (*e-mail: dechen_07@hotmail.com*)
5. Karma Galay, Chief Planning Officer, Department of Local Governance, Ministry of Home and Cultural Affairs (*e-mail: karmagalay@gmail.com*)
6. Karma Jamtsho, Senior Programme Officer, LDD, Gross National Happiness Commission Secretariat (*e-mail: kjamtsho@gnhc.gov.bt*)
7. Karma L. Rapten, Head, Environment Unit, UNDP Bhutan Country Office (*e-mail: karma.rapten@undp.org*)
8. Karma Tshering, Chief Forestry Officer, Watershed Management Division, Department of Forests, Ministry of Agriculture (*e-mail: kxt123@hotmail.com*)
9. Karma Tshering, Planning Officer, National Environment Commission Secretariat (*e-mail: ktshering@nec.gov.bt*)
10. Kinley Choden, Project Support Officer, Poverty-Environment Initiative Project, Gross National Happiness Commission Secretariat (*e-mail: kchoden@gnhc.gov.bt*)
11. Lam Dorji, Executive Director, Royal Society for Protection of Nature (*e-mail: ldorji@rspnbhutan.org*)
12. Lekey Wangdi, Assistant Planning Officer, Haa Dzongkhag Administration (*e-mail: lektsh@druknet.bt*)
13. Nidup Peljor, Deputy Chief Planning Officer, Policy and Planning Division, Ministry of Agriculture (*e-mail: n_peljor@moa.gov.bt*)
14. Passang Dorji, Assistant Planning Officer, Trongsa Dzongkhag Administration (*e-mail: trongsa@gnhc.gov.bt*)
15. Penjor, Assistant Planning Officer, Gross National Happiness Commission Secretariat (*e-mail: penjor@gnhc.gov.bt*)
16. Phuntsho Wangyel, Planning Officer, Gross National Happiness Commission Secretariat (*e-mail: pwangyel@gnhc.gov.bt*)

17. Roseleen Gurung, Programme Officer, Tarayana Foundation (*e-mail: roseleengurung@gmail.com*)
18. Sahadev Thapa, Deputy Chief Planning Officer, Wangdue Dzongkhag Administration (*e-mail: sthapa@druknet.bt*)
19. Sanath Ranawana, Poverty-Environment Initiative Advisor, UNEP Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific (*e-mail: sanath.ranawana@unep.org*)
20. Sangay Penjor, Senior Planning Officer, DCD, Gross National Happiness Commission Secretariat (*e-mail: spenjor@gnhc.gov.bt*)
21. Sonam Wangdi, Senior Accounts Officer, Department of Public Accounts, Ministry of Finance (*e-mail: sonamwangdi@mof.gov.bt*)
22. Sonam T. Dorji, Planning Officer, Policy and Planning Division, Ministry of Economic Affairs (*e-mail: stdorji@gmail.com*)
23. Sonam Y. Rabgye, Programme Assistant, UNDP Bhutan Country Office (*e-mail: sonam.rabgye@undp.org*)
24. Tashi, Programme Assistant, CDD, Gross National Happiness Commission Secretariat (*e-mail: tashi@gnhc.gov.bt*)
25. Tashi Dorji, Project Support Officer, Environment Unit, UNDP Bhutan Country Office (*e-mail: tashi.dorji@undp.org*)
26. Tashi Yangzom, Planning Officer, Policy and Planning Division, Ministry of Agriculture (*e-mail: y_tashi@moa.gov.bt*)
27. Tek B. Chhetri, Senior Programme Officer, Liaison Office of Denmark (*e-mail: tekchh@um.dk*)
28. Tempa Zangmo, Dzongkhag Environment Officer, Haa Dzongkhag Administration (*e-mail: tempazam@yahoo.com*)
29. Tshering Chopel, Senior Planning Officer, Department of Local Governance, Ministry of Home and Cultural Affairs (*e-mail: tchophel@gmail.com*)
30. Tshering Penjor, Assistant Planning Officer, Gross National Happiness Commission Secretariat (*e-mail: tsheringp@gnhc.gov.bt*)
31. Tshering Tashi, Gewog Administrative Officer, Tangsibi gewog, Trongsa dzongkhag (*e-mail: tashit@yahoo.com*)
32. Tshering Tempa, Forestry Officer, Ugyen Wangchuck Institute for Conservation and Environment (*e-mail: t_tempa@yahoo.com*)
33. Tshewang Dorji, Environment Officer, National Environment Commission Secretariat (*e-mail: dorji.tshewang@nec.gov.bt*)

34. Ugen P. Norbu, Consultant, Norbu Samyul Consulting (*e-mail: upnorbu@gmail.com*)
35. Wangchuk Namgay, Senior Planning Officer, DMCD, Gross National Happiness Commission Secretariat (*e-mail: wanam_8151@yahoo.com*)

Annex 4: Draft Results Matrix for the JSP Sub-outputs

Expected Outcomes	Outputs	Sub-outputs	Indicators	Baseline	Targets	Means of Verification
<p>Outcome 1: ECP mainstreamed in policies, plans and programmes</p> <p>ECP concerns integrated in sector and local government development plans</p> <p>Public expenditure on environment-related activities in sectors and local development programmes</p>	<p>1.1 ECP Mainstreaming Guidelines and Indicators available for use by sectors</p>	<p>Review and Refine ECP Mainstreaming Guidelines</p>	<p>Completion and use of harmonized ECP mainstreaming guidelines</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Poverty-environment mainstreaming guidelines in draft form ▪ Legal framework (EA Act, NEPA) exists to promote ECP mainstreaming ▪ Environmental stated as a cross-cutting theme of the 10th FYP ▪ Environment-related public expenditure during the 9th FYP period is 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Use the ECP mainstreaming guidelines for the mid-term review of the 10th FYP ▪ Use the ECP mainstreaming guidelines for the formulation of the 11th FYP at sectoral, dzongkhag and gewog levels ▪ 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Progress reports ▪ M&E reports (annual reviews, mid-term reviews and terminal evaluation) ▪ Mid-term review report of the 10th FYP ▪ 11th FYP documents
		<p>ECP indicators established</p>	<p>ECP indicators reconciled with GNH indicators</p> <p>Integration of national and local-level ECP indicators in PlaMS.</p> <p>Environment-related expenditure figures</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Environmental indicators exist for BEO 2008 and EIMS ▪ PlaMS in final stage of development ▪ Work on GNH indicators in progress 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Refine and consolidate existing indicators into ECP indicators by 2010 ▪ Integrate ECP indicators in PlaMS and GNH indicators by 2011 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Progress reports ▪ Evaluation reports (mid-term, terminal evaluation) ▪ PlaMS and GNH indicators

Expected Outcomes	Outputs	Sub-outputs	Indicators	Baseline	Targets	Means of Verification
			available in PEMS			
	1.2 Poverty – Environment Linkages demonstrated and benefit sharing policies and strategies, guidelines developed accordingly.	Analysis and assessments to demonstrate poverty-environment linkages and promote benefit sharing policies and strategies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Number of studies to support ECP mainstreaming in sectors and local development plans/policies/programmes ▪ Number of environmental benefit sharing policies and strategies derived from field lessons 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Small-scale/pilot activities related to environmental mainstreaming available in many sectors 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Studies undertaken in X number of sectors and X number of <i>Dzongkhag/Gewog</i> plans by XXXX. ▪ Results of the field projects assessed and policies and strategies on environmental benefit sharing based on field results produced by 2012 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Site visits ▪ Progress reports ▪ Evaluation reports (mid-term, terminal evaluation) ▪ Field assessment reports ▪ Policy/ strategy documents
	1.3 Staff and Modules available for ECP Mainstreaming trainings at all levels in relevant educational and training institutes	Capacity developed in education and training institutions to enable training of stakeholders at all levels to mainstream ECP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Number of Bhutanese training institutes with capacity for training in ECP mainstreaming ▪ Number of ECP mainstreaming training courses imparted by Bhutanese training institutes ▪ Level of knowledge and skills on ECP mainstreaming 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No ECP mainstreaming training capacity within Bhutanese training institutes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Training modules on ECP mainstreaming available in X education and training institutes by 2010 ▪ Start in-country ECP mainstreaming training programmes at X number of institutions by 2011 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Training curricula of training institutions ▪ Progress reports ▪ Evaluation reports (mid-term, terminal evaluation)

Expected Outcomes	Outputs	Sub-outputs	Indicators	Baseline	Targets	Means of Verification
			within the teaching staff of the training institutes.			
	1.4 Competent Staff available in all sectors including the proposed Help Desk to mainstream ECP.	Capacity developed in sector ministries and national agencies to Mainstream ECP including the proposed Help Desk to be set up at the NECS.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Existence of ECP mainstreaming Help Desk at the NECS with trained personnel and necessary equipment ▪ Level of use of ECP mainstreaming Help Desk by other sectors and agencies ▪ Number of staff trained and their level of knowledge and skills on ECP mainstreaming 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No ECP mainstreaming Help Desk at the present but few RGoB staff trained in environmental mainstreaming 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ ECP mainstreaming Help Desk operational NECS by 2009/2010 ▪ At least X number of staff with working knowledge of ECP mainstreaming available in each relevant sector agency by XXXX ▪ At least X number of staff with working knowledge of ECP mainstreaming available in each Dzongkhags and Gewogs by XXXX. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Organizational structure of NECS ▪ Progress reports ▪ Evaluation reports (mid-term, terminal evaluation)
	1.5 Competent staff available in other sectors to mainstream ECP.	Capacity developed in other stakeholders (e.g. PS and CSOs)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Number of staff trained in ECP mainstreaming in other sectors and agencies, in particular in the PS and CSOs ▪ Level of knowledge and skills on ECP mainstreaming of staff of PS and CSOs 	<p>?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Infrastructure for RSPN's ERIC infrastructure being developed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Establish a network of ECP mainstreaming focal persons within the Policy and Planning Divisions of all sectors/ agencies ▪ RSPN's ERIC operational by 2011 ▪ X number of CSOs apply ECP mainstreaming measures 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Progress reports ▪ Evaluation reports (mid-term, terminal evaluation)

Expected Outcomes	Outputs	Sub-outputs	Indicators	Baseline	Targets	Means of Verification
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existence of ERIC at RSPN and level of its use 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> in their respective work programmes by XXXX. X per cent of budgets of selected CSOs dedicated towards ECP mainstreaming activities by XXXX. PS? 	
Outcome 2: ECP mainstreamed in all development plans and programmes at local level	2.1 Revised Local Development Planning Manual is available for use by Local Governments	Integration of ECP concerns into Local Development Planning Manual	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Level of integration of ECP concerns in the LDPM 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environmental sustainability exists as a part of the GNH checklist in the LDPM 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tools to elaborate information in response to GNH checklist of LDPM in developed by 2010 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Progress reports Evaluation reports (mid-term, terminal evaluation) LDPM
	2.2 Benefit Sharing Mechanisms applied to selected conservation projects	Local benefit sharing guidelines developed and tested	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of pilot field projects implementing local-level environmental benefit sharing guidelines 	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At least 10 local-level environmental benefit sharing schemes tested and assessed by 2012 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Progress reports Evaluation reports (mid-term, terminal evaluation)
	2.3 Competent staff available at the local levels to mainstream	Capacity developed in administration and elected bodies at the level of Dzongkhags,	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of dzongkhag, gewog and thromde staff trained in ECP mainstreaming and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> DEOs exist in all dzongkhags with at least basic working knowledge of EA and EC 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All DEOs, DPOs, DEC members, GAOs, Geog RNR staff, Gups and Thromde EOs trained in ECP mainstreaming in 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Training reports Progress reports Evaluation reports (mid-term, terminal)

Expected Outcomes	Outputs	Sub-outputs	Indicators	Baseline	Targets	Means of Verification
	ECP.	Gewogs, and Thromdes	<p>their level of knowledge and skills on ECP mainstreaming</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Availability of information and tools for ECP mainstreaming to dzongkhag, gewog and thromde staff 		local development plans	evaluation)
	2.4 Local plans monitored for integration of ECP concerns	ECP contents of annual plans monitored and response provided	Response to ECP challenges and level of integration of ECP concerns in dzongkhag, gewog and thromde development plans	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ ECP contents monitored and integrated in all dzongkhag, gewog and thromde development plans 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ ECP mainstreaming monitoring reports ▪ Local development plan documents ▪ Progress reports ▪ Evaluation reports (mid-term, terminal evaluation)

Note: The expected outcomes, outputs and sub-outputs are given in the JSP-programme document, therefore, presented in grey-shaded columns to distinguish them from the indicators, baselines, targets, and means of verification for the sub-outputs which are not in the JSP-programme document but were developed provisionally for discussion at the workshop

Annex 5: Group Work on the Recommendations on the Programmatic Context of the JSP Outcomes

Outcome 1 Group

Outcome 1: ECP mainstreamed in national policies, plans and programmes

Output 1.1: ECP mainstreaming guidelines and indicators available for use by sectors

Recommendations

- ECP guideline to be tested during mid-term review of 10th FYP
- Awareness of ECP guidelines itself (activity in AWP)
- PEI indicator session

Output 1.2: Poverty environment linkages demonstrated and benefit sharing policies, strategies and guidelines developed

Recommendation

- Need to broaden/expand(example Energy aspects)

Output 1.3: Staff and modules available for ECP mainstreaming trainings at all levels in relevant educational and training institutes

Recommendations

- Not limit to few listed institutions (inclusion of College of Educations-PCE and SCE etc.)
- Linkage between output 1.2 and 1.3
- Include as PPD and relevant officers/staff (in 2nd Bullet point)

Output 1.4: Competent staff available in all sectors including the Help Desk in NECS to mainstream ECP

Recommendation

- Help Desk - need to look for a mechanism to ensure mainstreaming takes place plus plenary to comment
- Include as training of PPD and relevant officers/staff (need not necessarily be from PPD) (1st bullet)

Outcome 2 Group

General Issues

- LDD (GNHCS) vs Department of Local Governance (MoHCA) – who represents local governments at the central level?
- HRD Master Plan/ HRD Strategy for local governments is not transparent

- Meeting point of LGSP and JSP – where do they meet?
- Local elections? Capacity development at the local level will depend on when the local elections are held, which is long due but has been held up for legislative and administrative reasons.
- Local government staff capacity: capacity development may entail long-term absence of local government staff for training. RCSC's 'zero-growth' policy does not allow replacement of staff on training and this further creates capacity constraint at the local level.
- Fiscal decentralization – how, when?

Planning Issues

- Planning of activities for outcome 2 contingent upon activities under outcome 1 and LGSP
 - Examples: (1) Local development planning manual (LGSP); benefit-sharing strategies (JSP-outcome 1); capacity development strategy (LGSP); Local Governments Act; capacity development of local institutions
- Constituency development discretionary grant mechanisms/ criteria to be developed under LGSP in 2010
 - ↓ use of JSP capital development grant can be started in 2010
- Local development planning manual to be put under ECP lens
 - ↓ tools for practical implementation including hands-on ECP mainstreaming
- Environmental indicators – prioritize but should be a continuous process. Who is going to coordinate and guide – NECS?

