

Introduction

1.1. Introduction

HIV/AIDS is one of the most critical development challenges in sub-Saharan Africa. It is now widely recognised that HIV/AIDS reverses the achievements in human development in the region and, as a consequence, has the capacity to undermine economic growth and development. The epidemic also poses a serious challenge to governance and public sector management in sub-Saharan Africa. As such, it raises particularly challenging questions regarding the nature, strategic orientation and impact of development planning in the region as yet worst affected by HIV/AIDS.

Arguably, development planning seeks to make the complexities of the real world comprehensible, so that a government can shape and direct the course and nature of development to the benefit of its people and the fulfilment of their basic rights. Past efforts in development planning in sub-Saharan Africa have brought significant improvements, but also great disappointments. From the point of view of development planning, the human tragedy and devastation associated with the HIV/AIDS epidemic clearly adds to the complexity of the real world and makes the realisation of development goals infinitely more challenging. Whilst this report does not, and cannot, provide solutions to these challenges, it seeks to provide some guidance on how to approach them.

1.2. Background to the study

Several African governments and international agencies have sought to curb the spread of HIV and mitigate the devastating impacts of HIV/AIDS. Yet, in relation to the scale and devastating nature of HIV/AIDS, these efforts have at best yielded modest results. The UNDP Regional Project on HIV and Development in sub-Saharan Africa has identified at least three interrelated factors that help to explain the limited successes of country responses to HIV/AIDS in the region.ⁱ

Firstly, many prevention efforts have tended to ignore the social and economic context that renders certain individuals or social groups more vulnerable to HIV infection than others. Secondly, successes made in a few countries – and the social, political and institutional factors contributing to these successes – are not well studied to provide viable and useful lessons elsewhere. Amongst others, this has led to a replication of interventions that have demonstrated some level of success in a particular context, without due regard for the appropriateness of these interventions in other contexts. Thirdly, few country responses to HIV/AIDS have been sufficiently comprehensive and at scale, taking into account the socio-economic realities of individuals and communities prior to and after HIV infection.

To overcome these fundamental weaknesses, the UNDP Regional Project recognises that there is, firstly, an urgent need for a better understanding of the relationship between HIV/AIDS and development and the determinants of the spread of the epidemic in specific contexts and, secondly, a need for the development of appropriate methods, tools and frameworks for mainstreaming of HIV/AIDS into development programmes at country level. For this reason, the UNDP Regional Project commissioned this study. Its aim is to assess possible links between development planning and HIV/AIDS in sub-Saharan Africa. More specifically, it seeks to ascertain the extent to which development planning may facilitate, or curb, the spread of HIV and may exacerbate, or mitigate, the impacts and consequences of HIV infection on households, communities, organisations and institutions. As such, the study aims to contribute to the first need identified above, namely an enhanced understanding of relevant political and institutional factors in the context of HIV and development.

1.3. Study aim and activities

The specific aim of the study is twofold:

- To develop a typology of development planning on the subcontinent; and,
- To explore possible links between development planning and HIV/AIDS through an analysis of principal development planning frameworks.

To achieve the aim of the study, the following research questions have been formulated:

1. What are the most significant development planning frameworks guiding the development process on the subcontinent?
2. To what extent are HIV prevention and impact mitigation deliberate, or integral, objectives of particular development planning frameworks?
3. How do particular development planning frameworks, consciously or not:
 - a. Enhance or diminish an environment of vulnerability to HIV infection; and/or,
 - b. Strengthen or undermine the capacity of households, communities, organisations and institutions to cope with the impacts of HIV infection, ill health and possible death?

The study consisted of various phases. The first phase was the development of a Concept Paper *Understanding the Link between Development Planning and HIV/AIDS in sub-Saharan Africa*. The Concept Paper includes a typology of development planning and key development planning frameworks in sub-Saharan Africa. It further presents a tentative conceptual framework for analysis of the possible linkages between certain types of development planning (as reflected in key development planning frameworks) and HIV/AIDS in sub-Saharan Africa.

During the second phase of the study, this conceptual framework was used as a diagnostic tool to assess possible links between development planning and HIV/AIDS in selected countries. Country assessments were conducted in Cameroon, Senegal, Uganda and Zimbabwe. The findings of these country assessments have been reflected in Country Papers.ⁱⁱ

The final phase of the study consisted of consolidating the documentation produced into this report and preparing a synthesis of the key findings. The Concept Paper has been restructured and

forms the basis for Chapters 2, 3 and 4 in this report. The Country Papers have been edited and revised to ensure coherence and consistency. Furthermore, a synthesis of the findings reflected in the country assessments has been written, which has informed the development of a set of recommendations.

1.4. Project management and execution

As the commissioning authority of this study, the UNDP Regional Project on HIV and Development in sub-Saharan Africa played a key role in providing the necessary administrative support for the execution of the project. It commissioned a Lead Consultant to design and manage the project, to develop the conceptual framework and the research methodology for the study, and to coordinate the work of Local Consultants. The Lead Consultant was also responsible for compiling the final report, which included editing the Country Papers and writing a synthesis of the main findings, amongst others.

Local Consultants were commissioned to conduct the country assessments. To prepare them for this task and to ensure a consistent approach among the various consultants, they participated in a research methodology workshop in Pretoria, South Africa. Each Consultant produced a draft Country Paper and presented this at a Revision Workshop. Subsequently, the Local Consultants revised their draft Country Papers, which in some cases involved additional data gathering.

A Reference Group under the leadership of Prof John Ohiorhenuan (Resident Representative of UNDP South Africa) was established to give overall guidance to the study. An effort was made to ensure that government representatives of the case study countries were part of the Reference Group.ⁱⁱⁱ Selected international experts with expertise in development planning and/or HIV/AIDS were also invited to participate in the Reference Group. In addition to providing direction to the study and engaging with the documents produced, members of the Reference Group were tasked with the responsibility to assist local consultants in accessing relevant informants and documents.

1.5. Overview of the report

This report continues by presenting a brief historical overview of development planning in sub-Saharan Africa, starting from the period of decolonisation. Chapter 2 highlights how the first generation of independent African states, faced with some fundamental challenges, was able to make

significant strides in the first two decades after the Second World War. Yet, the economic crisis of the 1970s and 1980s exposed some structural weaknesses of African economies and their management. It further allowed neoliberalism to become the most dominant ideological framework, with far-reaching implications for the development project and development planning in sub-Saharan Africa.

With the declining and discredited role of the state in development, the concept of development planning fell into disuse – even though state control and planning have continued to play a role on the subcontinent. Chapter 3 argues for a reintroduction of the notion of development planning as ‘planning for development’ and emphasises the vital role of the state in this process. It defines development planning as a complex, participatory and inherently conflictual process of decision-making concerning appropriate priorities, strategies and resource allocations in the interest of the common good and of the implementation of these decisions. It includes a variety of activities at different functional, operational and spatial levels, including economic development planning, sectoral planning (e.g. health and education planning), multi-sectoral planning and integrated area planning (i.e. rural/urban development planning).

This working definition is followed by a typology of development planning and associated planning frameworks in sub-Saharan Africa. The main types of development planning identified are economic development planning, sectoral planning, multi-sectoral planning and integrated area planning. The section briefly elaborates on those development planning frameworks that are, or are increasingly becoming, most influential in guiding the development process in sub-Saharan Africa. The frameworks under discussion are: the National Development Plan, the Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP), the Medium Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF), the National Strategic Framework for HIV/AIDS, Sector Plans (particularly the Sector Wide Approaches – SWAps) and the Rural and Urban Development Frameworks. From the discussion, it emerges that a critical issue concerns the alignment and synchronisation of various planning frameworks. The chapter concludes by presenting an ideal type image of the linkages between the different development planning frameworks.

Chapter 4 maps out a tentative conceptual framework that can be used to review the various

development planning frameworks from the perspective of HIV/AIDS. A distinction is made between ‘development planning for HIV/AIDS’ and development planning aimed at realising other development objectives. ‘Development planning for HIV/AIDS’ refers to development planning in direct response to specific determinants or consequences of the HIV/AIDS epidemic or a more comprehensive response to HIV/AIDS. The National Strategic Framework for HIV/AIDS is a clear example of this type of planning. The chapter argues that other types of development planning, for which addressing HIV/AIDS is no exclusive – and possibly no explicit – objective, also have relevance for the spread of HIV and impact on the capabilities of individuals, households and organisations to cope with the consequences of HIV and AIDS.

Chapter 4 identifies a set of core determinants of enhanced vulnerability to HIV infection, which have particular relevance from the perspective of prevention of HIV transmission, and key consequences, which are critical from the perspective of impact mitigation (including treatment and care). These core determinants and key consequence are themselves complex development challenges. Clearly, HIV/AIDS makes the resolution of these challenges not only more complex, but also more acute.

The chapter continues by applying the proposed conceptual framework to the main development planning frameworks identified in Chapter 3. The reflection on possible links between particular development planning frameworks and HIV/AIDS is obviously not comprehensive or conclusive. The specific nature of such linkages has to be analysed with reference to particular contexts. Instead, the examples presented here are meant to be illustrative and point to a way of analysing specific development planning frameworks through the lens of the proposed conceptual framework. The chapter concludes that few, if any, development planning frameworks address all core determinants and key consequences of HIV/AIDS. Whilst this may in part be due to the functional and operational scope of particular types of development planning, it also points to a flawed conception of HIV/AIDS and to a lack of alignment between the various planning paradigms.

In attempting to depict the status of development and the nature and impact of development planning for the whole subcontinent, this report has set out on quite an ambitious endeavour. It is clear that within



its scope and space constraints, this report cannot do justice to the rich variety in historical trajectories, socio-economic realities, political and organisational systems or institutional frameworks that exist on the subcontinent. It also cannot adequately reflect the abundance and depth of perspectives on development and development planning, let alone how specific development planning frameworks are made relevant to local realities. Moreover, the report does not explore in detail the nature and manifestation of HIV/AIDS in particular societies. To some extent, these issues have been further explored in the country assessments.

Chapter 5 serves as an introduction to the country assessments, which are presented in Chapters 6 to 9. It outlines the selection criteria that were formulated to guide the selection process for the case studies. Although initially eight countries were selected (Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Ethiopia, Mozambique, Senegal, Tanzania, Uganda and Zimbabwe), four of these (Burkina Faso, Ethiopia, Mozambique and Tanzania) had to be discarded at different stages of the project for organisational and practical reasons. Chapter 5 further provides a brief overview of selected development trends and indicators in the four countries where country assessments were conducted. It concludes by providing some insight into the research questions that guided the country assessments, the research methods used and some of the challenges and difficulties encountered during this phase of the study.

Following the country assessments of Cameroon (Chapter 6), Senegal (Chapter 7), Uganda (Chapter 8) and Zimbabwe (Chapter 9), Chapter 10 draws out the similarities and differences with respect to development planning and HIV/AIDS in the four countries reviewed. The aim of this chapter is not so much to compare these countries and rank their performance. Rather, it seeks to identify possible trends that are likely to have relevance for development planning and HIV/AIDS not only in the four countries reviewed here, but also in other sub-Saharan African countries.

Finally, Chapter 12 provides a conclusion to the report. It outlines a number of key lessons that are drawn from the country assessments and study findings. It concludes with a set of recommendations aimed at informing development planning in the region most affected by HIV/AIDS.

