

# How might different types of national development plans lead to successful outcomes? A research agenda

Lauchlan T. Munro, Ph.D.

Presentation to UNDESA VNR Lab

10 July 2020

Université d'Ottawa | University of Ottawa



uOttawa

L'Université canadienne  
Canada's university



[www.uOttawa.ca](http://www.uOttawa.ca)

# Outline of the Presentation

- Research questions
- Data and methods
- The Chimhowu et al. typology of national development plans
- What does success look like?
- Pathways to success through the typology
- Conclusions and recommended readings

# Research Questions

- What different types of national development plans are out there?
- What does “success” look like?
- How does each type of plan work?
- Resilience, development and planning: How do they fit together?

# Data Sources and Methods

- Scour the web for national development plans => Electronic archive of 167 national development plans for 125 countries.
- Directed and summative content analysis (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005) of these plans => Excel database of plans for word counts, prominence of terms, location of terms.
- Conventional content analysis (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005) of these plans for more qualitative understanding of meaning.

# Communicative rationality vs. linear/ends-means rationality

- Linear/Ends-means rationality is the traditional form of planning:
  - set goals/targets,
  - organise and deploy resources to meet those targets,
  - results-based management, input-output tables, social cost-benefit analysis, linear programming, PERT, etc.
  - Search for specific end point or “optimal” solution.
- The large proportion of plans (60% +) based on communicative rationality is a key feature of the new national planning.
- Communicative rationality is based on the search for pragmatic amelioration, grounded in a broad consensus in a specific context, often allied with adaptive or “agile” management style.

# Different Types of Plans and Planning

Chimhowu, Hulme and Munro, 2019

<p><b>Type A (26%)</b> Largely top-down process Rational blue print Strong evidence base Limited social embeddedness</p>	<p><b>Type B (42%)</b> Largely bottom-up process Communicative Rationality Strong evidence base Socially embedded</p>
<p><b>Type C (12%)</b> Largely top-down process Disjointed blue print Weak evidence base Limited social embeddedness</p>	<p><b>Type D (20%)</b> Largely bottom-up process Communicative Rationality Weak evidence base Socially embedded</p>

# What does “success” look like?

- In many cases, attainment of the SDGs.
- Political support for SDGs: A mile wide and an inch deep?
  - Say yes, do no (e.g. Canada).
  - Development dissidents (ref. Munro, 2020) pursue a very different development agenda.
- Most plans do not take gender or inequality seriously, despite SDG5 and SDG10 (ref. Munro and Granger, 2020).

# Pathways to success – Type A Plans

- Type A Plans: Top-down, linear rationality, technically strong, limited social embeddedness.
- Strengths: Clarity, rigor, state commitment
- Challenges/Issues: Limited buy-in from social actors, trouble adapting to radically changed circumstances; vulnerable to change of government.
- Example: Indian planning in 1950s-80s, Benin 2016-21



# Pathways to success – Type B Plans

- Type B plans: Communicative rationality, technically strong, socially embedded.
- Strengths:
  - Clarity, rigor,
  - Broad social and political support; less vulnerable to change of government?
- Challenges/Issues:
  - How to evaluate and communicate “success”.
- Example: Benin 2011-15; Uganda 2015-21

# Pathways to success – Type C Plans

- Type C plans: Top-down, linear rationality, technically weak, limited social embeddedness.
- Strengths:
  - None, except perhaps as political signaling.
- Challenges/Issues:
  - A plan destined to “collect dust on the shelf”?
  - A political signal to opponents, civil society, private sector, international actors?
- Example: Zimbabwe, ZimASSET 2013-18. Peru

# Pathways to success – Type D Plans

- Type D plans: Communicative rationality, technically weak, limited social embeddedness.
- Strengths:
  - Communicative rationality has potential, but political commitment is questionable
- Challenges/Issues:
  - Key question: is it “weak by design” or is technical weakness due to lack of capacity or incoherent process?
- Example: Togo 2013-17

# Resilience, development and planning: How do they fit together?

- National development planning is not just a technical exercise.
- It is deeply political too.
- Need to understand both dimensions of planning.
- Is there a “best” type of national development planning?
  - Unclear, though C and D hold little promise for developmental purposes. (They may have other purposes!)
- Likely, it is a question of “best fit” (ref. Ramalingam et al. 2014) between planning type and regime type, rather than “best practice”.

# Recommended Readings:

- Chimhowu, A., Hulme, D., & Munro, L.T. 2019. “The ‘New’ national development planning and global development goals: Processes and partnerships”. *World Development*, Vol. 120.
- Hsiu-Fang Hsieh and Sarah E. Shannon. (2005). “Three approaches to qualitative content analysis”. *Qualitative Health Research*, Vol. 15, No. 9, pp. 1277-1288.
- Munro, L.T. 2020. “The resurgence of national development planning: How did we get back here?” *International Development Planning Review*, Vol. 42, No. 2.
- Munro, L.T. and Granger, L. 2020. “Women need not apply? Gender in the new national planning”. Presentation to the World Bank Gender Leads, 18 May 2020.
- Ramalingam, B. et al. 2014 . “From best practice to best fit: understanding and navigating wicked problems in international development”, ODI Working Paper, ODI, London. July.

# **Thank you! Merci!**

**Lauchlan T. Munro**  
**School of International Development and Global Studies**  
**FSS8006, 120 University Private**  
**Ottawa, ON, K1N 6N5**

[www.nationalplanning.org](http://www.nationalplanning.org)

**lmunro@uottawa.ca**