

# The Changing Paradigms of Zambia's National Development Planning: An Enigma or A Necessity?

Kangacepe Zulu<sup>1,\*</sup>, Vincent Kanyamuna<sup>2</sup>, Chitembo K. Chunga<sup>3</sup>, Easton Simenti-Phiri<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup>PhD Candidate, University of Bolton, Greater Manchester, England

<sup>2</sup>Assistant Dean (Postgraduate), School of Humanities and Social Sciences,  
Department of Development Studies, University of Zambia, Lusaka, Zambia

<sup>3</sup>National Coordinator, National Project Coordinating Unit (PPCR & TRALARD), Lusaka, Zambia

<sup>4</sup>Senior Lecturer, Off Campus Division, University of Bolton, Greater Manchester, England

\*Corresponding author: [kangacepe@gmail.com](mailto:kangacepe@gmail.com), [kz2ocd@bolton.ac.uk](mailto:kz2ocd@bolton.ac.uk)

Received March 12, 2023; Revised April 17, 2023; Accepted April 26, 2023

**Abstract** Development planning has been observed to be a critical element in the process of development attainment. The support for development planning at national and sub-national levels has gained momentum over the years and is considered essential to both developed and developing countries alike. Zambia has in like manner adopted national development planning as a tool to foster national development attainment. It is within the Zambian context that this study sought to exploit the gap in literature and scholarly discourse in relation to reviewing the progression of national development planning in Zambia. Through archival, secondary and informant interview data analysis and synthesis, this study highlights the significant changes to the development planning institutions and processes in Zambia's post-independence era from 1964 to date. It can be observed that significant institutional, policy, process and legislation changes have occurred over the years, and these have been accompanied by peculiar development planning challenges. From these observations, the study highlights policy lessons that inter alia include the need for commitment and adaptability; clarity on political roles and technocrats responsibilities; the need to devise models that synchronize economic stabilization goals and development planning goals; ensuring that financing instruments are programme/project specific and not conceived in generalities; and the need for the planning institutions to have goodwill from peer/sector institutions as much as from the politicians. Essentially, it is observed that development planning institutional changes are justified as long as they are aimed at continuous internal improvements and are responsive to emerging inclusive development dynamics.

**Keywords:** *development, national development planning, development coordination, public policy, NDP, Zambia*

**Cite This Article:** Kangacepe Zulu, Vincent Kanyamuna, Chitembo K. Chunga, and Easton Simenti-Phiri, "The Changing Paradigms of National Development Planning: An Enigma or A Necessity?" *World Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, vol. 9, no. 1 (2023): 34-47. doi: 10.12691/wjssh-9-1-5.

## 1. Introduction

The concept of development has long been debated among development practitioners and policy makers. Various ideas, assumptions and presuppositions have been advanced with regard to suggesting an acceptable and all-encompassing definition of the term. Development has therefore been associated with various terms, meanings, interpretations and theories, and the conclusion has come to be that it is a multifaceted and multidimensional phenomenon [1,2].

[3] therefore states that development is an evolutionary process in which the human capacity increases in terms of initiating new structures, coping with problems, adapting to continuous change, and striving purposefully and creatively to attain new goals. A working definition has accordingly been concluded upon with regard to a sustainable form of this phenomenon as a development

paradigm that can be continued either indefinitely or for a given period of time. Such scholarly and development policy practitioner debates have consequently given rise to the commonly quoted definition for sustainable development as 'a development paradigm that meets the needs of a current generation without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs'.

Delving further into the development debate through a review of scholarly and public policy work reveals intrinsic details related to processes that are necessary to attain development and its sustainability. Key among such processes is the notion of planning for development; commonly referred to as development planning [4,5,6,7]. It therefore can be observed that over the years, development planning has garnered much support in terms of scholarly attention [8], let alone with regard to public policy and practice [9,10]. This support for and recognition of the importance of development planning is not only evidenced at the global and regional levels, or only theoretically alluded to in scholarly work, but it can

also be observed at the domestic national-level of African countries [4,5,7], including Zambia [10].

The Government of the Republic of Zambia has since its independence in 1964 adopted national development planning as a tool to foster regional, sectoral and overall national development [11]. In its current form, Zambia's development planning paradigm incorporates an integrated multisectoral approach to development attainment [10] and the country is currently implementing its Eighth National Development Plan (8NDP) since independence [12]. As far as institutional responsibility is concerned, the apex agency mandated to coordinate, manage and oversee national development planning is the country's Ministry of Finance, which also carries the development planning function [11,12].

The purpose of this article is to highlight and discuss the results of a study that aims to provide a synopsis of Zambia's post-colonial development planning progression in terms of institutional arrangements and processes. Specifically, the study seeks to reveal what has been prevailing in the national development planning sphere in Zambia from its independence in 1964 to date. In so doing, the study discusses significant changes to the development planning processes and institutions that have been adopted in Zambia and draws key lessons.

The study endeavors to contribute to the body of knowledge by exploiting the gap in literature and scholarly discourse related to a synthesized documenting of the historical transitions of development planning in Zambia. In addition, the study contributes valuable lessons from development planning history from the vantage point of hindsight, blended with emerging issues in the subject area.

In the subsequent section the discussion is contextualized and the article then proceeds to highlight the tools and methods used to undertake the study. What then follows are the outcomes of this undertaking in narrative form. This article further discusses the key issues arising from the study and provides possible policy lessons for consideration.

## 2. Situating the Discussion

National Development Planning is viewed as a decision-making process that is coordinated and overseen by the government with the objective of achieving socio-economic progress [13]. It has been observed that planning techniques and practices have been a fundamental aspect of the development phenomenon since the inception of development practice. Since the 1920s, countries have used national development planning as a way to define the respective roles and responsibilities of the state and markets, in order to achieve higher levels of development. In more recent years, it has been used as a tool to promote the achievement of sustainable development goals [5,13]. Development planning has legitimized the enterprise of development altogether. The key idea behind it has been that the concept of planning embodies the belief that social and economic change can be engineered and directed or produced at will [5].

Despite the notion of development planning accompanying the development phenomenon since its inception, studies have highlighted an increase in the trend of development planning with the number of countries that have a national development plan (NDP) more than doubling between 2006 and 2018 [14]. Notwithstanding the mounting pressure since the 1990s, to reduce the role and power of central governments and allow for free market economies, 134 of the world's 195 countries have made use of national development planning as of 2019 [13]. This includes Southern African countries, like Zambia, that purposely endeavor to incorporate sustainable development principles in their socio-economic and urban and regional planning processes and initiatives [7].

The observed increased interest in national development planning among countries, including African nations, has been attributed to benefits arising from the Heavily Indebted Poor Countries (HIPC) Initiative and the Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs) that aided in building country capacities and emphasized the need to plan for the future. In addition, countries are currently making use of national development planning to respond to the various international agreements and global agendas. Another important stimulant, worth noting, of increased interest in national development planning is that developed countries are also using national development planning, but largely as a monitoring tool [14].

For Zambia, it may well be that all of the above stated stimulants have had an impact on the country's interest in pursuing national development planning as a critical tool in achieving its development agenda. Changes to the national development planning structure of the institutions and the accompanying diverse processes employed in Zambia over the years, must however be viewed in tandem with the political or governance administrative cycles that prevailed at given points in time of the historical development of the socio-economic planning paradigm.

[11] provide a summarized but comprehensive historical narrative of what they call the 'political-historical background of development planning' in Zambia. Their summary narrative is useful for this current study in order to situate the institutional progression of the national development planning paradigm in Zambia. It is therefore beneficial to this current study that their narrative is quoted at length:

*"Zambia has been characterised generally by three key periods, with each respective period being identified with the development planning paradigm prevailing at the time. The first period is identified by a coordinated approach to development planning, with the National Commission for Development Planning (NCDP) falling directly under the Presidency. In effect, this entailed that Zambia's first Republican President, Dr. Kenneth David Kaunda, had direct oversight with regard to matters related to development planning. During this period, Zambia's first four National Development Plans were formulated and implemented. It is worth noting that Kaunda adopted coordinated national development planning from the onset of his Presidency, which began in 1964 at Zambia's Independence, and he continued*

with this approach to development planning until his Party, the United National Independence Party (UNIP), was defeated 27 years later in 1991.

The defeat of Kaunda and his UNIP ushered in a new Government led by a young and vibrant President, Dr. Fredrick Titus Jacob Chiluba. President Chiluba and his political party, the Movement for Multiparty Democracy (MMD), not only made changes in the political arena, but also restructured the way Government undertook development planning. Under Chiluba's MMD administration, the paradigm of development planning shifted to a sectoral approach; thereby abolishing coordinated national development planning altogether.

The third period is characterised by the reintroduction of coordinated national development planning in 2001 by Chiluba's successor, Dr. Levy Patrick Mwanawasa. It was during Mwanawasa's initial years as President of the Republic of Zambia that a National Development Planning Division was created within the Ministry of Finance. This reintroduction of coordinated national development planning led to the formulation of the Fifth National Development Plan (FNDP), covering the period 2006 to 2010. Therefore, commencing in 2006 the FNDP continued from where Dr Kaunda's UNIP Government had ended, in 1990, with their last development planning document being Zambia's Fourth National Development Plan (4NDP), 1989 to 1991.

Successive Governments after Dr. Mwanawasa have continued with coordinated development. Mr. Edgar Chagwa Lungu who ascended to the Presidency in 2015 went further towards promoting coordinated national development planning by removing the national planning function from the Ministry of Finance and creating a separate Ministry responsible for National Development Planning, as well as appointing a Cabinet Minister solely responsible for this mandate. However, in 2021, the newly elected President of Zambia, Mr. Hakainde Sammy Hichilema of the United Party for National Development (UPND) abolished the Ministry of National Development Planning and reverted the national planning function to the Ministry of Finance" [11].

It can be observed that the study by [11] highlights the broad changes to the national development planning approach employed over the years. [15], like [11], also alludes to the existence of national development planning in Zambia from independence, and further highlights that there have been differing architectures used to deliver national development planning over the years [15]. It must be noted however that while the study by [11], which is cited at length above, provides some valuable insight into the progression of national development planning in Zambia, it falls short of addressing the key research questions that this current study seeks to answer. It can be observed that their study does not delve into the details of how exactly the coordinated national development planning was operationalized and what institutional arrangements existed at each given point. In addition, the study divides the progression of Zambia's national development planning into three broad dispensations without critiquing each dispensation in order to observe the intricate details prevailing at the time. Lastly, the study by [11] does not weigh the pros and cons with each

approach nor does it evaluate the challenges that have existed over the years in relation to national development planning.

In vindicating them, it could be argued that the main intention of the study by [11] was not to analyze or trace the historical developments of national development planning in Zambia, but rather to examine allusions and inclusions of climate change and environmental issues in each of Zambia's published National Development Plan (NDP) documents. Their focus was on inclusion of climate change and incidental phenomenon in development planning, rather than on the development planning paradigm itself, hence the brief review they gave as quoted at length above.

This identified gap in their study and in the existing body of knowledge on Zambia's development literature is what this current study sought to exploit. The subsequent sections, following the discussion on methods and tools, therefore discusses the findings of this study in relation to institutional approaches to national development planning prevailing over the years, from Zambia's independence in 1964 to date. Challenges and policy implications are also identified and discussed as part of the synthesized narrative.

### 3. Study Methods and Tools

This qualitative study utilized two primary methods (multi-method qualitative) for collecting data related to Zambia's development planning progression [16]. In an aim to achieve the core objectives of this study, the first area of focus was to undertake a desk research of existing literature related to national development planning in Zambia. In this regard, the study sought to review both archival-type literature and contemporary literature around the subject of development planning in Zambia. The literature was searched for using criteria that was informed by the aim of the study. Once the literature was gathered, it was then sorted, arranged, analyzed and synthesized in triangulation with the data obtained from the second data collection method; which was the semi-structured and in-depth interviews.

**Table 1. Key secondary resource archival and contemporary documents reviewed/referred to and analyzed**

#	Document Name	Publication Date
1	First Transitional National Development Plan (TNDP)	1964
2	First National Development Plan (1NDP)	1966
3	Second National Development Plan (2NDP)	1971
4	Third National Development Plan (3NDP)	1979
5	Fourth National Development Plan (4NDP)	1989
6	Second Transitional National Development Plan (TNDP2)	2002
7	Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP)	2002
8	Fifth National Development Plan (FNDP)	2006
9	Sixth National Development Plan (SNDP)	2011
10	Revised Sixth National Development Plan (R-SNDP)	2014
11	Seventh National Development Plan (7NDP)	2017
12	Zambia Economic Recovery Programme (ERP)	2020
13	Eighth National Development Plan (8NDP)	2022

The semi-structured and in-depth interviews, which were the second data collection method that was utilized followed the model employed by [11] whereby the key respondents were purposively sampled based on the fulfilment of two key criteria. The first criterion being that the informants had to have been a government official involved in development planning and straddled the different presidential administrations since the Kenneth Kaunda times (Zambia's first republican President). The second interview selection criterion related to the need for the respondents to have had been critically involved in Zambia's national development planning processes and had at least over a decade worth of experience in this field within the Zambian scenario. In addition to the interview respondent selection criteria employed by [11], this current study made use of the snow-ball sampling technique, whereby some respondents provided possible contact information of potential interviewees who would have reliable and beneficial information related to the study. Once the identified potential interviewees were scrutinized by the researchers, they were approached and engaged for an interview. Therefore, an initial number of twelve (12) possible interview informants was identified purposively, according to criteria outlined above. Of the twelve, nine (9) interviews were successfully undertaken with an additional five (5) informants also successfully interviewed arising from the snow-ball effect. This brought the total number of successful interviews undertaken for this study to fourteen (14). These interviews were undertaken over a period of eleven (11) months, with some informants providing further information on follow-up inquiries until data saturation was arrived at.

The study therefore sought to answer the following research questions:

1. What has been prevailing in the national development planning sphere in Zambia from its independence in 1964 to date?
2. Have there been any significant changes to the national development planning processes and institutions?
3. What policy lessons can be learnt, deduced or inferred from the answers to questions one (1) and two (2) above?

Thematic and narrative analyses were used to undertake the analysis of the data gathered from the desk research and that obtained from the semi-structured and in-depth interviews. The thematic and narrative analyses formed the basis upon which data from the various sources was synthesized and consequently developed into a synthesized narrative discussion. The draft narrative discussion was then subjected to review, scrutiny and validation by the key informants before being finalized and developed into a manuscript for publication. Direct quotations from interview informants, within the synthesized narrative of this paper, are indicated in italics and quotation marks e.g. "development planning."

#### 4. Zambia's National Development Planning Regime, 1964 to 2023

Findings from the analysis of the data and information reveals that Zambia has undergone transitions with regard

to development planning institutional arrangements and processes. The prevailing institutional arrangements at every juncture have also been accompanied by development planning processes, dynamics and challenges that have been unique to the institutional structures in place. Table 2 in the Appendix Section of this paper highlights a summary of the institutional arrangements and national planning dynamics prevailing during each development plan cycle.

#### 5. Significant Changes to National Development Planning Processes and Institutions

The period 1964 to 1970 (TNDP and INDP) was dominated by a drive to enhance the 'Zambianisation' of state institutions and process. It was observed in this study by most key informants that this early period in Zambia's development planning history was aimed at creating new institutions and restructuring of existing ones. As one informant put it: "*The Transitional National Development Plan set to transform the police, judiciary, establish a university and increase secondary school opportunities, and these were achieved. The First National Development Plan was set to the Zambianisation programme and economic reforms and these were achieved*".

"*For the TNDP (1964-1965) and the INDP (1966-1970), a central institution called the National Development Committee (NDC) of Cabinet, presided [over] by the Vice President was formed to ensure political oversight during the formulation and implementation. This committee was serviced by the Central Planning Office (CPO) as a secretariat*". It was observed that there were both the establishment of a committee of Cabinet to guide national development planning, as well as the involvement of the governing UNIP in the process through its Central Committee. One informant put it this way, "During the first period, internal coherence was prioritized by the President presenting to the National Council of UNIP for debate and approval. After, National Council, government would promulgate appropriate policy instruments and the National Development Plans would be articulated to implement strategies for policy implementation. Therefore, there was a close relationship between national plans and policies. This could have contributed to the high achievement of results in the TNDP and INDP".

However, all informants noted that this approach to national development planning at the time was highly centralized. Decisions made by the committee were what would be implemented by the Government. "*For example if the Committee decides that there would be Trades Schools in all Provincial centers, funds would be directed towards achieving that without asking individual provinces if such was their priority*".

It was during the implementation of the 2NDP, 1972 to 1976, that the Ministry of National Guidance was combined with Development Planning to create the Ministry of Development Planning and National Guidance. It was observed that despite the creation of this Ministry, planning arrangements largely remained the same,

characterized by a highly centralized approach. This was despite the Government stating in the Plan that provincial planning would be prioritized to the extent of engaging district and sub-district institutions in coming-up with development priorities [21]. It was during this period that serious coordination issues began to emerge.

The now famous National Commission for Development Planning (NCDP) was created during the period of the implementation of Zambia's 3NDP, 1979 to 1983. With its creation came the operationalization of Provincial Planning Units (PPUs) and District Planning Units (DPUs). *"The NCDP was created during the implementation of the 3NDP. Due to the position of the Commission in the Government hierarchy, it was able to get relevant planning information from all the Ministries, Parastatals and the private sector. The Regional Planning Department liaised with provincial centers on regional development. There were no planning structures at provincial and district level, which made consultations with the local communities in the planning process weak. The 3NDP recommended the establishment of Provincial Planning Units under the Regional Planning Department. This structure was created during the course of the plan period and was involved in monitoring and evaluation of the Third National Development Plan and the planning process for the Fourth National Development Plan."* The foregoing was an extensive submission by one of the informants concerning the creation and role of the NCDP at the time.

A JICA visiting fellow stated in a report that President Kaunda, in June 1978 gave a speech at the UNIP National Council at Mulungushi, which highlighted major weaknesses in the Central Planning system. NCDP, which was initially established under the Prime Minister's Office, was placed under the Office of the President in response to the President's speech. It was headed by a Cabinet Minister and had a Minister of State as well as a Director General. Departments included Sectoral Planning, Regional Planning, Economic and Technical Cooperation. Subsequent departments added included Investment Planning and Central Statistical Office [22]. The Government of Zambia itself attested to the need to strengthen central planning during this period by stating in the 3NDP that the success of the planning process depended to a large extent on the organization and status of the central planning office in the country's governmental setup. Creation of the NCDP was therefore viewed as a major step in the direction of strengthening the effectiveness of the planning machinery. This was done in order to improve and strengthen the institutional framework for plan implementation [23].

In the early 1980s, Zambia adopted and implemented the World Bank/IMF SAPs that were later cancelled in 1987 due to growing domestic discontent. The cancellation of SAP implementation was in preference to a domestic economic recovery programme which was called the Interim National Development Plan (INDP), 1987 to 1988. The study sought to interrogate informants and documents on what institutional and structural development planning processes prevailed during the SAP and INDP years. It seems from the outcomes of the inquiry that the Ministry of Finance played the leading role during the SAP period. The INDP on the other hand was coordinated and

operationalized by the NCDP. Zambia, at the time of INDP implementation, sought to pursue development using its own resources and not depend on external assistance from the Bretton woods institutions, among others.

President Kaunda himself stated that the theme for the New Economic Recovery Programme (INDP) was "Growth from own Resources," which represented the country's commitment towards self-reliance in all areas of Human endeavor, which was in line with the objectives of the philosophy of Humanism. In addition, the President, at the time, stated that the introduction of the INDP was necessitated by a background of worsening economic crisis. Between 1980 and 1986 the Zambian economy sunk into deeper crises caused mainly by continued high prices of oil. This crisis was characterized by a worsening in the country's terms of trade. While export prices rose by 151 percent between 1980 and 1985, these increases were more than offset by a simultaneous increase in import prices which saw the import prices index rising to 990.57 as against the 1979 base of 100. This represented a rise in import prices of more than 800 percent [24].

A review of the years 1989 to 1991 indicates that the NCDP continued to operate as the apex national development planning institution. In addition, it was observed that the 4NDP was viewed to have been the only Plan, in comparison to the previous NDPs, that largely carried some of the aspirations of the grassroots. One of the interview informants stated that, *"The formulation of the Fourth National Development Plan though done in a very short period went through a consultative process where all stakeholders were involved. It was the only Plan which carried aspirations of some of the local communities."*

This position by interview informants of having widely consulted in developing the 4NDP was also acknowledged by the Government. An excerpt from the document states: *"The formulation of the plan was done through broad based participation from a Cross Section of society. In all, twenty-four Planning Committees were constituted and these included officials from government ministries and departments, representatives of parastatals, the private sector, trade unions, University of Zambia and numerous other institutions. While the final processing, including testing for internal consistency and drafting of the documents, was done by the National Commission for Development Planning, the Plan represents, by and large the consensus of the various Planning Committees"* [24].

Implementation of the 4NDP was cut short by a change in government after the loss of UNIP to the MMD in 1991. It was during the MMD years that the NCDP was dismantled according to all interviewees. A JICA commissioned report places the actual year in which the NCDP was abolished as 1994 [22]. The dismantling of the NCDP meant that all its planning structures at provincial and district levels were equally abolished. The following year, the Government established Provincial Development Coordinating Committees (PDCCs) and District Development Coordinating Committees (DDCCs) through Circular No. 1 of 1995. Despite the creation of these development committees at provincial and district levels during this time, all informants agreed with the position that there was no coordinated national

development planning during the first MMD era, from 1991 to 2001. Part of the reasons given for the failures of the PDCCs and DDCCs was that they lacked a clear mandate, authority and institutional structure to undertake coordinated development planning. In addition, it was observed in this study that the Ministry of Finance was given a loosely defined role as the main coordinator of economic development in the country. Therefore, the focus during this time was on liberalization and a free market driven economy, which was loosely guided by sector based planning. Respective sector ministries were responsible for such uncoordinated sector plans.

Key informants gave varying perspectives to the approach that was employed by the MMD after abolishing coordinated development planning. Despite such varying perspectives, they all stated the similar position of a lack of coordinated and nationally led development planning. *“The Chiluba administration abolished national planning. There was no harmonization in planning between sectors and between the various institutions. The disintegration of national development planning started at this point. Only Presidential pronouncements or statements guided the sectors, institutions and provinces in their respective development planning. Zambia had no common development vision. No harmonization of approach.”* Stated one of the informants. Another put it in this way, *“the administration pursued economic liberalization, focused more on short-term sector policy papers or frameworks as it embarked on economic reforms which by and large were implemented under the Structural Adjustment Programmes (SAPs), in place of five-year development plans. These were assessed by later administrations to be rather too disjointed and involving a few selected sectors.”*

Interestingly, one of the interview informants actually attributed the abolishing of coordinated national development planning to the stigma that it carried as a communist preferred model of delivering development. *“The FTJ regime came at the backdrop of the cold war ending, and national development planning had been demonized. What was propelled was the macro-economic framework to replace the NDPs. The markets to determine development. The idea of a long term development goal was abolished.”* Whatever the underlying reason was for its abolishment during this era, all respondents interviewed and documents reviewed indicated a focus other than coordinated national development planning between 1991 and 2001. An indication of how government was operating at this time is summarized well by another of the respondents who stated, *“national development planning was abolished with a view to liberalize the economy and to decentralize planning. Development planning was decentralized into the sectors and was driven by line ministries. Policy direction was given by the center, but priority setting was done within sectors. What the sectors planned was executed by the provinces and districts.”*

It was in the second administration of the MMD, in 2002, that coordinated national development planning was reintroduced. It was recommenced under the auspices of the Ministry of Finance, which was restructured to be known as the Ministry of Finance and National Planning. The reintroduction of coordinated national development

planning brought with it the creation of Sector Advisory Groups (SAGs) in 2002 [25] and an apex coordination body to complement the PDCCs and DDCCs in 2006 [9]. In the FNDP, government proposed the creation of the NDCC as the apex development policy and planning coordination body. Interestingly, despite the creation of the NDCC, the committee never met until during the R-SNDP implementation period (2013-2016), which was about 8 years later.

The institutional arrangements for development planning remained the same from its reintroduction in 2002 until 2015 when the planning function was delinked from the Ministry of Finance to create a stand-alone Ministry of National Development Planning. The Ministry of National Development Planning was initially placed under the Office of the Vice President. The Vice President initially doubled as the Minister of National Development Planning until it was delinked from her Office to become a standalone Ministry headed by a Cabinet Minister and was briefly placed under the Office of the President. The idea behind these placements under the Offices of the Vice President and President were, according to findings from this study, to increase the convening, coordinating and decision making authority of the Ministry.

During the formulation of the 7NDP, the Ministry of National Development Planning championed the restructuring of the SAGs into Cluster Advisory Groups (CAGs). In arguing for the restructuring of SAGs into CAGs, the Government stated that clusters were meant to address developmental outcomes in a multisectoral integrated manner as opposed to institutions/sectors working in silos. The aim was to increase integration, which would result in efficiency and effectiveness in the coordination process and delivery of results [10]. The revision to the institutional arrangements during this period followed the spirit of the Plan at the time which was the introduction of an integrated multisectoral approach to planning and programme implementation. This development approach was introduced for the first time in Zambia, largely due to the challenges that had been observed during the implementation of previous NDPs. It was observed that sectors and institutions were working in silos and therefore increasing transaction costs and limiting the impact of development results.

In 2021, the Ministry of National Development Planning was abolished and the planning function combined with the Treasury and Budgeting functions to once more recreate a Ministry of Finance and National Planning [12].

## 6. Policy and Legislation Governing Development Planning

Evolutionary trends in Zambia's development planning policy and legal frameworks have largely been influenced by the inherent realization of its importance to development attainment, on the one hand, and by the drive by various stakeholders to push for a more comprehensive and robust policy and legislation, respectively. In justifying the formulation of Zambia's first ever National Planning and Budgeting Policy, the Government stated that a number of challenges had been faced over the years,

and to address these challenges, an amendment was done on the Constitution in 2009. This amendment facilitated for the introduction of a new Article that required Parliament to enact budgeting and planning legislation to provide for matters related to annual budgets and medium and long-term plans [19]. The 2016 Constitution Amendment retained a similar clause that required that legislation be enacted to provide for the preparation of medium and long-term financing frameworks and development plans [26]. The National Planning and Budgeting Policy was therefore developed as the first step in effecting the constitutional requirement, as well as to have a policy in place to strengthen accountability, oversight and participation mechanisms in national planning and budgeting [19].

It took a whole six years after the formulation of the Policy for the Government of Zambia to enact the much awaited National Planning and Budgeting Act. Evidence from interviews indicates that there seemed to have been inertia in the processes related to developing and enactment of this legislation largely due to institutional turf wars and disagreements on ownership, legal mandates and responsibilities. In 2020, however, these battles were seemingly settled and the planning and budgeting legislation was passed in Zambia's Parliament. The Act provides for the institutional framework for development planning; it stipulates the planning and budget preparation processes; and specifies general provisions related to recruitment and placement of planning officers, among others [27].

It is worth noting that in the intervening years, between the 2014 National Planning and Budgeting Policy formulation and the enactment of the legislation in 2020, the Government developed another essential policy worth mentioning in this discourse. In 2019, Zambia developed its first ever National Monitoring and Evaluation Policy. Its formulation was aimed at providing a framework to measure and track progress in implementing of policies, projects, programmes and plans. The goal for Zambia, through this Policy, has been to institutionalize and standardize M&E principles, procedures and guidelines in all development processes [28].

## 7. Challenges Faced Over the Years

A review of source documents, synthesized with data from interviews revealed a number of challenges in the development planning sphere in Zambia. The identified challenges were further mapped to each dispensation in order to provide a clearer picture of what the prominent issues were at each interval (refer to [Table 2](#) in the Appendix Section of this paper).

It can be observed from the synthesized information that in the first era of coordinated national development planning, the major challenges faced related to highly centralized planning processes and a limited number of technical personal. As the years progressed towards the late 1980s, economic stagnation issues affected development planning processes due to limited resources. This was coupled with external pressure exerted by the multilateral institutions and other donors at the time.

During the period that coordinated national development planning was abolished in favor of sector-led planning, the country faced challenges such as weak definition of roles and responsibilities among institutions tasked with planning for development, as well as the absence of a robust coordinated development delivery system altogether.

A review of the era of the reintroduction of coordinated national development planning, from 2001 to date also revealed a couple of challenges. Key among these have been institutions/sectors working in silos, weak development planning capacities among some institutions, weak linkages between financing instruments and national development plans, fragmentation of systems, multiplicity of priorities and limited resources to finance development interventions, among others. What is interesting is that by and large what seems to be a recurring challenge is inadequate coordination mechanisms. The observed weak linkages among sector ministries, provinces and districts was largely due to the lack of a framework to guide such linkages. Robust coordination and integration of planning institutions/structures from sub-national to national levels and across all sectors, has been elusive to the Government of Zambia.

## 8. Discussion of Findings

The study revealed changes to the development planning institutions in Zambia from 1964 to date. These changes have been in an apparent bid to improve development planning processes and consequently development delivery. Studies have been undertaken to prove a possible positive correlation between the structure of an institution and its effectiveness and efficiency in service delivery [29,30]. Therefore, there may well have been impetus on the part of the Zambian Government to undertake continuous institutional reforms.

What seems to be significant, proven and influential variables in planning institutional set-up are the need for grassroots participation [29] and the key role that political influence plays, which needs to be correctly harnessed in order to achieve the best results [30]. In Zambia's case, it seems from the data that the country has not fared quite well in widening the participation paradigm of the grassroots in planning for their own development. While strides have been made, it can be observed that national development planning was largely characterized by a centralized system in the early years after independence. This system was largely controlled by the party in power at the time. During the abolishment period, development planning was sector-led and highly disjointed. This created levels of marginalization and consequent challenges in obtaining the development aspirations of everyone in a structured and focused manner [6]. The reintroduction period has largely been characterized by a drive to improve institutional arrangements, coordination process and development policy and budget integration. All this has been at the expense of focusing on widening grassroots participation in development planning. While it is important to ensure robust institutions and coordination processes, of greater importance is increased inclusion for all, including marginalized groups.

An interesting finding of the study was the indication by most interview informants that national development planning institutions/process registered greater successes when an influential or forceful individual led the institution or when it was placed under high political office. This seems to prove that beyond the reliance on an influential/forceful leader of the planning institution, there is need for unambiguous political support from the highest level, if national development planning is to work the way it is supposed to. The study by [13] reinforces this point by highlighting the pivotal role that presidents play in effective national development planning. The study further suggests that beyond this required political will and support, there is need for enhanced planning capacities within all institutions, including those operating at sub-national levels. Zambia may need to build development planning capacities in sub-national institutions such as local authorities and district administration offices. The current national development planning architecture does not have any district planning officers and there is no clear linkage between planning officers in the local authorities and the provincial planning units. This may well be part of the reason why there is a low uptake of sub-national aspirations, and consequent marginalization of the grassroots.

It is also important to highlight the observation in the study whereby, at various intervals, the national development planning architecture was externally influenced. This was observed during the Kaunda era when the country implemented SAPs; during the Chiluba era, when the country abolished coordinated national development planning in preference to a liberalized economy; and during the Mwanawasa era when the country implemented the PRSP influenced by the World Bank and other donors. While some of the proposed development planning measures by external forces may have added value, the primary influencing factor should have always been the ordinary Zambian. As Mogue and Erman indicate, Governments need to be responsive to the ordinary individual [29] and therefore, community participation in development is essential [31].

## 9. Policy Lessons and Conclusion

This study may be limited by the fact that it did not delve, to a greater extent, into an in-depth analytical evaluation of the successive development planning institutional/organizational set-ups. The aim was rather to provide a synoptic overview and review of institutional changes and development planning dynamics in Zambia, with a view to piece together a historical picture, on the one hand, and deduce lessons from such a review, on the other. Therefore, this study has equally contributed to Zambia's historical discourse.

Consequently, a number of policy lessons can be observed from this historical study and some have already been alluded to or implied. However, it is necessary, for the fulfillment of the last key research question, to dedicate a specific section of the paper to the salient policy implications.

It is important to firstly observe that while the study showed that Zambia's early years were characterized by a

highly centralized national development planning archetype, it may well be that the Government was working with the limited skilled human resource that was available at the time. The issue of adaptability to working with what is available is important to consider. It further proves Zambia's commitment to national development planning regardless of this limitation. An ironclad commitment is therefore necessary.

The early years were further characterized by an obscure delineation of the role that the political actors played in relation to involvement in the highly technical aspects of development planning. This observation provides impetus to ensure that the development planning roles and responsibilities are clearly identified, allocated and enforced at every level. The lines of where politicians roles end and technocrats responsibilities begin are fundamental to the success of development planning.

The seemingly continuous tag-of-war between economic stabilization and national development planning is a false notion of an antitype between the two. The two were never mutually exclusive, but rather reinforcing. Therefore, the observation from this historical study of successive governments putting national development planning on hold to focus on economic stabilization and growth was a misconception. Policy makers need to devise models that synchronize the two concepts in order to achieve sustainable development.

Financing for development and the linkages between financing instruments and national development plans and process was observed to be critical in the study. This recurrent challenge for Zambia has stifled development attainment. As development plans are being envisaged, direct mapping of each programme/project to a specific and sustainable financing instrument must simultaneously be done. Financing instruments should not be conceived in generalities and as the last step in the development planning process, but must rather be programme/project-specific and undertaken simultaneously with each programme/project identification process. Effectively harnessing this lesson and the lesson in the immediate previous paragraph above, may to some extent deal with the conundrum of whether or not the national development planning function should be housed within the same institution that deals with fiscal policy, national budgeting and treasury functions.

It was repeatedly observed in the study that whatever the structure or design of the national development planning institutions, there was always need for sub-national/grassroots structures. This is especially expedient in harnessing the participation of the ordinary citizens and also widening inclusion in development planning. This must be a primary consideration and motivation in institutional design. Only then can governments start considering the secondary, yet still fundamental, dynamics of granting planning institutions the convening and coordinating authority required to achieve critical mass.

With regard to institutions working in silos, this coordination challenge requires the consideration of all other preceding lessons, coupled with the need to include institutional incentives for collaboration in achieving plan objectives. Reward, rather than punitive or coercive dynamics need to be considered to reinforce institutional collaboration. In addition, there is need for the technocrats



that lead planning institutions to have goodwill from both peer/sector institutional heads and from the highest political echelons.

Finally, the outcomes of this study seem to justify institutional changes as long as they are aimed at continuous internal improvements and responding to emerging inclusive-development dynamics. All this is done in a bid to improve service delivery. And in this particular Zambian context, the development planning institutional changes observed over the years, were supposedly operationalized with a view to improve delivery of development planning services and consequently development delivery. While it was observed that during certain dispensations such institutional changes and the accompanying planning dynamics were an enigma, it is safe to conclude that oftentimes the changes may have been necessary – save for the devil in the details.

## References

- [1] G. E. Reyes, "Four Main Theories of Development: Modernisation, dependency, world-system, and globalization," *Nomadas Revista Critica de Ciencias Sociales Juridicas*, vol. 4, no. 2, pp. 109-124, 2001.
- [2] M. P. Todaro and S. C. Smith, *Economic Development*, 8th Edition ed., Reading: Addison-Wesley, 2006.
- [3] J. Mensah, "Sustainable development: Meaning, history, principles, pillars and implications for human action: Literature review," *Cogent Social Sciences*, vol. 5, no. 1, 2019.
- [4] E. V. Filipe, K. Otsuki and J. Monstadt, "Translating the sustainable development goals in national development planning: the case of Mozambique's energy for all programme," *Sustainability Science*, vol. 16, pp. 1797-1809, 2021.
- [5] E. Lamberg, "Development cooperation and national planning: analysing Finnish complicity in postcolonial Tanzania's decentralization reform and regional development," *Planning Perspectives*, vol. 36, pp. 689-717, 2021.
- [6] F. Telch and S. Appe, "How can countries improve human development? Four distinct national planning strategies and the challenges for human development," *Development Policy Review*, 2021.
- [7] M. Gibbens and C. Schoeman, "Planning for sustainable livelihood development in the context of rural South Africa: A micro-level approach," *Town and Regional Planning*, vol. 76, pp. 14-28, 2020.
- [8] C. Chen, R. LeGates and C. Fang, "From coordinated to integrated urban and rural development in China's megacity regions," *Journal of Urban Affairs*, vol. 41, no. 2, pp. 150-169, 2019.
- [9] Ministry of Finance and National Planning, "Fifth National Development Plan (2006-2010)," Ministry of Finance and National Planning, Lusaka, 2006.
- [10] Ministry of National Development Planning, "Seventh National Development Plan," Ministry of National Development Planning, Lusaka, 2017.
- [11] K. Zulu and E. Simenti-Phiri, "When Did Zambia Start Going Green? Assessing the Allusion to and Inclusion of Climate Change and Incidental Phenomenon in Development Planning Policy From 1964 To 2021," *Advances in Social Sciences Research Journal*, vol. 9, no. 2, pp. 326-342, 2022.
- [12] Ministry of Finance and National Planning, "Eighth National Development Plan (2022-2026)," Ministry of Finance and National Planning, Lusaka, 2022.
- [13] F. Telch, C. Isaza and N. Rubaii, "Governance challenges within national development planning: lessons from the Colombian experience," *International Review of Public Administration*, vol. 25, no. 3, pp. 175-191, 2020.
- [14] M. Okitasari and T. Katramiz, "The national development plans after the SDGs: Steering implications of the global goals towards national development planning," *Earth System Governance*, vol. 12, 2022.
- [15] L. Chileshe, "Addressing Data Challenges For Monitoring and Reporting on National Development Programmes in Zambia: Exploratory Research Study," University of Cape Town, Cape Town, 2020.
- [16] M. N. K. Saunders, A. Thornhill and P. Lewis, *Research Methods for Business Students*, 8th Edition ed., Harlow: Pearson Education Limited, 2019.
- [17] F. Heidhues and G. Obare, "Lessons from Structural Adjustment Programmes and their Effects in Africa," *Quarterly Journal of International Agriculture*, vol. 50, no. 1, pp. 55-64, 2011.
- [18] N. Simutanyi, "The politics of structural adjustment in Zambia," *Third World Quarterly*, vol. 17, no. 4, pp. 825-839, 1996.
- [19] Ministry of Finance, "National Planning and Budgeting Policy," Ministry of Finance, Lusaka, 2014.
- [20] Ministry of National Development Planning, "Mid-Term Review of the 7th National Development Plan (2017-2021)," Monitoring and Evaluation Department, Lusaka, 2020.
- [21] Ministry of Development Planning and National Guidance, "Second National Development Plan, January, 1972 - December, 1976," Ministry of Development Planning and National Guidance, Lusaka, 1971.
- [22] Japan International Cooperation Agency, "A Review of the FNDP, PDP and DDP Development Processes: Commissioned by JICA in response to a request from the Ministry of Finance and National Planning and the Decentralisation Secretariate, Ministry of Local Government and Housing of Zambia," Research Group Institute for International Cooperation (IFIC) Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA), Tokyo, 2007.
- [23] Office of the President, National Commission for Development Planning, "Third National Development Plan, 1979 - 1983," National Commission for Development Planning, Lusaka, 1979.
- [24] National Commission for Development Planning, "Fourth National Development Plan," National Commission for Development Planning, Lusaka, 1989.
- [25] Ministry of Finance and Economic Development, "Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper," Ministry of Finance and Economic Development, Lusaka, 2002.
- [26] *Constitution of Zambia (Amendment) No. 2*, 2016.
- [27] *National Planning and Budgeting Act No. 1*, 2020.
- [28] Ministry of National Development Planning, "National Monitoring and Evaluation Policy," Ministry of National Development Planning, Lusaka, 2019.
- [29] T. Mogue and A. Erman, "Institutional arrangements to make public spending responsive to the poor: When intent meets political economy realities," *Development Policy Review*, vol. 38, pp. 100-123, 2018.
- [30] D. Follador, F. Duarte and M. Carrier, "Institutional Arrangements and Political Shifts in Curitiba, Brazil: A Comparative Analysis of the 2004 and 2014 Master Plans," *Journal of Planning History*, vol. 19, no. 2, pp. 112-128, 2020.
- [31] V. Kanyamuna and K. Zulu, "Participatory Research Methods: Importance and Limitations of Participation in Development Practice," *World Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, vol. 8, no. 1, pp. 9-13, 2022.

## Appendix

Table 2. National Development Planning Arrangements Since Independence

Years	Prevailing National Development Plan	Institutional Structure(s) at the time	Comments/Dynamics (Mode of undertaking Planning Operations)	Challenges
1964 – 1965	Transitional National Development Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>National Development Committee (NDC) of Cabinet</li> <li>Central Planning Office (CPO)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The NDC was presided over by the Vice President</li> <li>CPO was the secretariate of the NDC</li> <li>The national development planning process was highly centralized with no formal Government structures at subnational level. The governing UNIP structures served as means for mobilization and consultations.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Scarcity of skilled human resources inhibited broad based participation</li> </ul>
1966 – 1970	First National Development Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>NDC of Cabinet</li> <li>Central Planning Office (CPO) renamed to Office of National Development Planning</li> <li>UNIP National Council set as a platform for screening national priorities</li> <li>Provincial Development Committees</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The NDC and CPO which became Office of National Development Planning continued to lead the national development planning process.</li> <li>Provincial Development Committees provided regional planning input.</li> <li>The governing UNIP's Central Committee reviewed progress and endorsed proposed priorities and proposed policy alternatives.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development planning process were highly centralized</li> </ul>
1972 – 1976	Second National Development Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>NDC of Cabinet</li> <li>Ministry of Development Planning and National Guidance (the Development Planning Division of the Ministry led the national planning processes).</li> <li>Ministry of Finance (with some role to play in informing/guiding planning through budgeting).</li> <li>UNIP Central Committee and National Council continued to play key roles.</li> <li>Department of Technical Cooperation in the Ministry of Finance elevated to become a Ministry to lead external cooperation for development.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development planning arrangements still largely remained the same with a highly centralized process.</li> <li>Development Planning Division of the Ministry of Development Planning and National Guidance led the national development planning process.</li> <li>Regional Planning Unit of the Development Planning Division of the Ministry of Development Planning and National Guidance largely led the planning process for Provinces.</li> <li>There was intention to operationalize provincial planning units at this time, but it wasn't achieved (the 2NDP actually stated that it would take time to operationalize the provincial planning units).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Serious coordination issues began to emerge</li> </ul>
1979 – 1983	Third National Development Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>NDC of Cabinet</li> <li>National Commission for Development Planning (NCDP).</li> <li>Provincial Planning Units (PPUs)</li> <li>District Planning Units (DPUs)</li> <li>Ministry of Finance</li> <li>Increased participation of Sector Ministries in setting development objectives.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>NDC continued to operate.</li> <li>The Development Planning Division of the Ministry of Development Planning and National Guidance was elevated to become the NCDP and placed under the Office of the President.</li> <li>The NCDP was created and placed under the Office of the President in order to give it coordinating and convening authority to undertake effectively national development planning. It was responsible for formulating and implementing the Capital Budget.</li> <li>Subnational planning units at provincial and district levels established with constant liaison with NCDP.</li> <li>Ministry of Finance was responsible for the annual recurrent budgeting.</li> <li>Planning units also established in Ministries with constant liaison with NCDP.</li> <li>Programme implementation monitoring system conceived.</li> <li>Adoption of annual planning as key feature of the planning process also conceived.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Weak planning machinery due to weak systems related to project formulation, progress reporting and implementing of remedial measures.</li> <li>Limited planning personal.</li> <li>Limited individual technical capacities in planning.</li> <li>Weak linkages with sector ministries, provinces and districts.</li> </ul>

Years	Prevailing National Development Plan	Institutional Structure(s) at the time	Comments/Dynamics (Mode of undertaking Planning Operations)	Challenges
1983 – 1985	IMF/World Bank Structural Adjustment Programme (SAP)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ministry of Finance</li> <li>NCDP</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SAPs were the World Bank and IMF's response to the African economic crises of the 1970s [17].</li> <li>The SAPs were adopted by Zambia in part as requirement to receive external financings from the Bretton Woods Institutions.</li> <li>SAP measures included devaluation of currency, limiting of wage increases, reduction in civil service employment, removal of price controls on essential commodities, removal of subsidies on maize and agricultural inputs, liberalization of agricultural marketing and public sector reform, among others [18].</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Economic growth and stabilization challenges.</li> <li>Increases in production costs in the manufacturing sector because of currency fluctuations.</li> <li>Inability for local firms to raise local currency (Kwacha) due to foreign exchange fluctuations.</li> <li>Escalation in the cost of living, mostly in urban areas [18].</li> </ul>
1987 – 1988	Interim National Development Plan (Economic Recovery Programme)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>NCDP</li> <li>Ministry of Finance</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Implementation of SAPs was cancelled due to rising discontent with the economic reform measures [18].</li> <li>Zambia defaulted on loan repayments during this period.</li> <li>The country made a unilateral decision to allocate a percentage of GDP to debt service thereby causing defaults in repayments. This made lenders unhappy with the country and it cost Zambia. The lenders consequently decided not to work with the Country.</li> <li>The new plan (Economic Recovery Programme) had the objective to 'Grow From Own Resources' (a plan meant to wean Zambia off from donor dependence) was conceived by the Zambian Government during this period.</li> <li>The Economic Recovery Programme introduced measures such as fixing exchange rate at K8 to US\$1 (from previous rate of K21 to a dollar); reintroducing prices controls; limiting debt service to 10% of foreign export receipts; and nationalizing private milling companies, among others [18].</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Economic growth and stabilization challenges continued and intensified.</li> <li>Country lacked external finance, as no donor was obliged to provide Zambia with any loans given no formal relationship with the IMF [18].</li> </ul>
1989 – 1991	Fourth National Development Plan Policy Framework Paper (PFP)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>National Commission for Development Planning (NCDP)</li> <li>Ministry of Finance</li> <li>PPUs and DPUs</li> <li>Provincial Council Committees</li> <li>District Committees</li> <li>Ward Committees</li> <li>Ministry planning Units</li> <li>Broad based participation comprising among others parastatals, private sector, civil society and academia, among others.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>NCDP with subnational planning structures continued to operate.</li> <li>The NCDPs Regional Planning Department coordinated with provincial centers on regional development matters</li> <li>PPUs and DPUs worked with provincial, district and ward committees in a bid to operationalize a bottom-up planning approach.</li> <li>In 1990, Government reverts to the IMF and draws up a Policy Framework Paper (PFP) which spelt out economic policies to be pursued between 1990 and 1993 [18].</li> <li>On basis of the PFP, Government received donor financing for balance of payments support.</li> <li>PFP measures included phased reduction of maize subsidies and reduced social sector spending [18].</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Articulation of results by various agencies did not take into consideration interlinkages of several intermediate outputs to achieve a desired result</li> <li>The non-review of key legislation contributed to the resentment of NCDP because of the perception that they overstepped mandates.</li> <li>Geo-political dynamics and perceptions against strong national planning institutions debate adopted with rigorous domestic testing.</li> <li>Economic challenges continued that included high inflation rates. Annual inflation in 1991 was registered at 129% [18].</li> </ul>
1991 - 2001	No overarching National Development Plan Public Investment Programme (PIP)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Coordinated National Development Planning abolished</li> <li>Provincial Development Coordinating Committees (PDCCs)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Dissolution of the NCDP</li> <li>Dissolution of subnational planning structures i.e. PPUs and DPUs</li> <li>PIP formulated as investment document to fill-in gap created by the absence of an all-encompassing</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Weak definition of mandates for DDCCs and PDCCs and DDCCs and PDCCs, had no mandate for plan implementation</li> <li>Weak or non-existent mechanism for monitoring</li> </ul>

Years	Prevailing National Development Plan	Institutional Structure(s) at the time	Comments/Dynamics (Mode of undertaking Planning Operations)	Challenges
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>District Development Coordinating Committees (DDCCs)</li> <li>Ward Development Committees (WDCs)</li> </ul>	<p>development plan due to the abolishment of coordinated national development planning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>PIP developed with limited consultations, particularly at subnational level due to absence of planning structures at the lower levels</li> <li>Eventually, Circular No 1 of 1995 established the NDCC, PDCCs and DDCCs due to the recognized challenge of a lack of coordination and the absence of coordinating structures</li> </ul>	<p>policy implementation or impact of policies.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Absence of categorical linkages between policies and plans and monitoring of results within the results framework.</li> <li>Weak demonstrable compliance with identified national priorities.</li> <li>Weak accountability for results</li> </ul>
2002 - 2004	Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP) Transitional National Development Plan (TNDP2)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ministry of Finance and National Planning</li> <li>Sector Ministry level planning units</li> <li>Sector Advisory Groups (SAGs)</li> <li>PDCC</li> <li>DDCC</li> <li>PPUs</li> <li>DPU</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>TNDP2 implemented alongside the PRSP and reverted the economy to coordinated development planning, moving away from a free market economy driven approach.</li> <li>Sector Advisory Groups (SAGs) created in addition to the PDCCs and DDCCs</li> <li>Planning mandate established in the Ministry of Finance</li> <li>Planning and Economic Management Department (PEMD) in the Ministry of Finance and National Planning focal point for PRSP coordination, monitoring and evaluation.</li> <li>All other departments in the Ministry of Finance and National Planning involved in planning and management of PRSP process with PEMD taking a lead.</li> <li>Re-establishment of Provincial Planning Units (PPUs) under the Ministry of Finance and National Planning and District Planning Units (DPUs) conceived in line with anticipated Decentralization Policy which was under formulation.</li> <li>Anticipation that PPUs would work through PDCCs and the DPUs through the DDCCs. District Plans to be approved by DDCCs before submission to PDCCs and their PPU secretariates.</li> <li>Strong participation of international community and non-state actor stakeholders in planning and plan implementation</li> <li>Long-Term National Vision adopted as modality for setting long term national development priorities</li> <li>Increased importance of Medium Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF) in funding of national development process</li> <li>PIP continued as key programme under the PRSP</li> <li>Annual Budgets recognized as primary instruments for effecting PRSP expenditures.</li> <li>The PRSP, MTEF and PIP synchronized to roll over every three years in view of their inter-linkage</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Poor linkages between Ministry level strategic plans and National Development Plans</li> <li>Vague mandate for the Cabinet Office in monitoring plan/policy implementation and impact of policy</li> <li>Weak capacity in national institutions</li> <li>Difficulties in harmonization of development priorities and MTEF</li> </ul>
2006 - 2010	Fifth National Development Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ministry of Finance and National Planning</li> <li>Sector Ministry level planning units</li> <li>SAGs</li> <li>National Development Coordinating Committee (NDCC)</li> <li>PDCCs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Established coordinated national development planning premised on sectoral approach</li> <li>Established the National Development Coordinating Committee (NDCC)</li> <li>PEMD continued to be the focal point in coordinating national development planning, monitoring and evaluation of Plan.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Silo approach to undertaking planning and implementation of programmes. Each sector planned independent of others to a certain extent.</li> <li>The Plan and the budget were not linked. Budget configuration was</li> </ul>

Years	Prevailing National Development Plan	Institutional Structure(s) at the time	Comments/Dynamics (Mode of undertaking Planning Operations)	Challenges
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DDCCs</li> <li>• WDCs</li> <li>• PPU</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Plan was conceived to be operationalized through MTEFs and Annual Budgets.</li> <li>• Local participation was expected to be coordinated through the WDCs</li> <li>• Special interest groups to participated in development planning through the SAGs. The SAGs then expected to provide professional and technical advice.</li> <li>• Private Sector was expected to be represented in the SAGs, PDCCs and DDCCs.</li> </ul>	<p>different from the programmes in the Plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Too many priority areas in the Plan, thereby causing resources to be spread too thinly with limited impact.</li> <li>• NDCC never met</li> </ul>
2011 - 2015	Sixth National Development Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ministry of Finance and National Planning</li> <li>• PPU</li> <li>• NDCC</li> <li>• PDCCs</li> <li>• DDCCs</li> <li>• Area Development Committees (ADCs)</li> </ul>	<p>Continued on the coordinated development planning premise</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Also continued the sector approach to national development planning</li> <li>• Plan implementation and coordination done by the PDCC at Provincial level and the DDCC at district level.</li> <li>• PDCCs and DDCCs provided forum for public sector, private sector and non-state actor participation in implementation and coordination of regional programmes.</li> <li>• PPU facilitated the operations of the PDCCs and the DDCCs.</li> <li>• At sub-district level the ADCs coordinated the implementation of the development programmes.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Weak coordination, NDCC never met to receive submissions from PDCC which were meeting quarterly and SAGs.</li> <li>• ADCs were not effective in coordinating implementation</li> </ul>
2013 - 2016	Revised Sixth National Development Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cabinet Office</li> <li>• Ministry of Finance</li> <li>• Sector Ministries</li> <li>• PPU</li> <li>• NDCC</li> <li>• PDCCs</li> <li>• DDCCs</li> <li>• SAGs</li> <li>• Joint Monitoring, Evaluation and Statistics Working Group</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Implementation of initial Sixth Plan cut short and revision to the Plan made to align development objectives to the newly elected PF Government priorities.</li> <li>• PDCCs and DDCCs continued to provide advisory services at provincial and district levels, respectively.</li> <li>• Cabinet Office designated to coordinate policy analysis and implementation</li> <li>• Ministry of Finance responsible for programme coordination, implementation and monitoring and evaluation</li> <li>• Sector Ministries continued to undertake programme implementation, monitoring and evaluation.</li> <li>• SAGs provided advisory support to the sectors.</li> <li>• A Joint Monitoring, Evaluation and Statistics Working Group created to harness the participation of non-state actors so as to augment capacities in M&amp;E and statistics at national, provincial and district levels.</li> <li>• Formulation and operationalization of the first ever National Planning and Budgeting Policy which sought to promote coordination of national planning and budgeting functions and outline processes and procedures for development planning and institutional arrangements [19].</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development programmes not adequately funded.</li> <li>• Mismatch between programmes contained in annual budgets and those in the plan. Therefore, resources were expended on non-core activities of the Plan.</li> <li>• Failure to fully implement decentralization policy affected Plan implementation.</li> <li>• Poor coordination among the various implementing institutions and stakeholders due to poor institutional arrangements and limited technical capacities.</li> <li>• Poor uptake of results which led to implementing institutions not having timely policy guidance with regard to Plan implementation.</li> <li>• Fragmented systems and limited data availability.</li> <li>• Lack of a national programme/project appraisal system which resulted in weak prioritization of programmes and projects, thereby negatively impacting implementation.</li> <li>• Too many priority areas in the Plan, thereby causing resources to be spread too thinly with limited impact.</li> </ul>
2017 - 2021	Seventh National Development Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ministry of National Development Planning under the Office of the President</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Introduced grouping of related sectors into clusters</li> <li>• Improved coordination by changing</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Faced a bit of resistance in terms of new institutional arrangements and the new</li> </ul>

Years	Prevailing National Development Plan	Institutional Structure(s) at the time	Comments/Dynamics (Mode of undertaking Planning Operations)	Challenges
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cabinet Office</li> <li>• Ministry of Finance</li> <li>• Cluster Advisory Groups (CAGs)</li> <li>• NDCC</li> <li>• PDCCs</li> <li>• DDCCs</li> <li>• Ward Development Committees (WDCs)</li> </ul>	<p>paradigm to an integrated multisectoral approach to development planning, implementation and monitoring and evaluation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Creation of a Ministry solely responsible for National Planning by delinking the National Planning function from the Ministry of Finance.</li> <li>• The newly created Ministry of National Development Planning was initially placed under the Office of the Vice President who also took up the role of Minister of National Development Planning.</li> <li>• The Ministry was consequently moved to the Office of the President with a Cabinet Minister appointed to lead the Ministry of National Development Planning.</li> <li>• SAGs reorganized into Cluster Advisory Groups with a view to promote an integrated multisectoral approach in addressing each development outcome outlined in the Plan.</li> <li>• WDCs strengthened with a view to promote their undertaking of planning, monitoring and evaluation activities at sub-district level.</li> <li>• Planning approach and Plan strongly aligned to the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).</li> <li>• Formulation of the National M&amp;E Policy.</li> <li>• Enactment of the National Planning and Budgeting Act No. 1 of 2020 in order to provide the legal framework for an integrated national planning and budgeting process, as well as for strengthening accountability, institutional and coordination arrangements. In addition, the legislation provided for processes and procedures, responsibilities of state and non-state actors and guaranteed participation of all stakeholders at every level.</li> </ul>	<p>planning paradigm shift. This approach therefore had some teething problems.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Complete adoption of the integrated multisectoral approach was hindered by the slow pace of operationalization of the integrated budgeting system which was to be based on the outcome areas of the 7NDP.</li> <li>• Limited resources were allocated to support coordination mechanisms.</li> <li>• Failures in feedback mechanisms between national and sub-national levels.</li> <li>• Reporting templates not adequate in design. Therefore failed to systematically capture progress of Pan implementation at sub-national level [20].</li> <li>• Limited planning, monitoring and evaluation capacities at sub-national levels</li> </ul>
2022 - 2026	Eighth National Development Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ministry of Finance and National Planning</li> <li>• Ministry of Local Government and Rural Development.</li> <li>• Cluster Advisory Groups (CAGs)</li> <li>• NDCC</li> <li>• PDCCs</li> <li>• DDCCs</li> <li>• WDCs</li> <li>• Ministries, Provinces and other Spending Agencies (MPSAs)</li> <li>• House of Chiefs</li> <li>• Cabinet Office</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Ministry of National Development Planning was abolished and the function reverted back to the Ministry of Finance</li> <li>• Continued on the paradigm of integrated multisectoral approach to planning, implementation and M&amp;E.</li> <li>• Plan strongly aligned to the SDGs, the African Union Agenda 2063, the Southern African Development Community (SADC) Regional Indicative Strategic Development Plan (RISDP) and the Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa (COMESA) protocols.</li> <li>• Strong emphasis on decentralization in planning, implementation and M&amp;E hence the strong linkage with the Ministry of Local Government and Rural Development and the House of Chiefs.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limited resources to finance the plan due to shrinking fiscal space caused by huge debt burden.</li> <li>• Focus largely on economic stabilization rather than development programmes implementation.</li> </ul>

