PIM: A PRACTICAL MANAGEMENT SYSTEM
FOR IMPLEMENTING RURAL DEVELOPMENT
PROGRAMMES AND PROJECTS

by

Deryke Belshaw and Robert Chambers*

DISCUSSION PAPER. NO. 162

INSTITUTE FOR DEVELOPMENT STUDIES
UNIVERSITY OF NAIROBI

JANUARY 1973

*   Deryke Belshaw is a Senior Lecturer with the School of Social Studies,
University of East Anglia, and was a Research Associate of the Institute
for Development Studies of the University of Nairobi when the research on
which this paper is based was carried out. Robert Chambers is a Fellow
of the Institute of Development Studies, University of Sussex, and began
the research on which this paper is based when a Senior Research Fellow
of the Institute for Development Studies of the University of Nairobi.

PIM: A Practical Management System for Implementing
Rural Development Programmes and Projects

by

Deryke Belshaw and Robert Chambers

ABSTRACT

This paper describes the origins and operation of a management
system for implementing rural development programmes and projects. The
system has been developed from elements from several sources, including
network analysis, Management by Objectives, and the Malaysian Red Book
system. Simplifications have been continually introduced during testing.
Independent evaluations of the system have found that it sharpens govern-
ment implementation of projects and programmes in rural areas.

The system has three main parts: an Annual Programming Exercise
in which those responsible for implementation jointly plan how it shall
be carried out; a Monthly Management Meeting which receives reports on
progress and decides on who shall do what, how and by when; and a Monthly
Management Report, distributed to those whose action is required, sent
out shortly after the meeting.

The system has operated in the Kenya Special Rural Development
Programme for eighteen months. With minor adaptation it appears
replicable within Kenya in connection with district planning. In Kenya
and in other countries, it could be used to improve implementation of a
wide variety of rural development programmes and projects. It might be
particularly effective in Tanzania as a system for operation by the
District Development Directors.

CONTENTS   PAGE

ABBREVIATIONS

AC	Area Coordinator
ACDO	Assistant Community Development Officer
AFC	Agricultural Finance Corporation
AIE	Authority to Incur Expenditure
APC	Annual Programming Chart
APE	Annual Programming Exercise
APF	Annual Phasing Form
DLO	District Livestock Officer
DO	District Officer
LO	Livestock Officer
MBO	Management by Objectives
MFP	Ministry of Finance and Planning
MOA	Ministry of Agriculture
MMM	Monthly Management Meeting
MMR	Monthly Management Report
PDA	Provincial Director of Agriculture
PIM	Programming and Implementation Management
SRDP	Special Rural Development Programme

"Planners cannot limit themselves to saying <u>what</u> is to be achieved without showing <u>how</u> and by <u>whom</u> it is to be done."

Albert Waterston (1969:11)

1. INTRODUCTION

This paper describes a system for managing the implementation of rural development programmes and projects[1] which has been developed within the framework of the Kenya Government's Special Rural Development Programme (SRDP). It is designed to meet the need for a method of programming, operational control, and evaluation for a wide variety of rural development programmes and projects. The system was devised and introduced between April and August 1971 and at the time of writing (December 1972) is well into its second annual cycle. Modifications have been introduced in the light of experience. Two independent evaluations of the system have suggested that it can be an effective means of sharpening the operation of the government machine in rural areas (Nellis 1972; IDS, 1972).

The set of procedures described in this paper is termed the Programming and Implementation Management (PIM) system. This is one of six component systems of a higher-order system (described in Belshaw and Chambers, 1972) which incorporates management procedures deriving partly from the control system principles of engineering cybernetics (Belshaw, Bjorlo and Shah, 1972). The other five systems respectively cover:

Field Staff Management (FSM)
Local Participation Procedures (LPP)
An Evaluation Review Sequence (ERS)
Rural Research and Development (RRD)
Plan Formulation Procedures (FFP)

We intend to describe these in further papers. The PIM system is the core of the higher-order system and can be introduced independently of the other five systems, although as and when these are added, they have linkages with

---

[1] For the purposes of this paper, "programme" means an organised government initiative planned for more than one administrative area, and "project" means an organised government initiative in one administrative area. A programme typically consists of a number of projects in different administrative areas. The system can be used for both programmes and projects, although its use so far has been mainly at the project level.

PIM. PIM has three principal components - a programming exercise, periodical management meetings, and a series of management control reports. In the SRDP, these are described respectively as the annual programming exercise. the monthly management meeting, and the monthly management reports. Experience with PIM suggests that it is adaptable to a very wide variety of rural programmes and projects. With suitable minor modifications it should be replicable both within Kenya and in other countries with broadly similar rural administrative institutions.

2. THE GENESIS OF THE SYSTEM

The need for the PIM system was generated by the Kenya Government's Special Rural Development Programme, which also provided an ideal laboratory for testing and modifying it. A brief explanation of the SRDP and of the development of the system will set the context for the description of the system itself.

The history of the SRDP up to the end of 1971 has been recorded more fully elsewhere (Nelli 1972). In brief, following a conference on education, employment and rural development held at Kericho in Kenya in 1966 (for the papers presented at which see Sheffield, ed., 1967), a series of initiatives led in 1968 to the selection and survey of fourteen divisions (sub-districts) which were considered to be representative of smallholder and to a lesser extent pastoral conditions (Heyer, Ireri and Moris, 1971). This was followed by the preparation in 1969 and 1970 of multi-sectoral and to some degree experimental development plans for six of these divisions. Donor support was obtained for five of these areas and implementation began in the first half of 1971. An administrative officer of the Provincial Administration, designated an Area Coordinator, was posted to each area. In summary his terms of reference were:

(i)   to help officers at all levels to get the programme started, and in particular to tackle problems as they arose at the different levels, not attempting to dictate to other departments, but acting in a support role.

(ii)   to act as a communications link between divisional, district and provincial levels and interministerially between departments, speeding up the communication of information.

(iii)   to act as a contact or link man with donor representatives, evaluators and visitors.

(iv)   in collaboration with the Provincial Planning Officer, to draw up timetables and work programmes to maintain the momentum of the programme.

To enable the Area Coordinators to carry out these functions, however, more detailed guidelines were required. At this time, attention was drawn to the importance of procedural and organisational detail by a Kenya Government Commission to review the efficiency of the public service (the Ndegwa Commission). The Commission's Report (Kenya Government, 1971) pointed to the connection between past failures in rural planning and poor or non-existent procedures. For example, the difficulties of Development Committees were attributed partly to the lack of definition of the "actual duties and responsibilities of all the members of these Committees, and the routines to be followed in plan-implementation, progress-reporting and plan revision at the District level" (Kenya Government 1971:115). The recognition of the need for procedures for Area Coordinators followed this line of thinking, and provided a timely opportunity to innovate experimentally in a relatively unexplored area between the applied social sciences, public administration and management.

At first the main need perceived for Area Coordinators was a reporting system. In April 1971, a preliminary paper made four sets of points to guide the design of a reporting system (Chambers and Belshaw, 1971):[1]

(i)   Report-writing should not be a substitute for other action. Reports take time to write, may be delayed through time-lags in information becoming available, and are sometimes held up in typing, duplicating, and in the post. Urgent issues must always be dealt with immediately, usually by telephone, telegram or word of mouth and not reserved for a report.

(ii)   Restraint should be exercised in requests for information. An intellectually perfectionist approach to management control requires the obtaining and communication of a great deal of information, but this has its costs. Lower-level staff find report-writing a great chore, and their time has an opportunity cost. Also, most information in most reports is never used.

---

[1]   This paper followed and benefitted from comments by David Brokensha, J. Mugo Gachuhi (1971) and Peter Moock on the role of the Area Coordinator.

(iii)   Care should be exercised not to ask for information which,
        though desirable, will be misleading.

(iv)   Area Coordinators' reports should be designed with the
        following purposes in mind:

   a)   developing the Area Coordinators' roles and
        relationships

   b)   improving and maintaining staff and programme
        performance

   c)   securing necessary action at the various levels
        of government

   d)   recording progress for continuing and subsequent
        evaluation

   e)   forcing staff into continual self-evaluation and
        feedback

   f)   developing and maintaining commitment to the
        programme

   g)   developing the planning and replanning process

   h)   identifying problems and bottlenecks at an early
        stage and securing action to overcome them

   i)   improving the government's existing reporting
        systems.

   As this list suggests, consideration of the potential uses of a
reporting system drove us into developing backward linkages to programming
operations and forward linkages to operational control and evaluation. We
found that we were concerned not just with reporting but with the procedural
elements of a system of management. Our purposes became first, to work out,
test and improve procedures to enable Area Coordinators to develop their
roles and carry out their functions; and, second, in accordance with the
experimental rationale of the SRDP and the aim of replicability, to develop
those procedures into a management system for rural development programmes
and projects which might have potential for use much more widely within
Kenya and elsewhere.

   Some of the dangers of systems for programming and controlling
the implementation of rural development programmes and projects were

recognised (Belshaw and Chambers, 1971). Excessive or unnecessary informa-
tion might be demanded. Unreliable and misleading information might be
generated by demanding quantification of achievements upon which reporting
staff members thought they were being judged, leading sometimes to tacit
connivance between levels of staff so that reported figures would not be
checked. Programmes, or the balance between programmes, might be biassed,
as happened in the rural development programme in Malaysia, towards
construction because construction was easily quantified and inspected
(Ness 1967: 124-141). Staff might be demoralised through the setting
from above of unattainable targets. Self-help and participation by the
people might become forced rather than voluntary if officials were
required to achieve self-help targets in their areas. In designing the
PIM system the desirability of avoiding these problems and where possible
improving on previous practice was borne in mind.

The approach followed in designing PIM was eclectic. Critical
path analysis was considered and rejected as too complex for use at the
field level. It is excellent for a complicated project such as a major
construction works or a new-land settlement scheme (illustrated by
Millikan, 1967), especially when there are inexorable deadlines, as Butcher
(1971) as shown where a population is being displaced by a lake forming
behind a dam; but it is less useful for simpler projects and programmes.
The linkages between activities in low-level rural development programmes
are normally already well understood by those taking part and necessary
adjustments can be made without recourse to a network diagram. Moreover,
network analysis is difficult to teach to field staff. However, the first
stage of network analysis - identifying the operations which have to be
carried out - did seem useful and was accepted. Another point of departure
was provided by a bar chart monitoring system employed by the Ministry of
Works in Nairobi and updated through a monthly reporting system. Some of
the principles o. **Management by Objectives (MBO)** (see, for example, Humble,
1967; Jarrett and Walker, 1969; and Reddin, 1971) also seemed applicable,
especially the idea that performance targets should be set not from above
but by the subordinate in discussion with his supervisor. In addition, the
technique of using a blackboard to write up participants' ideas and focus
discussion was borrowed from case study teaching methods. The Malaysian
operations room and red book system (Ferguson, 196:, Ness 1967; Kulp,
1970: 633-651) was also examined. The complete system was considered too
elaborate in some respects and inadequate in others, but the idea of keeping

a central, visible record of progress was adopted.

The system for managing programming and implementation which
emerged was discussed with headquarters staff, Provincial Planning Officers,
and Area Coordinators, and a number of modifications were made in the light
of their suggestions. The pilot system was finally agreed at a meeting at
the Kenya Institute of Administration held in July 1971 and was then
implemented for the 1971/2 financial year in four of the SRDP areas -
Mbere, Migori, Kapenguria, and Vihiga. Further discussions were held with
Provincial Planning Officers and Area Coordinators in July 1972 after the
system had been operating for a year. Further minor modifications were
introduced. In 1972 the programming exercise at the start of annual
implementation was carried out without assistance from research staff and
the system has continued since then in all six SRDP areas without a further
research and development input.

3.   THE PROGRAMMING AND IMPLEMENTATION MANAGEMENT SYSTEM

As already indicated, the PIM system has three components. For
the SRDP these are called:

- an annual programming exercise (APE)
- a monthly management meeting (MMM)
- a monthly management report (MMR)

These are described as they have been taking place in the SRDP. Replicability
in other contexts is discussed in the final section of this paper.

(i)   The Annual Programming Exercise (APE) (see also Appendices A, D and E)

A decision is taken as to which projects should be phased. In
1971 this decision was taken in the field according to the priority and
state of readiness of the projects. In 1972 the decision was taken jointly
between field and Nairobi staff in their own joint planning meeting.

For each project in turn, those staff members directly concerned
with implementation are invited to a joint programming meeting. The person
or persons responsible for SRDP matters in the ministry headquarters (known
as the "linkmen") are invited whenever funding from a ministry is entailed.
Sometimes those present are, except for the Area Coordinator, all from the
same ministry (as is especially common with Agriculture). Often, however,
especially with projects involving production infrastructure or self-help,
several ministries are involved. The staff attending may be from divisional,

district or even provincial level, but it is most important that the officer
who is directly responsible for implementation of any operation in the
project should be present and should feel free to speak his mind and
contribute his experience.

Discussion starts with an examination of the objectives of the
project. Often these are not clear and sometimes the value of the project
may be questioned. In such cases follow-up action may be decided and the
meeting adjourned. When there is agreement on objectives, their desir-
ability, and the potential of the project for achieving them, programming
can begin.

For detailed programming a blackboard was originally used to focus
attention and discussion. Months were marked horizontally, and then the
component operations required for the project were listed vertically from
the top downwards on the left hand side in rough chronological order.
Participants often identified key operations which had been left out and
the list was modified until there was general agreement. Any inexorable
deadlines (for example connected with crop seasons) were then marked in
against the affected operations. Any operations which could not be
completed before a certain date (for example a standard lead time was
allowed for fund releases) were also marked in. Through informal dis-
cussion, bars were then entered on the blackboard to show the period for
each operation. Quantifiable targets were written in above the bars where
possible. A completion indicator - the event or output which showed the
operation to be complete - was agreed and written in on the right hand
side. When all the participants had agreed on and were committed to the
phasing shown on the board, it was transferred to two forms - the Annual
Phasing Form (APF) and the Annual Programming Chart (APC) (for examples of
which see appendices D and E . The Annual Programming Chart was identical
with the layout on the blackboard but the Annual Phasing Form included the
officer responsible for each operation, the resources required for it, and
the precise start and finish dates set for the activity. When these had
been completed, each participant had his own record of the implementation
programme that had been agreed for the following year. Normally, Annual
Programming Charts were kept by between 3 and 5 officers while Annual
Phasing Forms, which could be typed or even stencilled, were sometimes
distributed more widely.

In the second (1972) annual round of joint programming, in order
to reduce the dangers of omissions and to save time in the meetings, a

checklist of probable operations for the most typical projects was prepared
(Belshaw 1972). The blackboard tended to be abandoned and may indeed have
been less necessary for those staff who were familiar with the system. Area
Coordinators and others tended to write onto APFs which were used as work
sheets and then to transfer programming later onto a fair copy on the APCs.
This had the advantage of speed in the meeting but two disadvantages:
first, participating staff could not so easily see the connections between
different operations; and second, if they were not familiar with the system
they could be left behind and might not even have been fully aware of what
they were agreeing to. In general, however, the second annual programming
exercise went more rapidly and smoothly than the first and it did not
require any research and development input.

(ii) The Monthly Management Meeting (MMM) (see also Appendix B)

After programming has taken place, management meetings of those
responsible for implementation are held at monthly intervals. The officer
responsible for coordination (the Area Coordinator for the SRDP) checks
through the APCs and asks about all the operations which should be in hand
or which should have been completed. The officers responsible report on
progress. The APCs are entered in green for on time or on or above target,
and red for behind time or below target. Remedial action is discussed and
decided.

The style of the meeting varies with personalities. Meetings may
be chaired by the District Commissioner, a District Officer, departmental
officers in informal rotation, or the Area Coordinator himself. The meetings
all, however, concentrate on practicalities, on who has to do what, how, and
by when, and also through collegial control provide an incentive for staff
to perform adequately and on time those operations for which they are
responsible.

(iii) The Monthly Management Report (MMR) (see also Appendices C and F)

The word "report" is misleading since this is an operational
control device for securing action, not a means for communicating routine
information. The report follows directly on from the monthly management
meeting, the findings of which it records. It is written by the Area
Coordinator soon after the meeting and distributed quickly and widely.

The report has two main sections. The first, the "Progress and
Action Summary", is a short sharp statement of the position and of action

required: for each project it lists the operations which are or should be active, the target for the month's end, the actual achievement, whether (YES or NO) the operation is on time, the remedial action required if it is not on time, and who should take that action. The persons from whom action is requested have their initials circled in red on the copies they receive so that they focus quickly and do not have to read the whole document. The second section of the report is also brief, but elaborates on what has happened and specifies more exactly what needs to be done and the implications of delay.

The report is unusual in being sent simultaneously to different departments and to four or five different levels in government - ministry headquarters, province, district, division, and sometimes location. The normal lengthy process of feeding upwards through district and province is thus avoided, though those levels are kept informed.

The reports help and encourage recipients to act promptly in support of projects and also enable them to keep their APCs up-to-date. For the Kenya SRDP all the charts are displayed in an operations room in the Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning so that the reported state of implementation of projects can be appreciated at a glance. Each Area Coordinator maintains a similar field operations room for his area with charts and maps.

4. AN EVALUATION AND SOME CAVEATS

The system has been evaluated by a researcher (Nellis, 1972) and by an independent team from the Institute for Development Studies, not including the authors, (I.D.S., 1972); studied and commented on by third year students of the Department of Government of the University of Nairobi (H.H.A. Chabala, D.H. Kiiru and S.W. Mukuna); and reviewed in periodic discussions by the government staff (the Area Coordinators, the Project Advisers, the Provincial Planning Officers, and Ministry Head-quarters staff) who have been most closely involved. The points which follow summarise some of the main findings, including our own:

(i) The Annual Programming Exercise

This has generally been effective in:

- providing a procedure which brings together the staff involved in a rural development project jointly to plan a year's implementation. No case is known of staff refusing to attend.

- facilitating cooperation and coordination between departments. The simple fact of a joint meeting has on occasion led to startling discoveries about incompatibilities or complementarities between the proposals or programmes of different departments.

- focussing attention on the practical detail of programming - who should do what, how, when, with what resources - at an operational level which anticipates difficulties and identifies problems that may have to be faced and the measures that may be required to overcome them.

- providing an institutionalised opportunity for a subordinate to explain his difficulties and resource needs to his superior. This therepeutic function of the meeting has been particularly noticeable in Agriculture where there is a common communication block between division and district levels, sometimes associated with authoritarianism on the part of the district-level officers.

- securing staff commitment to responsibility for performing operations according to a mutually agreed timetable and achieving self-set and freely agreed targets.

    Its main weaknesses in practice have proved to be:

- the difficulty experienced by some staff who are not familiar with the system in keeping up with the discussion during the programming exercise. This has sometimes led to their not keeping their own copies of the APFs or APCs and even to a failure to understand what they are being committed to. However, this does not appear to have been very common.

- the large amount of time required of ministry headquarters linkmen in travelling to meetings where they may make only a minor contribution. This criticism applies mainly to ministries other than Agriculture and Social Services, both of which typically have several projects to phase in each area. There is also a counter-vailing benefit in impressing on linkmen the crucial importance of central fund releases in the success of projects and in gaining their agreement to trying to secure such releases according to a timetable. The costs of late fund releases - in lost effectiveness and in loss of staff morale - are so high that this may often be a worthwhile use of their time.

(ii) The Monthly Management Meeting

While the style of these meetings has varied and care has been
taken not to standardise routine, in order to gain experience with different
approaches, these meetings appear always or almost always to have been
effective in:

- concentrating discussion on the hard details of implementation
- making staff aware of the difficulties which other officers and
  departments experience
- inducing cooperation and the sharing of resources and generating
  a sense of teamwork
- acting as an incentive to effective and timely performance of
  activities through the courteous shaming of an officer before his
  peers when operations for which he is responsible are behind schedule
- establishing the Area Coordinator in his roles, and in particular
  presenting him as an ally of departmental officers in breaking bottle-
  necks which the **officers themselves are powerless** to affect.

The main weaknesses of the monthly management meeting have been:

- the failure of officers to turn up, forcing the Area Coordinator to
  harry them in order to obtain their reports and weakening the value
  of the meeting for others. Such failures have occurred most with
  very busy officers and have not been common.

- failure of officers to come with the data required for the monthly
  report. This has usually been a teething problem overcome once
  officers are familiar with the system.

- waste of time while projects which do not concern an officer are
  being discussed. This has been largely overcome by altering the
  sequence in which projects are considered, so that those concerned
  only with only one or a few projects can be dealt with first and
  then leave.

(iii) The Monthly Management Report

The monthly management report has been generally effective
in:

- communicating simultaneously at several levels of government (and
  especially providing a direct line from division level to the ministry
  headquarters for sounding alarms about delayed fund releases and their
  implications in the field).

- showing recipients quickly and easily (through circling their initials
  in red where their action is requested) what they are expected to do
  and securing their action.

- for evaluation, identifying bottlenecks and problems at all levels,
  showing where responsibility for failures lies, and maintaining a
  record of the year's performance month by month which can be analysed
  and presented in an Annual Implementation Review with feedback to the
  following year's programming and implementation.

- enabling recipients, if they wish, to maintain their APCs as a
  graphical up-to-date picture of the state of implementation.

    Its main weaknesses have been:

- the length of time taken in preparation, including the amount of the
  Area Coordinator's time taken **in drafting and checking the report** before
  it is sent out. Various suggestions for speeding up the process have
  been rejected by Area Coordinators who on their own have sharply
  improved the speed of production and despatch, with a consequent
  increase in its effectiveness as a management tool.

- the length of the report. This has been most marked in Mbere, where
  as an experiment all the projects of all the departments concerned
  with rural development were programmed. Elsewhere, reports were much
  shorter. Where report length is a problem, there may be a case either
  for simplifying the report still further or for being more selective
  in the projects which are programmed.

- unintelligibility. Recipients new to the system have found the first
  section difficult to understand. In 1972, however, most recipients,
  notably all the linkmen, were familiar with the system and this
  problem no longer arose. With diffusion of the system throughout
  government, this difficulty would disappear altogether except with new
  recruits.

(iv) General

    On the positive side, the PIM system appears to have contributed
to the purposes listed in April 1971 (see page 4 above) under heading (iv)
with the sole exception of (i) "improving the government's existing
reporting systems", which still continue as before. It has helped to
legitimate the Area Coordinator in the eyes of his colleagues in technical

departments and has enabled him to appear less as an arrogant administrator
who lords it over technical officers and more as a peer with special means
of overcoming problems on their behalf. It has also had an educational
effect on many government officers (and some researchers including the
writers) in showing them how government procedures do or should operate.
Perhaps its most obvious contribution has been demonstrating how damaging
late fund releases can be particularly in Agriculture where the seasonal
calendar waits for no one.

While the performance and operation of the system have varied,
it seems fair to conclude that it is workable in the SRDP context and that
its benefits outweigh its costs. It is important to recognise, however,
that it has been operating in circumstances of somewhat closer supervision
than might be the case if it were more generally adopted. Also it is worth
pointing out that there are four particular dangers with a system of this
sort which should be guarded against, whether it is used on a small or on
a large scale:

(a) Conservatism and Ritualism: Once staff have become accustomed to the
details of a system, they are reluctant to change. The Area Coordinators
in 1972 rejected a proposal to simplify one part of the system, although
the proposal would have reduced their own workload. Similarly, the
operation of such a system can always tend towards an empty ritual, although
if that occurred with PIM it would quickly become evident since it is so
closely linked in with the performance of verifiable activities. The
conclusion is that the operation of such a system should be subject to
careful supervision, with a readiness to adapt and innovate as necessary.

(b) Falsification of Performance Returns: False reporting of achievement
is less likely when, as with PIM, many of the targets are set by the staff
themselves, or when, as in Agriculture, many of the targets are vulnerable
to factors exogenous to staff performance so that staff cannot and should
not be judged by target achievement. False reporting can, however, occur,
and is likely to develop if the reporting system is used for disciplinary
purposes. A more subtle form of "cooking" is the deliberate setting of low
targets so that achievement can look better. The conclusion here is that
if reported performance is to be used to evaluate individuals, care should
be taken that the evaluation takes place with full discussic between
senior and subordinate and that as far as possible evaluation is limited
to achievements which are verifiable and unaffected by exogenous factors.

(c) <u>Bias towards the visible and quantifiable</u>: The Malaysian Red Book and Operations Room system was associated with a bias towards capital and construction works which could be inspected. In any system of procedures which sets a value on quantifying achievement, there is a danger that a similar bias towards the visible and more easily quantifiable will creep in. Departments of Community Development, attacked for their lack of visible results, have sometimes veered towards monumental self-help in order to have something to show. It is much harder to demonstrate the beneficial effects of, say, a child-spacing programme, than of a programme of village well-building. The conclusion is that in selecting programmes and in programming itself, a balancing counterbias should be introduced, and non-verifiable, non-visible targets should be permitted, always with the qualification, in accordance with the principles of MBO, that they should be set through discussion with the staff who are to try to achieve them.

(d) <u>A drive towards authoritarian 'self-help' activity</u>: Self-help activity is difficult to programme but where it is an essential element in a project - as with self-help cattle dips in Kenya - other activities depend upon its effective performance. Programming is then liable to mean that Administration and Community Development staff accept targets for the collection of self-help contributions. As and when these fall behind schedule, staff may redouble their efforts and be driven into high-handed and authoritarian methods of collection. Such methods have any way been used by the Administration in Kenya (Nyangira 1970) with harmful effects. Two conclusions can be drawn. First, where possible, leaders of the community should be involved in the annual programming operation. There is no reason why this should not be held in a local classroom, using the blackboard, perhaps with the Community Development Officer taking a leading part. Second, staff should not be held responsible for short falls. There is a dilemma here between "realistic" and "carrot" target-setting (see Devons, 1949, for these issues in aircraft production in Great Britain during the Second World War). If there is a tendency to fall short of any target at whatever level it is set, then more may be achieved by setting a higher, unrealistic, or "carrot" target than a lower more realistic one; but if this unrealistic "carrot" target-setting is used, then there is all the more reason not to judge staff crudely in terms of target achievement.

5.   FUTURE DEVELOPMENT AND REPLICATION

Notwithstanding the early conservatism and enthusiasm of those who have operated the PIM system, there is nothing sacrosanct about any part of it. Several modifications can be considered. First, there is a strong case for any simplification which does not involve loss of information used in decision-making or a loss of incentive. The most obvious would be the amalgamation of the APT and APC into one form to avoid duplication and to streamline the annual programming exercise.[1] Second, the principle of management by exception might be applied more strongly to the monthly report by mentioning in the first section only those items which were below target or behind schedule. Area Coordinators would, however, be likely to resist this since it would give a misleading impression of failure. Third, it has been suggested that the monthly meeting should be held every two or three months. Our experience leads us to disagree with this proposal. With most projects the bunching of key operations is such that operational control through a meeting at monthly intervals is barely adequate; on the other hand, meetings at shorter intervals might pose an undue demand on staff time.

Replication of the PIM system, or of an approach like it, raises some interesting questions. It is currently (December 1972) being used only in the SRDP areas in Kenya, although a similar system has been recommended to the Botswana Government for village projects. Replication can be considered first, within Kenya; and second, in other countries.

Replication within Kenya could take several forms:

(i) Use within a Department or Ministry: The annual programming exercise leading to the agreement and preparation of APCs could be adopted by a department or ministry for any programme or project at any level. Such an approach would be least appropriate where the staff involved were subject to unpredictable demands on their time (such as preparing answers to parliamentary questions), or where essential operations had to be carried out by people who cannot for some reason come to meetings (self-help projects have hitherto been a special case in this category). Care would be needed in identifying a monitoring system. A monthly meeting is only one of several approaches. An APC can be used by one person for his own work - for instance for programming the writing of a book or the preparation of a report. In such a case, monitoring is a private and personal matter, though it can be conducted at regular intervals. If the

---

[1.]   See Appendix G.

system were used within a ministry or department, monitoring and reporting could be carried out either by one person through a number of person-to-person contacts, or through periodic meetings not necessarily at one month intervals. The system could also be used for an inter-ministerial working party, in which case the perhaps irregular meetings of the working party would provide the occasion for reporting on progress. In such ways, the system could be used or adapted to various needs and situations.

(ii) <u>Replication in Connection with District Planning</u>: The most obvious replication would be for managing district plans when these are prepared, with the new District Development Officers acting in similar roles to the Area Coordinators. If this occurred, two issues would have to be confronted. First, there might be a tendency for divisional staff to be left out of programming. This would be unfortunate and contrary to the principles of MBO. Divisional staff should take part in the annual programming exercise and should then in turn mount similar meetings with their subordinate staff in the divisions. Second, if many districts were involved, provision would have to be made to handle the workload generated at the provincial and ministry levels, particularly the demands for action through the reporting system. Any attempt to cut out the direction communication with Nairobi, unless accompanied by greater financial decentralisation to provincial level, would weaken the system, since fund releases have been shown to be such a crucial bottleneck. The present field administration of the Kenya Government appears just efficient enough to operate an inefficiently overcentralised system well enough to stave off reform. But a wider introduction of PIM at district level would precipitate a need either for financial decentralisation or for additional staff in the ministries in Nairobi.

(iii) <u>Replication in Connection with Rural Development Programmes Generally</u>: The over-attention paid to plan formulation has obscured the potential benefits of improving the implementation of existing programmes. For a small input of high-level staff time, a management system can be introduced in a district in mid-implementation. Planning has been compared to playing a game with considerable stakes in a taxi with the meter running; (quoted, no source, by Chadwick 1971: 366). But in this game plan formulation can only be of use if it affects the moves. If plan formulation takes long to complete, it may be best, in view of the ticking meter, to start by doing whatever is possible to improve the moves which are going to be made anyway.

Thus in any district, in a week, it should be possible for one experienced person to introduce a slightly modified PIM system for those on-going programmes where it appears that it would bring the greatest benefits. These would be those which have the highest priority, or which involve the largest sums of money or numbers of staff, or where coordination between departments is most crucial. The reporting system could be operated by a senior administrative officer or by the senior technical officer in the district, based on meetings chaired by the District Commissioner. If this system were tried experimentally, an immediate improvement in programme performance could be expected for very low cost. Initially, the reporting distribution could be as for the SRDP, with the qualification that replication on a wider scale would raise the problems of information and demand overload at the centre already discussed under (ii) above.

Replicability outside Kenya will depend upon adaptation to the conditions of particular countries. The system appears sufficiently versatile to be usable, with suitable modifications, in most if not all the countries of Eastern Africa. It seems particularly well suited to Tanzania following the decentralisation of budgetary allocations to the regions and given the emphasis now being given to management aspects of rural development. Its introduction into a Tanzanian region on a trial basis would not raise the problems of overload on the centre mentioned above for Kenya, because the necessary decentralisation has already taken place; and there would be no need for reports to go to Dar es Salaam. Moreover, the new structure provides the posts, personnel and institutions to operate such a system, with the District Development Director and the Planning Sub-committee of the District Development Council at the district level, and the Regional Planning Officer and Regional Financial Officer at the regional level. No doubt modifications would be required; but there seems no reason to suppose that PIM would not work well as a component of the new Tanzanian system, and improve the implementation and effectiveness of development programmes in the rural areas. In Tanzania it could also have the advantage of systematising annual plan implementation with joint participation by both functional officers and local political leaders, enabling the political leaders to have a clear idea of the activities to be carried out by the functional officers, and assuring the functional officers of stable support for annually agreed programmes.

Finally, it must be stressed that PIM is by no means a panacea. The evidence so far suggests that it is one way of improving the performance of government staff and programmes in rural areas. It is, however, by no means the only way. It does not touch many of the issues affecting staff morale, nor does it directly confront the crucial issues of policy and programme choice. Its reliance on charts and the visual presentation of progress may not appeal to some, although we believe that this contributes to its effectiveness. Uncritical adoption on a wide scale without careful appraisal of the effects and of the requirements generated could be **dysfunctional.** Nevertheless, it now appears sufficiently proven in the context of the SRDP in Kenya to justify its being considered for more wide-scale application elsewhere.

REFERENCES

Belshaw, Deryke and Robert Chambers (1971) "Programming, Operational Control and Evaluation for Rural Development Plans", (mimeo), Institute for Development Studies, University of Nairobi, Staff Paper No. 111.

Belshaw, Deryke (1972) "Special Rural Development Programme: a Check-list of Operations for Major Rural Programmes", (mimeo), Institute for Development Studies, University of Nairobi.

Belshaw, Deryke, T.J. Bjorlo and M.M. Shah (1972) "A Hierarchical Systems Formulation of the Rural Development Process in Developing Countries", (mimeo), University of Nairobi.

Belshaw, Deryke and Robert Chambers (1972) "A Management Systems Approach to Rural Development", (mimeo) Institute for Development Studies, University of Nairobi forthcoming.

Butcher, D.A.P. (1971) An Operational Manual for Resettlement: a systematic approach to the resettlement problem created by man-made lakes, with special relevance for West Africa, FAO, Rome.

Chadwick, George (1971) A Systems View of Planning: Towards a Theory of the Urban and Regional Planning Process, Pergamon Press, Oxford.

Chambers, Robert and Deryke Belshaw (1971) "Reporting System for Area Coordinators", (mimeo), Institute for Development Studies, University of Nairobi.

Devons, Ely (1949) Planning in Practice, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Ferguson, C.G. (1965) "The Story of Development in Malaya (now Malaysia) - Some Aspects", Journal of Local Administration Overseas, 4,3.

Gachuhi, J. Mugo (1971) "The SRDP and the Area Coordinator", (mimeo), Institute for Development Studies, University of Nairobi.

Garrett, John and S.D. Walker (1969) Management by Objectives in the Civil Service, CAS Occasional Paper No. 10, HMSO, London.

Heyer, Judith, Dunstan Ireri and Jon Moris (1971) Rural Development in Kenya, East African Publishing House, Nairobi.

Humble, John W. (1967) Improving Business Results, McGraw-Hill, New York.

Institute for Development Studies (1972) "An Overall Evaluation of the
    Special Rural Development Programme, 1972", (mimeo), Evaluation
    Team Report for the Ministry of Finance and Planning, Institute
    for Development Studies, University of Nairobi.

Kenya Government (1971) Report of the Commission of Enquiry (Public Service
    Structure and Remuneration Commission) 1970-71 (The Ndegwa
    Commission Report), Government Printer, Nairobi.

Kulp, E.M. (1970) Rural Development Planning: Systems Analysis and Working
    Method, Praeger, New York.

Millikan, Max F. (1967) "Comments on methods of reporting and evaluating
    progress under plan implementation", in Planning and Plan
    Implementation, Department of Economic and Social Affairs, United
    Nations, New York.

Nellis, J.R. (1972) "Report on the Special Rural Development Programme:
    Calendar Year 1971", (mimeo), Institute for Development Studies,
    University of Nairobi.

Ness, Gayl D. (1967) Bureaucracy and Rural Development in Malaysia,
    University of California Press, Berkeley and Los Angeles.

Nyangira, Nicholas (1970) "Chiefs' Barazas as Agents of Administrative and
    Political Penetration", Institute for Development Studies,
    University of Nairobi, Staff Paper No. 80.

Reddin, W.J. (1971) Effective MBO, Management Publications Limited,
    London.

Sheffield, James J. ed., (1967) Education, Employment and Rural
    Development, East African Publishing House, Nairobi.

Waterston, A. (1969) "An Operational Approach to Development Planning",
    International Development Review, 11,3.

APPENDIX G: AMALGAMATION AND STREAMLINING OF THE
                 ANNUAL PHASING FORM AND THE ANNUAL PROGRAMMING CHART

       The attached form presents a proposed simplification of the system, amalgamating the APF and the APC. The information lost through this amalgamation is:

(i)   The resources column of the APF: This column has not proved of much use. The most common resource required is staff time. It was originally hoped that this could be quantified allowing consistency checks between alternative staff time uses. This has proved impracticable and staff time conflicts should be resolved through the Field Staff Management systems which will be the subject of a future paper. Other resources entered have typically been "transport" or financial sums. While the latter may be of use, they can usually be entered anyway in the completion indicator column, (e.g. AIE for £3,300 received). In programming, consideration of resource needs is important and this is included in the procedure; but recording what are usually vague statements in a resources column does not seem worthwhile.

(ii)   The exact start and completion dates: In using the amalgamated form, start and completion dates could easily be pencilled in against the upper and lower railway lines. But the black lines should indicate to within a week when a start or completion is planned and this should normally be a precise enough date for programming and monitoring purposes.

(iii) The September column of the second year. In practice it has been found that the entries in September of the following year are of little use, and will be covered anyway by the APE for that year.

       The benefits of the amalgamation are:

(i)   a reduction in paperwork, requiring only one sheet instead of two

(ii)   setting the initials of the officer responsible against the bar chart to facilitate discussion in the MMM.

       It is a matter of choice in adopting PIM whether to have separate APFs and APCs or whether to amalgamate. Experience in the SRDP has been that APFs are used mainly as working documents in the APE and that APCs are used mainly in the MMMs. An amalgamated form could well be used for both purposes.