



Alexandria University  
**Alexandria Engineering Journal**

[www.elsevier.com/locate/aej](http://www.elsevier.com/locate/aej)  
[www.sciencedirect.com](http://www.sciencedirect.com)



ORIGINAL ARTICLE

# Efficiency of participation in planning <sup>☆</sup>

Ghada Farouk Hassan <sup>a,\*</sup>, Ayman El Hefnawi <sup>b</sup>, Mohab El Refaie <sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup> *Urban Planning Department, Faculty of Engineering, Ain Shams University, Egypt*

<sup>b</sup> *Architecture and Housing Department, Housing and Building Research Centre, Egypt*

Received 10 November 2010; accepted 21 March 2011

Available online 6 August 2011

## KEYWORDS

Participation;  
Planning;  
Efficiency;  
Strategic planning;  
Planning tools;  
Building trust;  
Development;  
Egypt

**Abstract** The participatory planning became recently the main pier that leads changes and development in cities. The communicative turn in spatial planning reflects the changes of local economies and society towards open, globally reaching relationships, and increasing concerns for local environments.

Moreover, increasing participation is an efficient tool for avoiding social exclusion, which is often related to restructuring local economies and unemployment. At the strategic level, participation can also be understood as collaboration between economic actors, NGOs and the city, in addition to the public. This shows how the city reflects the needs of other actors in its strategy and policy making.

In Egyptian communities' cases, new innovative arenas and localized processes were set to realize the potential for urban planning, as well as for public policy processes. These innovations were necessary especially for guaranteeing the real implementation of planning outputs which cannot be realized unless the participation process was efficient.

Participatory processes need resources: time, organizational efforts, communication and clear commitment. Two different participatory applications of urban development had been applied in Egyptian cities since 2002 with the help of different international agencies:

<sup>☆</sup> Comparative study between two participatory planning experiences applied in Egypt.

\* Corresponding author.

E-mail addresses: [ghadafhassan@yahoo.com](mailto:ghadafhassan@yahoo.com) (G.F. Hassan), [a\\_elhefnawi@yahoo.co.uk](mailto:a_elhefnawi@yahoo.co.uk) (A. El Hefnawi), [elrefaie@gopp.gov.eg](mailto:elrefaie@gopp.gov.eg) (M. El Refaie).

1110-0168 © 2011 Faculty of Engineering, Alexandria University.  
Production and hosting by Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.

Peer review under responsibility of Faculty of Engineering, Alexandria University.

doi:10.1016/j.aej.2011.03.004



Production and hosting by Elsevier

(1) The first was Strategic Urban Planning (SUP) with the assistance of the Sweden international Development Agency (SIDA) technical assistance.

(2) The second was The Strategic Urban Planning For The Small Cities (SUPSC), with the assistance of UN-Habitat.

The two methodologies considered participation of the communities as trigger to start and to feed the planning process. Therefore, they were formulating their local planning process, activities, and trying to achieve almost the same outputs, and outcomes.

A comparison between the two processes will take place in order to identify the participation activities and their real efficiency. The comparison will be focused on the parameter of participation realized in each case in order to find gaps that have negative effects and needs to be filled.

© 2011 Faculty of Engineering, Alexandria University. Production and hosting by Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.

## 1. Introduction

In the early 2000s Egypt was facing different challenges; Egypt's cities were growing fast, mostly without the benefit of governmental or municipal planning. 95% of the population is concentrated in 5% of the entire country's surface area. Informal settlements which were constructed in violation of legislation related to subdivision of land, land use, construction, or registration of property, usually lack basic infrastructure such as paved roads, sewerage, schools and health facilities, and applied pressures on cities. The traditional master Plans of cities which were done to eliminate problems were usually unable to be implemented, due to the absence of the community involvement and consequently, their inapplicable solutions [4].

Lately, the government established several principles and development priorities [6]. The principles included sustainable development, participation, and decentralization, with special focus on the importance of socio-economic problems in addition to a lack of basic infrastructure. Many efforts initiated by the Government of Egypt were to establish participatory planning and to develop appropriate strategies to prevent the creation of new urban slums and by providing urban governance and management instruments conducive to equitable growth, enhancing financial sustainability, improving access to land and services, and increasing democratic decision making, public accountability and transparency.

Participatory planning, here, is an important lever to enhance the legitimacy of policy-and decision making by creating a sense of local ownership and ensuring consideration of citizens' and property owners' rights. The decision making process should be transparent so that all citizens are made aware of the reasoning behind decisions. Engaging stakeholders provides a way of exchanging knowledge and information to improve the spatial planning process. It can also help create consensus between stakeholders and increase the general support for policies. All mature spatial planning systems contain procedures to involve stakeholders throughout the process of policy-making. More specially, these usually provide opportunities for participation, consultation, representation and appeal.

This paper is discussing the efficiency of participation, as a tool, in enhancing planning process. It starts with the discussion of participatory planning as a model not only for effective planning but also a tool to empower citizens as well. Criteria behind "efficient participation" is developed paying more

attention to 'building trust' as an important parameter in such criteria.

The paper is analyzing, in the following section, the experience of participation in two cases in Egypt. The first was the Strategic Urban Planning (SUP) applied in Zefta city, which is located in the Delta (agriculture context). The second was the first phase of Strategic Urban Planning for Small Cities (SUPSC) applied in Delta cities also. The two cases are similar from context and communities point of view. Both cases are managed by the General Organization of Physical Planning (GOPP) with assistance of an international agency. The analysis is focusing on the efficiency of participation in the two participation methods in order to assess its real efficiency followed by main findings, discussion and general recommendation concerning participatory approaches for better planning process.

## 2. Participation as an effective tool in planning

"It's no longer a question to carry out participation, but how to carry it out" (Rider and Pahl-Wostl, 2005).

Participation in planning attempts to move away from Static, state driven, spatially biased planning process to one that is Dynamic, people-driven and integrative [13]. It's believed that participatory planning is better model for management relative to "conventional" one based primarily on expert input. Several reasons are given include:

- *A tool for shaping city system of rules and relations.* It provides a planning process with information and judgments regarding local systems' vitality and adaptiveness which supports depicting clear picture of the whole city complex system. The participant, here, can contribute to the learning ability of the decision making system by contributing to the reorientation of system-wide goals and norms. This leads to better understanding of issues' root causes, and the ability to assess consequences of any proposed development actions.
- *A tool for managing conflicts.* It is dealing with the emergence of the local tensions and the change in old concepts of the relationship between the governing power and the capital community. Via participation people's acceptance for measurements is improved, if they realize their chances to participate. This favors to carry out the remediation without interruptions which is helpful if there are any problems and adversities. The more engagement, of stake-

holders, in remediation, the more included they are, the more they are taken up with the remediation (by being responsible & formative), the less they will put up resistance [14]. This leads to a further integration of power with authority moving toward a more democratic society.

- *A tool for identifying and prioritizing city needs.* Here, Information is gathered from those involved to develop solutions based on their knowledge. The outcome of this process is a gradual increase in the participation of ordinary citizens in making decisions which affect their lives, in levels of organization in the community, and in the responsiveness of local government. A new level of citizenship is expected to be emerged.
- *A tool for Identifying socially accepted solutions and improve decisions.* Here, people are used for information supply, which is called consultation. Participation in here can be defined as an interdisciplinary process of combining, interpreting and communicating knowledge pieces of diverse disciplines in such a way that insights are made available to decision makers.
- *A tool for creating new sense of ownership of both problems and solutions,* which leads to more effective and sustained development programs/actions implementation.
- *A planning tool for analysis and evaluation.* Participation simply provides a broader basis and potentially more comprehensive framework for analysis and evaluation. Community members can quickly identify certain kinds of consequences implicit in the adoption of different alternatives. More important, community members can contribute to the generation of relevant alternatives, saving the planning process the energy devoted to the preparation and elimination of useless alternatives [12].

**3. Participation is not only a tool for a better city planning; it empowers cities’ citizens as well**

It is enabling people to work together in a spirit of collaboration and cooperation and to make decisions about their own lives. This can be attained by sharing vision among partners and exchanging information, altering activities, sharing resources and enhancing each other’s capacity for mutual benefit. It has been concluded that seven basic components, in participation, usually characterize empowerment of individuals:

- (1) *Self efficacy,* or a range of feelings related to self-worth ability to be affective in a broad sense, self confidence

and positive self image. Here, self efficacy means general confidence and comfort in ability to be effective in a public participation context.

- (2) *Knowledge and skills,* or any knowledge and skills relevant to the context or goal of empowerment, extending from knowledge of social, political and economic power structures to basic literacy skills. Key knowledge includes understanding of social and political power systems and power structures, government policies, policy-making processes and how to obtain resources. Key skills include decision making, social and political participation, communication, lobbying, organizing, critical thinking and problem solving.
- (3) *Opportunity,* or a wide range of opportunities to take action, including to make decisions and provide input on an organizational management committee, or to mobilize without being repressed. Opportunities can be offered (such as through an invitation to participate in a government or community decision-making process, or can be created, such as through lobbying or community action).
- (4) *Action,* including a wide range of activities, from trying to take greater control of one’s own life and health, to running for elected office. This can be pursued by lobbying, or participating in community or government-based decision processes.
- (5) *Resources* can include funding, basic education, and training. Specific resources of interest usually are funding, time, human resources, information and training.
- (6) *Impact,* can range from taking greater control of one’s own health or well being to greater ability to do one’s job. In practice, impact can involve having a desired effect on policies, events or decision-making processes.
- (7) *Building trust and respect,* the participation with the opportunity of frequent direct communications may facilitate mutual trust among stakeholders, especially between the governmental executive bodies and the locals. Thus measures and development procedures can be carried out in a smooth and informal ways. [2]

So as to evaluate the efficiency of the participation process, 13 principals (parameters), commonly used in the literature, have been selected. Where the trust factor is represented by its previously mentioned dimensions

**4. Quality assurance principals “efficiency” of participation in planning**

Principal to be assured	What does it mean for Planning
1. Transparency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Understanding the action of the different people involved in the complex remediation process requires providing and disseminating information</li> <li>– Well-defined decision structures and precise responsibilities/competences are also for the concerned of utmost importance (role of participants should be clearly defined and communicated)</li> <li>– The concerned should have a very comprehensive and uncomplicated admission to documents which concerns their own estate</li> <li>– It should be made clear that final decision-making/taking remains with the relevant authority</li> </ul>

Principal to be assured	What does it mean for Planning
2. Openness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Refers to the perception that the object of trust is open for concerns, opinions or criticism</li> <li>– Being ready to enter into a dialogue, it also means to provide info., discuss open-mindedly, to take sorrow and fears of concerned seriously, and also to speak about deficits and problems</li> <li>– The concerned have to get the opportunity to form their opinion</li> </ul>
3. Earliness/early involvement	<p>To provide information and participation at early stage is essential requirements for building trust, thus it's possible to make offers and to act instead of react</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– It's also an advantage to start at the early phase, because there is usually less pressure</li> </ul>
4. Completeness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Participants should represent a “typical” cross section of the population or all interest groups should be involved</li> </ul>
5. Continuity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Instruments for participation and information should continuously be applied</li> <li>– It's also an advantage, if there is a sustainability of contact persons</li> </ul>
6. Reliability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Refers to the perception that one can rely on others work or performance and that others adhere to decisions, keep conditions and promises</li> <li>– To meet deadlines as well as the quality of information are important requirements for establishing trust</li> <li>– To detect concealed information often means an irreparable loss in trust</li> <li>– Participants should receive adequate and timely feed-back, showing how their inputs have been used</li> </ul>
7. Competence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Participation process should be designed in ways, which enhance the learning capacity of the participants in the process</li> <li>– Ability to develop, with consultants, adequate community-based indicators</li> <li>– Ability to build development scenarios based on the combination of proposed measures and perceived consequences</li> </ul>
8. Benefits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Benefits to all partners. If there is not the prospect of benefits for all partners, and if the benefits will not be distributed or shared equitably, the prospects for a sustained partnership are low</li> <li>– Also short-term benefits must be visible besides mid or long-term community improvements</li> </ul>
9. Shared Vision	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– a participation likely will be enhanced if there is a shared vision to which there is a strong, mutual commitment</li> </ul>
10. Equitable power	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– This does not mean equal power</li> <li>– Even when differential power is held by partners, all partners must be able to be involved, and feel valued</li> </ul>
11. Communication channels	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Potential for misunderstanding and miscommunication always exists, even in the presence of mutual trust and respect</li> <li>– Often, not enough time and resources are allocated to ensuring sufficient communication.</li> <li>– This need becomes even greater if partners are in different physical locations</li> </ul>
12. Adaptability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– This allows participants to respond positively to the inevitable change, uncertainty and conflict which will be encountered</li> </ul>
13. Integrity, patience and perseverance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Obstacles will need to be overcome, and progress will not always occur as quickly as everyone would like. Combined with mutual trust and respect, these three attributes help partners deal with difficult situations</li> </ul>

[2], [7].

### 5. Building trust as an important parameter for participation efficiency

Trust is most commonly defined as a belief or expectancy regarding the attitudes, the future behavior, and the performance of an object of trust [11].

Building of trust is sometimes regarded as the genuine benefit of participatory processes because of its presumed positive influence on social relations, systems, and psychological functioning, that goes even beyond the current planning process [3].

Given that participation is a process of social interaction involving different actors, trust represents a crucial aspect in structuring mutual relationships. As such, trust may facilitate an open dialog and productive cooperation among different actors as well as influence public support for decisions and projects[1].

Trust is a complex phenomenon that consists of diverse dimensions, refers to different objects, and is often assumed

to develop gradually over time from a low level of initial trust at the beginning of interaction towards a higher level which is knowledge-based [10]. Usually the perception of trust-related attributes or dimensions of trust, such as *transparency*, *openness*, *competence*, and *reliability* are assessed as empirical indicators for trust.

### 6. Legal framework of applying participation of planning

There are various legal documents supporting participation as an essential part in planning process in Egypt; local government law 1979 which paved the way for participation of different stakeholders in Egypt, this law sets the rules of participation and stages of participation in the development area at large including the roles of the executive and elected leaders. This law paved the way for two important laws in the urban development field in specific; these are the urban planning law number 2/1983 and the building law number

119/2008 [18]. The first law sets the participatory approaches mainly the participation of the elected popular councils in the master plan preparation and approval. The second law pointed out several point views for participation;

- The participation of the different stakeholders including the elected councils, executive councils, NGO's, local leaders, private sector and the community in identifying issues/problems/challenges and proposing solutions for these problems.
- The participation of the different actors in the baseline preparation including the revision of the plan by a committee formulated by the governor.
- Attendance of the different actors the city consultation where the future scenarios of the city and its new spatial boundaries are presented.
- The participation was meaningfully in this law and manifested where the local actors should formulate the building regulations of the city which forms the basic framework for issuing building permits.

### 7. The strategic urban planning (SUP) with the assistance of the SIDA technical assistance

*Background:* In 2002, the government established several principles and development priorities. The principles included sustainable development, participation, and decentralization. The development priorities included slum upgrading and preserving agricultural land.

The project was developed through two integrated projects with the assistant of the UNDP (The United Nation Development Program) and SIDA Project (The Sweden International Development Agency) to support the GOPP in Planning and GIS (Geographic Information System) in order to develop participatory urban planning methodologies suitable for Egypt and document them in Strategic Urban Planning Guidelines [8,9]. This guideline was based on testing the SUP (The Strategic Urban Planning) in the two real-life situations, in Zifta and Awlad Sakr, where new plans were prepared for these two cities by the GOPP Regional Centers in consultation with Local Authorities' Planning Units, using the Guidelines, which were then adjusted in light of experience.

*Activities done for performing participation:* The preparation of Strategic Urban Plans for cities will be implemented by local urban planning firms/teams. The scope of work includes:

#### 7.1. Preparatory phase

1. Meeting with the Governor and members of the Governorate Executive Council.
2. Meeting with the town executive director and members of the executive department and popular councils.
3. Introductory workshop with broad planning program and to encourage their participation.
4. Individual meetings between specialists (Ministries of Education, Health, etc and technical units for gathering profile data, later for identifying proposals, checking capacities, etc.
5. Personal meeting to build personal relationships and to build bridges.

6. Site visits to build the own opinion and to better know the city including regular city walks.

#### 7.2. Present situation phase

Series of workshops are closely linked to Asset Based Community Development (ABCD) and the multiple-D cycle (discover, dream, design, decide, develop deliver and deliberate). A series of workshops and meetings was held during the process of planning.

*Purpose:* To analyze internal and external issues to identify trends and main strengths and opportunities as well as weakness and threats the city is facing; (10–15 times). Workshops were mainly divided into:

- Asset Workshop – to analyze internal and external issues to identify trends and main strengths and opportunities as well as weakness and threats the city is facing.
- Vision workshop – participatory workshop to use assets to establish a town – and if possible a slogan for the town. The vision should also be “unpacked” to establish long term sectoral and thematic goals.
- Profile and priorities workshop, participatory work and discussed. This should lead to
  - (a) short term objectives
  - (b) Priority focal themes anc.
  - (c) Agreement of focal working group theme

*Focus (concerns):* The main concerns was to facilitate a process that encourages self-confidence based on past success and current assets, focusing on strengths rather than deficiencies, and finding a source of motivation of engagement and commitment. Many small group discussion sessions are built around a question.. The group draws new enthusiasm, new energy, and are stimulated to generate new ideas based on what they know has already been achieved, when considering the future and the challenges around them.

*Range of participants:* 20–30 participants of the same concerns form between individual specialists and the established working groups working on the focal themes.

*Timeframe:* Twice per month, and took from 2 to 3 h.

#### 7.3. Strategy formulation phase

To discuss with the city its future vision, objectives as well as the Strength Weakness Opportunities Threats (SWOT) to fill development gaps and improve the living conditions of city residences. To perform this purpose, following activities were done:

Purpose:

1. Thematic working groups working on the focal themes: workgroup produced different themes; they was “steered” to give a particular kind of response; they formulated to generate discussion, stimulate thoughtful reflection.
2. Strategy workshop – participatory workshop at strategies, compare them for consistency, and ensure that the spatial dimensions are clear.



3. Sectoral focus group to consolidate priority actions into a strategic urban plan reflecting the spatial organization of the city; and to prepare with stakeholder’s action plans for priority projects.(5 times).
4. General consultation -To Present the strategic plan to broad stakeholder community, and to the local councils for approval in principle. This is done before the details of projects, implementation program and action plans; then a presentation of finalized plan, including details of pro-

size can then combine their results in a plenary session where all participants are present. For the general consultation, The public should be encouraged to attend.

*Time frame:* Depending on the complexity of the context, this can be a process that takes several months, from beginning to end.

*Point of testing the participation efficiency:* The following table helps in Analyzing the efficiency of participation (quality assurance) in the experience of SUP:

Points of testing the participation efficiency in SUP													
Activities to perform participation in SUP	transparency	openness	early involvement	completeness	continuity	reliability	competence	benefit	shared vision	equitable power	communication channels	adaptability	Integrity, patience, perseverance
<b>PREPARATORY PHASE</b>													
1. Meeting with the Governor	■		■										
2. Meeting with the town	■	■	■										
3. Introductory workshop	■	■	■					■		■			■
4. Individual meetings	■	■	■	■							■		
5. Personal meeting	■	■	■	■	■						■	■	■
6. Site visits	■	■	■	■		■							
<b>SITUATION ASSESSMENT PHASE</b>													
1. Asset Workshop –	■	■	■	■	■		■	■		■		■	■
2. Vision workshop	■	■	■	■	■		■	■	■	■		■	■
3. Profile and priorities workshop	■	■	■	■	■		■	■	■	■		■	■
<b>STRATEGY FORMULATION PHASE</b>													
1. Thematic working groups.	■	■	■	■			■	■	■				■
2. Strategy workshop	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■		■	■
3. Sectoral focus group	■	■	■	■			■	■	■			■	■
4. General consultation	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■

jects, implementation program action plans to council for formal approval was held.

*Focus (concerns):* The process builds on four steps: Discover, Dream, Design and Deliver. These increased to several more depending on the need. Thematic focus group was almost always adding assets, though some may also be lost through time. They alter their dreams as well, usually through a process in which expectations are increased.

*Range of participants:* As with most group work, the optimal scale of working is 5–7 individuals. Several groups of such

Although building trust is an important objective to be attained through the participatory planning process, introduced participation techniques in preparatory and situation assessment phases, here, achieved only half of the trust dimensions (transparency and openness). Reliability seemed to be almost not realized and the procedures taken to enhance learning capacity of participants were considered only on the situation assessment phase and missed on the first one. However, the diversity of participation techniques used on the Strategy Formulation phase succeeded to upsurge participants competency.

It should be notified here that reliability and opened communication channels, as important factors not only to achieve trust with community but also to sustain the planning process as well, are in need for more actions and procedures to be reached.

## 8. Strategic urban plan for fifty small cities SUPSC

*Background:* The strategic urban plan of cities in Egypt in 2007 was localized to fit national development priorities for defining urban strategies [15]. It contributed to political sustainability by undertaking a participatory process. It assessed the existing urban and economic situation of cities; integrate this analysis into a comprehensive Strategic Urban Plan. It joined authorities and stakeholders with a common vision and strategy. The work had involved data collection, data analysis, priority identification, strategy formulation through stakeholders' engagement. The project is focusing on three substantive areas, namely shelter, basic urban services, and economy while had addressed cross-cutting areas to ensure exposure of related environmental, governance and vulnerability issues. The work had also included the spatial integration of the above mentioned sectors into a strategic urban plan for cities. And finally, the task had included the collection of urban indicators to be able to initiate an urban development report. The project aimed that the stakeholders could constitute the framework ensuring consistency among local development plans.

*Activities done for performing participation:* The preparation of Strategic Urban Plans for cities has been implemented by local urban planning firms/teams [16]. The scope of work includes:

### 8.1. Preparatory phase

Purpose/focus:

1. Meeting with the Governor and members of the Governorate Executive Council.
2. Meeting with the city executive director and members of the executive department, elected popular council members, NGO's & private sector as well.
3. Introductory workshop with broad planning program and to encourage their participation.
4. Personal meeting to build personal relationships and to build bridges with the team members.
5. Site visits to build the own opinion and to better know the city including regular city walks.

*Range of participants:* All these meetings and workshops are introductory and recommended for tuning of thinking between the different stakeholders and also important to bring forward the political dimension and visions from the governor as the local political leader of the governorate.

### 8.2. Present situation phase

Series of workshops, interviews and questionnaires are closely linked to identification of city (strength, weakness, opportunity and threat).

#### 8.2.1. Workshops

*Purpose:* To analyze internal and external issues to identify development trends. Such workshops were mainly divided into:

Asset Workshop – to analyze internal and external issues to identify trends and main strengths and opportunities as well as weakness and threats the city is facing. Profile and priorities workshop, participatory practices are discussed. This should lead to identifying short term objectives, priority focal themes

*Focus (concerns):* The main concerns was to facilitate a process that encourages self-confidence based on past success and current assets, focusing on strengths rather than deficiencies, and finding a source of motivation of engagement and commitment.

*Range of participants:* Working groups were formulated on each of the themes of the strategic plan (Shelter, LED, BUS ...etc) the working groups are a mix of different stakeholders and those workshops are guided by the consultant.

*Time frame:* There is no time framework set for these workshops

#### 8.2.2. Interviews

Purpose:

- Identifying main areas of concerns
- Projects are more coherently built
- Identification and screening of different stakeholders aiming to identify the "city champion"

*Focus:* These semi structured interviews were mainly targeting some in-depth identification of some of the main issues of the city either in one of the main thematic areas and the cross-cutting areas too (environment, governance. Vulnerability).

*Range of participants:* This is mostly a one-to-one that is done up to ten times in any city. The team leader (consultant's side) is mostly interviewing these shortlisted city stakeholders in order to achieve the purposes above.

#### 8.2.3. Questionnaires

Purpose:

- Identifying main areas of concerns
- SWOT of the city is built
- Projects are identified

*Focus:* This questionnaire is used to describe a short city profile including identification of problems, issues, opportunities, threats, ongoing projects and future once, financial aspects of the sector, division of roles and responsibilities, institutional highlights, identification of some future projects.

*Range of participants:* This is mostly as part of the structured way to facilitate the thematic workshops. Hence participants are about 20-30 where the consultant is actively supporting each stakeholder type (executive, elected, NGO's, private sector, etc.) to write down their views regarding each focal areas. This way measuring areas that are partially or completely common between the four target groups which could be area of support when building scenarios for development or identification and prioritization of projects

#### 8.2.4. Focus group discussions (FGDs)

*Purpose:* This Focus group discussions was prepared for the disadvantaged and vulnerable groups in the hot issues like employment, access to BUS, environmental problems such as





meeting attended by the public, in certain cases, attendees reached 300 persons or more.

*Time frame:* Depending on the complexity of the context, this can be a process that takes several months, from beginning to end.

Points of testing the participation efficiency in SUPSC

Participation activities “procedures” performed, here, on the preparatory phase have attained, like the first process SUP, only half of the trust dimensions (transparency and openness) where reliability and competence seemed to be almost not realized on this phase.

The multiplicity of participation techniques used on the situation assessment phase succeeded in opening more communication channels with the community members, nevertheless it didn’t contribute in a way to achieve more reliability.

Participation activities were directed through the strategy formulation phase toward capability for implementation, continuity of the participation process and the competence of the

the SUPSC method, they were partially addressed by field survey or by workshops. Those two parameters are also forming the trust dimension that need to be effectively addressed in this phase. Accordingly, participation activities might be enhance to realize those parameters

- The shared vision parameter was better achieved in the SUP method because of the activity of VISION workshop in the second phase. The direct and clear objective of this workshop effectively encourages the participants’ to share their vision, and improve the analysis of situation.
- In the strategy formulation phase, the involvement of the community in the SUPSC method was wide and solid enough to realize efficiency, comparably to the SUP method
- Hereafter is a table showing a comparison of participation efficiency throughout the different phases in both presented planning methods (SUP and SUPSC)

Comparison of participation efficiency of presented cases

Comparison items	the participation efficiency in SUP method	the participation efficiency in SUPSC method
The participation actions	Distributed among 13 activities	Distributed among 12 activities
Achieving efficiency in participation in the preparatory phase	Succeed in realizing transparency and openness that build trust dimension in the beginning	Succeed in realizing transparency and openness that build trust dimension in the beginning
Achieving efficiency in participation in the present situation phase	Gaps in the reliability and the communication channel parameter	Contributing in realizing all parameter and thus achieving efficiency Reliability and competence were partially addressed
Achieving efficiency in participation in the strategy formulation phase	the involvement of the community was not solid enough to realize efficiency	the involvement of the community was wide and solid enough to realize efficiency
Author’s analysis.		

participants, are attained completely which might lead the credibility of the planning process on the next implementation phases.

**9. Main findings by the comparison of the two methods**

- The participation actions were distributed among 13 activities in the SUP method, while in the SUPSC method they were 12 activities. This means that the interventions of the community in both methods were almost the same.
- The two methods succeed in achieving efficiency in participation in the preparatory phase through realizing transparency and openness that build trust dimension in the beginning
- In the present situation phase, activities of participation in the SUPSC method were contributing in realizing all parameter and thus achieving efficiency, while there are gaps in the reliability and the communication channel parameter in the SUP method. It is important to mention that even if reliability and competence were addressed in

**10. Discussion and general recommendation**

A growing body of literature examines different participatory approaches and tools to evaluate participation in planning processes. Some concluded that *trust of workshop attendees decreased during the planning process* which may partly represent a shift from enthusiastic expectations to a more realistic view, and must not be regarded as a negative outcome, since it prevents participants from serious frustration (Corina Hoppner, Jacqueline Frick, Matthias Buchecker, 2007).

It is recommended here that a long-term participation strategy, providing different participatory arenas and settings (so as to sustain continuity of participation), is essential in order to comprehensively affect all dimensions of trust and to foster engagement.

Adding to this, some other activities that can be proposed to enhance the building of trust which affects positively the overall participation process;

- Implementing small pilot projects “greenery, street cleaning, garbage collecting, health campaigns ...etc” through

preparatory phase as an early contribution providing some needed services [17]

- Conducting Participatory Budgeting workshops through the Strategy Formulation Phase which give citizens better opportunities for access to works and services like basic sanitation, street paving, transportation improvements, and health and education centers. By participating actively in PB process, the citizen's contribution is not limited to the act of prioritizing developing projects or programs, but also decides spending priorities and controls the management of the government. This would not only improve the transparency of public administration and efficiency in public expenditure but also, increase trust between the governorate and the population
- Different workshops, focus group discussions or community-based dialogues should be designed in ways, which enhance the learning capacity of the participants in the process (competence). To increase their abilities to develop, with consultants, adequate community-based indicators and to build development scenarios based on the combination of proposed measures and perceived consequences.
- Allocating enough time and resources to sustain communication channels, between different stakeholders groups, which have been opened through planning phases so as to ensure sufficient communication in implementation and monitoring phases afterwards.

Through the comparison of the two participation methods studied, it has been found that the competitive behavior of participants; *which is a common basic human characteristic motivated by self interest*, somehow impede, hinder or block realization of the potential benefits of partnerships and participatory approaches. In here, it is highly recommended to stress more on activities and measures which can drive, the participants, to optimize gains in a competitive environment. This issue can be tackled by expressing the whole benefits and consequences of actions on all partners and silent groups "vulnerable" comprising community. We should not view participatory approaches in an unrealistic manner, and should consider the implications of the design of institutional arrangements and decision-making processes for city management that must function in the context of rapid change, high complexity and uncertainty, and significant conflict

Another issue found concerning participatory planning process, here, is that planning decisions made in the present may eliminate options and constrain societal processes in the future; and participants tend to be biased toward or limited by the time frame in which they exist. There is pressure for immediate solutions to immediate problems often with a disre-

gard for future consequences. More important perhaps is that future participants are excluded from a planning process in the present which leads to an environment they will have to live in.

## References

- [1] J. Brockner, P.A. Siegel, J.P. Daly, T. Tyler, C. Martin, When trust matters: the moderating effect of outcome favorability, *Admin. Sci. Q.* 42 (1997) 558–583.
- [2] Bruce, Mitchell, Participatory partnerships: engaging and empowering to enhance environmental management and quality of life, *Soc. Indicat. Res.* 71 (2005) 123–144.
- [3] D.S. Carr, S.W. Selin, M.A. Schuett, Managing public forests. Understanding the role of collaborative planning, *Environ. Manage.* 22 (1998) 767–776.
- [4] C. Weingran, Public participation in the remediation of the warfare related site Stadallendorf-conception, principles, experience, in: *Proceedings 2nd International Conference on Managing Urban Land*, 2007.
- [5] B. Cullingworth, V. Nadin, *Town and Country Planning in the UK*, 14th ed., Routledge, London, 2006.
- [6] D. Ridder, C. Pahl-Wostl, Participatory integrated assessment in local level planning, *Reg. Environ. Change.* 5 (2005) 188–196.
- [7] GOPP 2007, the Strategic Governorate Planning Guidelines, report by the SIDA and the GOPP, ministry of housing utilities and new urban communities, first ed., Egypt.
- [8] GOPP 2008, the Strategic Governorate Planning Guidelines, report by the SIDA and the GOPP, ministry of housing utilities and new urban communities, second ed., Egypt.
- [9] R.J. Lewicki, B.B. Bunker, Developing and maintaining trust in work relationships, in: R. Kramer, T. Tyler (Eds.), *Trust in Organizations*, Sage, London, 1996, pp. 114–139.
- [10] R.J. Lewicki, B. Gray, M. Elliott, Making sense of intractable environmental conflicts, *Frames and Cases*, Island Press, Washington, 2003.
- [11] L. Bremner, Participatory planning – models of urban governance. *Porto Alegre and Greater Johannesburg, Urban Forum* 9 (1) (1998) 111–119.
- [12] Richard Warren Smith, *A Theoretical Basis for Participatory Planning*, Elsevier Scientific Publishing Company, Amsterdam, *Policy Sciences* 4, 1973, pp. 275–295.
- [13] S.P. Shapiro, B.H. Sheppard, L. Charskin, Business on handshake, *Negotiation J.* 8 (1992) 365–377.
- [14] UN-Habitat 2007, SUPSC term of references for the project of the small cities.
- [15] UN-habitat 2008, Al Maragha profile, governorate of Sohag, GOPP, Egypt.
- [16] United Nations Human Settlements Program – UNHABITAT, 2004. 72 Frequently Asked Questions about Participatory Budgeting, *Urban Governance Toolkit Series*.
- [17] Laws and decrees: Local Government Law, 1979; The Urban Planning Law, 2/1983; The Building Law, 119/2008.