

## DISCUSSION GROUP NO. 2 (ENGLISH) ON TUESDAY 28 JUNE 2005:

### MAINSTREAMING EPM AT LOCAL LEVEL

**RAPPORTEUR: MR. FAHMY ISMAIL, SRI LANKA**

**(Facilitators: Chris Radford, Kibe Muigai, Sandra Bos, Ole Lyse, Lowie Rosales)**

**Focal question 1** - Which most important factors have enabled the mainstreaming of EPM into daily local practices?

In considering this factor, there was no doubt that mainstreaming was very closely linked to **political support and commitment**. The reason being that Local Authorities (LAs) are driven in most cases on the directives and wishes of the Mayor, who again in most cases is a political figure. It was also felt that to give more strength and to make it more effective – Policy and Legislative Support was necessary. An important contributing and enabling factor was **creative awareness and capacity building**, lacking which many feel was a reason why the concept was not being readily accepted or receiving support. Surprisingly, information management as a factor for mainstreaming EPM received no attention from the group participants. Though, some expressed the opinion that this could be a part of Capacity Building and creating Awareness.

**Focal Question 2** - Which most important factors have hindered the mainstreaming of EPM into daily practices?

The majority response was **lack of organizational/institutional aspects**. This included lack of political support, lack of Financial Resources, inadequate Institutional Framework. Contributing factors also included lack of awareness and information and the weak capacities of the LAs. An interesting yet an accepted factor was that the EPM process had too **little immediate and wide physical impact**, and thereby motivation and mobilizing support was difficult.

**Focal question 3** - which national support is required to facilitate mainstreaming of EPM at local level?

Two strong factors emerged which received equal response from the group's participants.

Firstly important to **provide capacity guiding and technical support**. This includes a national strategy for Capacity Building, ToT programmes on EPM, and regular training through national training institutes for officials at all levels and elected members.

Secondly to institute the necessary **policy and legislative changes**. Many felt that for sustainability this is essential to give more “teeth” to the process. Further, the risk that policies and practices also could change with political changes could be overcome by introducing in time such enabling laws that would ensure continuity/sustainability.

**Focal Question 4** - Which main changes in SCP/LA21 Regional/Global processes could help to facilitate mainstreaming at local level?

Three changes were strongly recommended:

1. **Capacity Building – Regional Centres:** facilitate a strong Capacity Building programme right from the beginning of introducing the EPM approach, including C-building for information management.
2. **Sharing of experience** – Facilitate increased networking among cities, and facilitate regular exchange programmes, share experiences at regional level on common issues.
3. **Project Development to include demo-funding and to ensure something “visible” in the early stages of the EPM process.** Many felt that “visibility” through demo-projects comes too late. Clearly Mayors, politicians and the community would like to see something tangible – but this takes long time and thereby at times difficult to sustain the interest of the Mayor, the community and other key stakeholders of the EPM/SCP process which is NOT a project implementing mechanism in itself (and not meant to be). Hence demo funding mobilisation thru local/national budgeting cycles is very important for more early visibility. Another change suggested was to strengthen **donor programme coordination** so to enhance more and effective implementation.