Planning Manual

Centre for Administrative Service

Table of Contents

Right-click and select 'Update Field' to generate the Table of Contents.

Right-click the table above and select “Update Field” to generate page numbers.

Preface

This Manual provides guidance on the practice of administrative planning in the modern state. It is a systematic treatment of the functions, processes, and craft of planning: the disciplines by which a government determines what it will aim to achieve over time, how it will get there, and how it will know. The Manual covers foresight and situational diagnosis, strategy and plan production, the linkage from plan to budget, the monitoring and revision of plans, and the special contexts that alter the planning craft. It is the companion to the Administrative State Manual and assumes the reader has mastered the doctrine of that volume or its equivalent.

The Manual is written for the Planner as a dedicated professional category, and for those who discharge planning functions under other titles — ministerial advisors, statistical analysts, finance managers, policy officers, and the senior officials who supervise planning work. It is also written for those who study planning, for those who advise planners, and for those who are building planning capacity in jurisdictions where it is still developing. The techniques and principles it covers are drawn from comparative planning practice across many jurisdictions and traditions; they are not the property of any single polity.

The Manual is organized in five parts. Part I establishes the foundations of planning statecraft — what planning is, where it sits in government, how it relates to political authority, what it encompasses, and why planning capacity matters. Part II covers the disciplines that precede strategy: foresight and horizon scanning, scenario methods, trend analysis and driver mapping, the baseline and situational diagnosis, and strategic risk assessment. Part III treats strategy and plan production — the national development plan, sectoral plans, spatial plans, the capital investment plan, the planning cycle, and the drafting, consultation, and approval of plans. Part IV covers the disciplines that connect plans to action: the plan-to-budget linkage, the medium-term fiscal framework, plan execution monitoring, and plan revision. Part V addresses special contexts and the planner's craft — crisis and continuity planning, spatial and regional development, comparative planning traditions, the planner's judgment, drafting and communication, and the planner's toolkit.

The standard the Planning Manual trains the Planner toward is this: the Planner who has mastered the Manual should understand the functions of planning statecraft, should be able to execute those functions to a professional standard, should be able to assess and improve the planning systems they work within, and should be able to serve the public and the constitutional order with competence and integrity. Corrections and proposed revisions should be submitted through the standard review process.

Chapter 1 — What Administrative Planning Is

Part I: Foundations of Administrative Planning — The discipline of determining what the state will aim to achieve over time, how it will get there, and how it will know.

1.1 Definition

Administrative planning is the systematic discipline by which a government determines the objectives it will pursue over a defined period, identifies the means by which those objectives will be achieved, and establishes the measures by which progress will be assessed. It is conducted within the institutions of the state, under the direction of political authority, and within the legal framework enacted by the legislature. Every modern state engages in planning of some form. The variation between states lies in the quality and rigor of the practice, not in whether planning occurs.

The term carries four load-bearing elements. Planning, as distinct from the plan, is the activity: the process of foresight, diagnosis, strategy, and production. The plan is the artefact: the document that records the results of the process and commits the state to a course of action. The planner is the professional who conducts the activity and produces the artefact. Foresight, baseline, and strategy are the substantive disciplines within planning, treated in Parts II and III of this Manual.

Planning is systematic. A government that responds to events as they arise, that states objectives without identifying means, or that allocates resources without a statement of purpose, is conducting other functions that may be useful but that do not constitute planning. Planning requires the connection of objectives to means, of means to measures, and of measures to revision. Where the connection is absent, the discipline has not been practiced.

The discipline is administrative. It is conducted by officials within institutions, under political direction, and within the legal framework. The planner does not set the objectives of the state; that is the function of political authority. The planner does not enact laws; that is the function of the legislature. The planner's work is to make political direction operational: to convert objectives into actions, to identify the means required, and to establish the measures by which execution will be assessed.

1.2 Planning and Adjacent Functions

Planning is related to four adjacent functions: budgeting, project management, policy-making, and forecasting. Each overlaps with planning and each depends on planning, but the functions are distinct. Confusion among them produces characteristic failures: a government that treats budgeting as planning allocates resources without strategic direction; a government that treats project management as planning executes projects without coherence; a government that treats policy-making as planning announces positions without means; a government that treats forecasting as planning projects the future without acting on it.

Budgeting is the annual allocation of financial resources to programmes and activities. Planning establishes what the state aims to achieve over the medium term; budgeting allocates resources for the next fiscal year. The two are linked through the plan-to-budget process, treated in Chapter 18, by which the plan's first-year commitments are costed and submitted for legislative approval. The plan is produced by the planning authority; the budget is produced by the finance ministry; the two are reconciled through the linkage process.

Project management is the discipline of delivering a defined output within defined constraints of time, cost, and quality. It is treated in the Administrative State Manual and is not re-derived here. The planner's concern is the selection and sequencing of projects, not their execution. The capital investment plan, treated in Chapter 15, is the statement of the projects the state intends to undertake; the execution of those projects is a project management function.

Policy-making is the process by which the state determines its substantive positions on public questions. It is the function of political authority, supported by policy advisors. Planning and policy-making are related: the plan expresses the state's policy objectives over the planning horizon. The distinction is that policy-making asks what the state should do, while planning asks how the state will do it, over what period, with what means, and against what measures. Both capacities are required for effective government.

Forecasting is the projection of future conditions on the basis of past and present data. It is an input to planning, not a substitute for it. A forecast states what is likely to happen if present trends continue; a plan states what the state intends to do in response. Forecasting is the function of the statistics office and the economic forecasting authority. The planner uses forecasts as inputs to the baseline, treated in Chapter 9, but does not produce them.

1.3 The Planner as a Professional Category

The Planner is a dedicated professional category within the public service. The defining competence is the ability to conduct the planning discipline — foresight, diagnosis, strategy, plan production, and plan revision — to a professional standard, under political direction, and within the institutional framework of the state. The Planner may serve at any level, from the junior analyst in a sectoral ministry to the head of the central planning office. The craft is the same at every level; the scale and scope differ.

The Planner serves political authority. The objectives of the plan are set by the elected government. The Planner's role is to make those objectives operational, to advise on feasibility, to identify the means required, and to surface the risks and trade-offs that political authority must consider. The Planner does not set objectives, does not choose between objectives, and does not substitute personal judgment for political direction. The duty is to serve the government of the day with competence and honesty, to provide advice that is accurate even when unwelcome, and to implement the government's decisions once made. This relationship is treated in Chapter 3.

The Planner works within institutions. Every jurisdiction organises its planning function differently. Some maintain a central planning office: France's Commissariat Général du Plan, historically; Indonesia's Bappenas; Singapore's Strategy Group. Others locate the planning function within the finance ministry: the United Kingdom's Treasury, New Zealand's Treasury. Others distribute the function across sectoral ministries with coordination by a central body: China's National Development and Reform Commission, Germany's sectoral planning tradition. The

Manual describes the craft of planning in terms applicable to any of these arrangements. The institutional variation is treated comparatively in Chapter 25.

The Planner's career path, rank, and certification are matters for each jurisdiction's personnel authority. The Manual describes the competencies the Planner must possess, the judgment the Planner must exercise, and the toolkit the Planner must master. The corresponding role definition, rank placement, and training programme are determined by the civil service commission and the training institutions of each jurisdiction. The Planner's competencies are treated in Chapter 28; the Planner's judgment in Chapter 26.

1.4 The Product of Planning

The product of planning is the plan: a document that records the results of the planning process and commits the state to a course of action over a defined period. The plan is the artefact; planning is the activity that produces it. Both are required: the process without the artefact is unstable, and the artefact without the process is a document without foundation.

A plan contains four elements. It states the objectives the state aims to achieve over the planning period. It states the means by which those objectives will be pursued: the policies, programmes, investments, and institutional reforms. It states the measures by which progress will be assessed: the indicators, targets, and milestones. It states the assumptions on which the plan rests: the demographic, economic, fiscal, and geopolitical conditions the plan takes as given. A document that lacks any of these elements may be useful, but it does not constitute a plan as the term is used in this Manual.

The plan distinguishes between assumptions and commitments. Assumptions are the conditions the plan takes as given; commitments are the actions the state undertakes. Assumptions may prove incorrect and are revised through the plan amendment process, treated in Chapter 21. Commitments are binding until formally revised. The distinction is maintained throughout the plan's lifecycle and is the basis for plan revision when conditions change.

The plan's logic requires that every objective be linked to the means by which it will be achieved, and that every allocation of means be linked to the objective it serves. A plan in which the means do not connect to the ends, or in which the ends exceed the means, is a plan that will fail in execution. Maintaining the integrity of this logic is the planner's responsibility. The plan-to-budget linkage, treated in Chapter 18, is the principal mechanism by which the logic is tested against fiscal reality.

1.5 The Standard of the Manual

The Manual trains the Planner toward the professional execution of the planning discipline. The standard comprises four elements: understanding the functions of planning statecraft; executing those functions to a professional standard; assessing and improving the planning systems within which the Planner works; and serving the public and the constitutional order with competence and integrity.

The standard applies to every element of the Planner's work: every baseline constructed, every assumption stated, every recommendation given, every monitoring report produced. A baseline that is optimistic because the truth is unwelcome does not meet the standard. A strategy that evades hard choices because the choices are politically difficult does not meet the standard. A plan that is not linked to the budget does not meet the standard. A monitoring system that reports what is flattering rather than what is accurate does not meet the standard. Consistency is required across all elements of the work.

The standard is comparative. The Planner's work is assessed against the practice of mature jurisdictions, not against local practice alone. A Planner whose work is adequate by local standards but would not meet the standard in Paris, Singapore, Beijing, or London has not yet mastered the discipline. The comparative dimension is not a matter of copying what other jurisdictions do; it is a matter of knowing what the discipline requires and holding one's own work to that standard. Comparative planning traditions are treated in Chapter 25; the comparative principle applies throughout the Manual.

The standard is ethical. The Planner's duty is to produce honest work: honest baselines, honest assessments of feasibility, honest identification of risks, honest reporting of progress. Political pressure may push toward optimism; institutional inertia may push toward conformity; budgetary pressure may push toward understatement. The Planner's integrity is the capacity to produce work that is accurate despite these pressures. The ethical dimension of planning is treated in Chapter 3.

1.6 Worked Example: Distinguishing a Plan from a Budget Submission

Consider a ministry directed to prepare a five-year plan for the expansion of rural water supply. The minister has announced the intention to extend piped water to 90 per cent of rural households within five years. The Planner assigned to the task must produce a plan that meets the standard set out in this Manual.

The plan must state the objective with precision. The political direction — 90 per cent of rural households within five years — must be converted into a plan objective that specifies the definition of “rural household,” the standard of service (piped water to the dwelling, to a yard tap, to a community standpipe within a defined distance), the baseline coverage rate, and the annual trajectory by which the target will be reached. The Planner's first task is to convert political direction into an objective that is precise enough to be implemented and measured.

The plan must state the means. Extending rural water supply requires investment in infrastructure — boreholes, treatment plants, distribution networks — and investment in institutional capacity — the water authority's operational capability, local government's maintenance capability — and changes to the regulatory framework — tariff setting, quality standards, service accountability. The plan identifies the scale of investment required, the sequence in which it will be undertaken, the institutional arrangements for delivery, and the regulatory changes needed. The means must be sufficient to the objective; if the means are insufficient, the objective must be revised or the means must be increased.

The plan must state the measures. Progress toward the target is tracked by indicators: the number of households connected, the percentage of the rural population served, the functionality rate of water points, the average hours of service per day, the water quality compliance rate. Each indicator has a baseline, a target, and annual milestones. The measures are designed to detect both progress and problems: a system that reports connections but not functionality will not reveal whether the investment is delivering the service intended.

The budget submission is a separate document, produced after the plan is approved. The budget submission allocates resources for the next fiscal year, drawing on the plan's first-year milestones. The budget submission must be consistent with the plan — it funds the activities the plan says will be undertaken in that year — but it is concerned with the annual allocation, while the plan is concerned with the five-year trajectory. The two documents are distinct, and the Planner produces the plan while supporting the budget submission that follows.

The example illustrates the Planner's craft. The Planner receives political direction, converts it into a plan objective, identifies the means, designs the measures, produces the plan, and supports the subsequent budget submission. The work requires foresight, diagnosis, strategy, production, linkage, and monitoring. These are the disciplines treated in the chapters that follow.

1.7 Chapter Summary

Administrative planning is the systematic discipline by which a government determines what it will aim to achieve over a defined period, how it intends to achieve it, and how it will know whether it has been achieved. It is distinguished from budgeting by its medium-term horizon and its focus on objectives; from project management by its concern with selection and sequencing; from policy-making by its operational focus; and from forecasting by its commitment to action.

The Planner is a dedicated professional category whose defining competence is the ability to conduct the planning discipline to a professional standard, under political direction, and within the institutional framework of the state. The Planner serves political authority, works within institutions, and produces the plan as the artefact of the discipline. Career path, rank, and certification are matters for each jurisdiction's personnel authority.

The product of planning is the plan: a document that states objectives, means, measures, and assumptions. The plan distinguishes between assumptions and commitments, and requires that objectives be linked to means and means to objectives. The plan-to-budget linkage is the principal mechanism by which the plan's logic is tested against fiscal reality.

The standard of the Manual is the professional execution of the planning discipline, assessed comparatively and applied ethically. The standard applies to every element of the Planner's work. The chapters that follow treat the disciplines of planning in detail, from foresight through revision.

Chapter 2 — The Planning Function in Government

The institutional arrangements by which planning is conducted vary across jurisdictions. This chapter describes the common functions and the principal institutional forms, without prescribing a single model.

2.1 The Planning Function

Planning is conducted through institutions. The function comprises the production of plans, the maintenance of the planning cycle, the coordination of sectoral and spatial plans, and the linkage of plans to budgets. These activities are performed by officials within government, under political direction, and within the legal framework. The institutional location of the function varies, but the function itself is constant.

The planning function has four components regardless of where it is housed. The first is foresight: the systematic assessment of trends, risks, and opportunities over the planning horizon. The second is diagnosis: the construction of a baseline that states where the jurisdiction stands at the start of the period. The third is strategy: the identification of objectives and the means to achieve them. The fourth is production: the drafting, consultation, approval, and maintenance of the plan document. Each component is treated in detail in subsequent Parts of this Manual.

The planning function is distinct from the budgeting function, the policy advisory function, and the statistical function. It intersects with all three and depends on inputs from each, but the planning function produces a distinct output: the plan. A government that locates planning within the finance ministry must distinguish the planning function from the budgeting function; a government that locates planning within a policy unit must distinguish it from the policy advisory function; a government that locates planning within the statistics office must distinguish it from the statistical function. The distinction is maintained through the plan document, which is the planning function's specific product.

2.2 Institutional Forms

Three institutional forms predominate across mature jurisdictions. The first is the central planning office: a dedicated body, located at the centre of government or within a planning ministry, responsible for producing the national plan and coordinating sectoral plans. The second is the finance-ministry model: the planning function is located within the finance ministry, integrated with the budget function. The third is the distributed model: the planning function is distributed across sectoral ministries, coordinated by a central body.

The central planning office model was exemplified by France's Commissariat Général du Plan, established in 1946 and operational through the indicative planning era. Indonesia's Bappenas follows a similar form, producing the RPJMN and coordinating sectoral planning. Singapore's Strategy Group, within the Prime Minister's Office, combines strategic planning with foresight. The central planning office model separates the planning function from the budget function, which may strengthen the plan's strategic independence but may weaken the plan-to-budget linkage.

The finance-ministry model locates planning within the treasury. The United Kingdom's HM Treasury produces the spending review and the long-term fiscal projections; New Zealand's Treasury produces the long-term fiscal position and the wellbeing framework. This model integrates planning with fiscal reality, strengthening the plan-to-budget linkage, but may subordinate strategic planning to fiscal management. The planning function in this model is often a unit within the fiscal or economic division rather than a distinct office.

The distributed model assigns planning to sectoral ministries and coordinates through a central body. China's National Development and Reform Commission coordinates the five-year plan system while sectoral ministries produce sectoral plans and provincial governments produce provincial plans. Germany's planning tradition distributes the function across federal and Länder ministries. The distributed model leverages sectoral expertise but requires strong coordination to maintain coherence across plans. The coordination mechanism is the critical element; without it, the distributed model produces a collection of sectoral documents rather than a national plan.

2.3 Relationships with Other Functions

The planning function maintains defined relationships with four adjacent functions: the statistics function, the budget function, the policy advisory function, and the audit function. Each relationship is governed by the exchange of inputs and outputs, and each is subject to characteristic failures when the exchange is weak.

The statistics function produces the demographic, economic, and social data on which the baseline is constructed. The planning function depends on the statistics office for the baseline and for the indicators used in monitoring. The relationship fails when the statistics are delayed, when the data quality is poor, or when the planning function constructs its own data in parallel with the statistics office. The mature practice is for the planning function to draw exclusively on the statistics office for official data, with the statistics office responsible for methodological consistency and publication standards.

The budget function allocates resources annually. The planning function provides the medium-term framework within which the annual budget is set. The relationship is governed by the plan-to-budget linkage, treated in Chapter 18. The relationship fails when the budget ignores the plan, when the plan ignores fiscal reality, or when the two functions produce documents that are not reconciled. The mature practice is for the planning function and the budget function to operate in a defined cycle, with the plan setting the framework and the budget executing the first year.

The policy advisory function provides advice to political authority on substantive positions. The planning function translates policy into operational commitments. The relationship fails when policy advice is not translated into plans, or when plans are produced without policy direction. The mature practice is for the planning function to receive policy direction as an input and to produce the plan as the operational expression of that direction.

The audit function, whether internal or external, assesses the execution of the plan. The planning function provides the plan as the benchmark against which execution is audited. The relationship fails when the plan is not auditable, when the audit does not use the plan as a benchmark, or when audit findings are not fed back into plan revision. The mature practice is for the planning function to design plans that are auditable and for the audit function to report against the plan's measures.

2.4 The Planner's Institutional Position

The Planner works within whichever institutional form the jurisdiction has established. The craft is the same; the institutional constraints differ. A Planner in a central planning office works with greater strategic independence but must build the plan-to-budget linkage through negotiation with the finance ministry. A Planner in a finance ministry works with direct access to the fiscal framework but must protect the strategic dimension from being subordinated to annual budgeting. A Planner in a sectoral ministry works with sectoral expertise but must align the sectoral plan with the national plan through coordination.

The Planner's reporting line matters for the integrity of the work. A Planner who reports to a senior official with direct access to political authority can provide honest advice that reaches the decision-maker. A Planner who reports through several layers of management may find that honest advice is filtered before it reaches the decision-maker. The mature practice is for the planning function to report at a level that permits direct communication with political authority on planning matters, whether through the head of the central planning office, through a deputy minister, or through a cabinet-level official.

The Planner's institutional position does not determine the quality of the work, but it constrains it. A Planner who produces honest baselines in an institution that rewards optimism must find ways to maintain integrity without losing access. A Planner who produces strategic plans in an institution that subordinates strategy to fiscal management must find ways to maintain the strategic dimension. These are institutional challenges that the craft of planning must accommodate, not problems that the Manual can resolve. The Planner's judgment, treated in Chapter 26, is the faculty by which these challenges are navigated.

2.5 Chapter Summary

The planning function comprises foresight, diagnosis, strategy, and production, conducted within institutions and under political direction. The function is distinct from budgeting, policy advisory, and statistical functions, though it depends on inputs from each. The institutional forms that predominate across mature jurisdictions are the central planning office, the finance-ministry model, and the distributed model. Each form has characteristic strengths and weaknesses.

The planning function maintains defined relationships with the statistics, budget, policy advisory, and audit functions. Each relationship is governed by the exchange of inputs and outputs and is subject to characteristic failures. The mature practice is for the planning function to draw exclusively on the statistics office for data, to operate in a defined cycle with the budget function, to receive policy direction as an input, and to design plans that are auditable.

The Planner works within whichever institutional form the jurisdiction has established. The craft is constant; the institutional constraints differ. The reporting line and the level of access to political authority are determinants of the planning function's effectiveness. The institutional position constrains the work but does not determine its quality; the Planner's judgment navigates the constraints.

Chapter 3 — Planning and Politics

The relationship between planning and political authority is governed by the principle that the planner serves the government of the day while maintaining the integrity of the discipline. This chapter treats the principle and its operational requirements.

3.1 The Principle

The planner serves political authority. The objectives of the plan are set by the elected government; the planner's role is to make those objectives operational, to advise on feasibility, to identify the means required, and to surface the risks. The planner does not set objectives, does not choose between objectives, and does not substitute personal judgment for political direction. The duty is to serve the government of the day with competence and honesty.

The principle has two corollaries that govern the planner's conduct. The first is the duty of honest advice: the planner provides assessments that are accurate even when unwelcome, identifies risks that political authority must consider, and states the trade-offs that the plan's choices entail. The second is the duty of faithful implementation: once the government has made its decisions, the planner implements those decisions competently, regardless of whether the planner agreed with them. The two duties are complementary. Honest advice is given before the decision; faithful implementation follows it.

The principle applies across changes of government. A new government may revise the plan, may change the objectives, or may abandon the plan entirely. The planner serves the new government with the same competence and honesty as the previous one. The planner does not sabotage the new government's policies, does not leak to embarrass the government, and does not use the planning function to advance a political position. The plan is the government's plan; the planner's role is to produce and maintain it.

3.2 Political Direction and Plan Content

Political direction is the input to the plan. The direction may take the form of a manifesto, a speech from the throne, a ministerial statement, or a cabinet decision. The planner receives the direction, assesses its feasibility, identifies the means required, and produces the plan that operationalises the direction. The planner does not critique the direction's merits; the planner assesses its feasibility and identifies what it requires.

Political direction is often imprecise. A direction to improve rural water supply does not specify the standard of service, the target coverage, the timeline, or the budgetary implications. The planner's first task is to convert imprecise direction into precise objectives. This requires technical analysis and judgment, conducted in consultation with the relevant sectoral ministries and the finance ministry. The conversion is the planner's responsibility; the output is a set of objectives that are precise enough to be implemented and measured.

Political direction may be infeasible. The objectives announced by political authority may exceed the available means, may conflict with each other, or may rest on assumptions that the planner's analysis does not support. The planner's duty in such cases is to state the infeasibility, to identify the constraints, and to propose alternatives that achieve as much of the direction as the constraints permit. The planner does not silently adjust the objectives to make them feasible; the planner presents the infeasibility to political authority and lets the decision rest with the decision-maker.

3.3 The Duty of Honest Advice

Honest advice is the planner's contribution to the quality of decisions. The advice covers feasibility, risk, and trade-off. Feasibility advice states whether the objectives can be achieved with the available means, and if not, what additional means would be required or what reduced objectives would be feasible. Risk advice states the conditions under which the plan may fail, the probability and consequences of those conditions, and the measures that would mitigate the risk. Trade-off advice states the choices that the plan entails: which objectives are pursued at the expense of others, which regions or populations are prioritised, and which costs are borne by whom.

Honest advice is given in writing, through the plan document and the supporting memoranda, and orally, through briefings to the decision-maker. The written record is the durable form; the oral briefing is the immediate form. Both are required. A planner who gives honest advice only orally leaves no record and cannot be held accountable; a planner who gives honest advice only in writing may find that the advice is not read. The mature practice is to give advice in both forms, with the written record supporting the oral briefing.

Honest advice may be unwelcome. The planner who states that a ministerial announcement is infeasible, that a favoured project is not the priority, or that the fiscal framework cannot support the announced objectives is giving advice that political authority may not wish to hear. The planner's integrity is the capacity to give such advice without flinching. The planner who adjusts the advice to match what political authority wishes to hear has not met the standard, however convenient the adjustment may be in the short term. The relationship between political authority and the planner is treated in the Administrative State Manual, Chapter 38, and is not re-derived here.

3.4 Transitions of Government

A transition of government may require the revision or replacement of the plan. The new government has the authority to change the objectives, to redirect the means, or to abandon the plan and produce a new one. The planner's role in a transition is to provide the new government with an honest assessment of the existing plan: what it has achieved, what it has not achieved, what it would take to complete it, and what it would take to replace it.

The planner does not advocate for the existing plan. The plan is the previous government's plan, and the new government has no obligation to it. The planner's duty is to provide the information that the new government needs to make its decisions, not to defend the previous government's choices. A planner who advocates for the existing plan is substituting personal judgment for political direction; a planner who sabotages the existing plan to favour the new government's preferences is failing in faithful implementation.

The transition period is a test of the planner's professionalism. The new government may be suspicious of officials who served the previous government; the planner must demonstrate that the planning function serves the government of the day, regardless of which party holds office. The standard practice is for the planner to prepare a transition brief that states the current state of the plan, the options available to the new government, and the implications of each option. The brief is factual, not advisory; the decisions are the new government's to make.

3.5 Chapter Summary

The planner serves political authority. The objectives of the plan are set by the elected government; the planner's role is to make those objectives operational, to advise on feasibility, to identify the means, and to surface the risks. The duty of honest advice and the duty of faithful implementation are complementary: honest advice is given before the decision, faithful implementation follows it.

Political direction is often imprecise and may be infeasible. The planner's task is to convert imprecise direction into precise objectives and to state infeasibility when it arises. The planner does not silently adjust objectives to make them feasible; the planner presents the constraints and lets the decision rest with the decision-maker.

A transition of government may require the revision or replacement of the plan. The planner provides the new government with an honest assessment of the existing plan and the options available. The transition brief is factual, not advisory; the decisions are the new government's to make.

Chapter 4 — The Scope of Planning Statecraft

Planning statecraft encompasses the disciplines by which the state determines its objectives over time and the means to achieve them. This chapter defines the scope and distinguishes what planning includes from what it does not.

4.1 What Planning Includes

Planning statecraft includes seven disciplines, treated in the Parts that follow. Foresight and horizon scanning is the systematic assessment of trends, risks, and opportunities over the planning horizon. Scenario methods is the construction of alternative futures against which strategy is tested. Trend analysis and driver mapping is the identification of the forces shaping the planning environment. The baseline and situational diagnosis is the planner's accounting of where the jurisdiction stands at the start of the period. Strategic risk assessment is the identification and assessment of risks to the plan's assumptions and feasibility.

Strategy and strategic planning is the disciplined choice of objectives and the identification of means. Plan production covers the national development plan, sectoral plans, spatial plans, the capital investment plan, the planning cycle, and the drafting, consultation, and approval of plans. The plan-to-budget linkage connects the plan to the annual budget. The medium-term fiscal framework provides the fiscal envelope. Plan execution monitoring tracks progress against the plan. Plan revision maintains the plan as a living instrument.

Special contexts cover crisis and contingency planning, continuity and recovery planning, and spatial and regional development planning. Comparative planning traditions provide the reference against which the planner's own practice is assessed. The planner's judgment, drafting, and toolkit cover the craft elements that distinguish the competent planner from the credentialed one.

4.2 What Planning Does Not Include

Planning does not include the execution of the plan. Execution is an administrative function, treated in the Administrative State Manual, Chapter 7. The planner's role in execution is monitoring: tracking progress against the plan's measures, identifying deviations, and advising on corrective action. The planner does not manage projects, does not deliver services, and does not execute programmes; the planner produces and maintains the plan against which execution is assessed.

Planning does not include the formulation of policy. Policy formulation is the function of political authority, supported by policy advisors. The planner receives policy direction as an input and translates it into operational commitments. A planner who formulates policy is exceeding the role; a planner who does not translate policy into plans is failing in the role. The distinction is maintained through the plan document, which states the policy as received and the operational commitments that follow from it.

Planning does not include the production of statistics. Statistics are produced by the statistics office, under methodological standards that ensure consistency and reliability. The planner uses statistics as inputs to the baseline and to monitoring, but does not produce them. A planner who produces statistics in parallel with the statistics office creates inconsistency and undermines the authority of the official statistical system.

Planning does not include financial management. Financial management is the function of the finance ministry and the accounting officers, treated in the Administrative State Manual, Chapter 9. The planner produces the plan that the budget executes; the planner does not execute the budget. The distinction is maintained through the plan-to-budget linkage, which connects the plan to the budget without conflating the two functions.

4.3 The Boundaries of the Discipline

The boundaries of the planning discipline are maintained through the plan document. The plan states what the state will do, not what the state will think about doing; it states the means, not the analysis of options; it states the measures, not the methodology of measurement. The analysis, the options, and the methodology are inputs to the plan and are documented in the supporting memoranda, not in the plan itself. The plan is a commitment, not a discussion.

The boundaries are also maintained through the planning cycle. The cycle separates the phases of planning — foresight, diagnosis, strategy, production, monitoring, revision — and assigns each phase to a defined period. A planning process in which the phases are conflated — where strategy is being revised during production, or where monitoring is being conducted before the plan is approved — is a process that has lost its discipline. The cycle, treated in Chapter 16, is the temporal structure that maintains the boundaries.

The boundaries are maintained through the institutional separation of functions. The planner produces the plan; the finance ministry produces the budget; the statistics office produces the data; the audit office assesses the execution. Each function has its own institution, its own standards, and its own accountability. The planning function that absorbs the other functions — that produces its own statistics, that executes its own budget, that audits its own execution — has lost the discipline that comes from institutional separation. The mature practice is for the planning function to maintain its boundaries and to depend on the other functions for their respective inputs.

4.4 Chapter Summary

Planning statecraft includes the disciplines of foresight, diagnosis, strategy, production, linkage, monitoring, and revision, plus the special contexts and the craft elements. These are treated in the Parts and chapters that follow. Planning does not include execution, policy formulation, statistical production, or financial management. These are distinct functions, treated in the Administrative State Manual or conducted by other institutions.

The boundaries of the discipline are maintained through the plan document, the planning cycle, and the institutional separation of functions. The plan is a commitment, not a discussion; the cycle separates the phases of planning; the institutional separation prevents the planning function from absorbing the other functions. The planning function maintains its boundaries and depends on the other functions for their respective inputs.

Chapter 5 — Why Planning Capacity Matters

Planning capacity is a determinant of state effectiveness. This chapter states the relationship between planning capacity and the state's ability to govern, and identifies the consequences of weak planning.

5.1 Planning Capacity and State Effectiveness

Planning capacity is the state's ability to determine what it will aim to achieve, to identify the means, and to monitor progress. A state with strong planning capacity can convert political direction into operational commitments, can allocate resources against strategic priorities, and can adjust course when conditions change. A state with weak planning capacity cannot do these things, regardless of the quality of its political leadership or the adequacy of its resources.

The relationship between planning capacity and state effectiveness is observable across jurisdictions. The states that consistently produce and execute credible medium-term plans — France during the indicative planning era, Singapore since independence, China since the reform period, Indonesia since the introduction of the RPJMN system — are states that have converted political direction into sustained operational programmes. The states that struggle to produce or execute plans are states where political direction dissipates into uncoordinated sectoral action, where budgets are not linked to strategic priorities, and where monitoring is absent or unreliable.

Planning capacity is not the only determinant of state effectiveness. Administrative capacity, fiscal capacity, institutional capacity, and political capacity all matter, and all are treated in the Administrative State Manual. But planning capacity is the capacity that connects the others: it is through planning that administrative capacity is directed toward objectives, that fiscal capacity is allocated against priorities, and that institutional capacity is mobilised for sustained programmes. A state with strong administrative, fiscal, and institutional capacity but weak planning capacity will execute well but will not execute coherently; it will be efficient without being effective.

5.2 The Consequences of Weak Planning

Weak planning produces characteristic failures. The first is the gap between policy and execution: political direction is announced but is not translated into operational commitments, with the result that the direction remains an intention. The second is the gap between plan and budget: plans are produced but are not linked to the budget, with the result that the plan is not funded and the budget is not strategic. The third is the gap between commitment and monitoring: plans are approved but progress is not tracked, with the result that deviations are not detected and corrective action is not taken.

These gaps compound. A plan that is not linked to the budget is a plan that will not be executed; a plan that is not monitored is a plan whose failure will not be detected until it is too late for corrective action; a plan that is not revised in light of changing conditions is a plan that will become irrelevant within its own planning period. The compounding effect is that weak planning capacity produces plans that are published and ignored, with the result that the act of planning is discredited and the capacity is further weakened.

The consequence for the state is a loss of strategic direction. A state that cannot plan cannot set priorities over time, cannot allocate resources against those priorities, and cannot adjust course when conditions change. The state's actions become reactive rather than strategic: the government responds to events rather than shaping them, and the allocation of resources is driven by incremental adjustment to the previous year's budget rather than by a forward-looking assessment of priorities. The state may remain administratively competent — it may deliver services, collect taxes, and enforce laws — but it cannot pursue sustained programmes that require commitment over multiple years.

5.3 Planning Capacity and Legitimacy

Planning capacity contributes to state legitimacy. A state that produces credible plans, executes them, and reports honestly on progress demonstrates competence that sustains public confidence. A state that announces plans and does not execute them, or that reports progress that is not accurate, undermines the credibility of its commitments and erodes public trust. The relationship is direct: planning capacity is one of the mechanisms by which the state demonstrates that it can govern.

The relationship between planning capacity and legitimacy is not unique to planning. Administrative capacity, fiscal discipline, and institutional integrity all contribute to legitimacy, and all are treated in the Administrative State Manual. But planning capacity has a specific contribution: it is through planning that the state makes commitments over time, and it is through the execution of those commitments that the state demonstrates that its word can be trusted. A state whose plans are not credible cannot make credible commitments; a state that cannot make credible commitments cannot sustain the public's confidence over the long term.

The implication for the planner is that the integrity of the plan is a public good. A plan that is honest, that is feasible, that is linked to the budget, and that is monitored and revised is a plan that contributes to the state's legitimacy. A plan that is optimistic, that is not feasible, that is not linked to the budget, or that is not monitored is a plan that undermines legitimacy. The planner's duty is to produce plans of the first kind, not the second.

5.4 Chapter Summary

Planning capacity is a determinant of state effectiveness. A state with strong planning capacity can convert political direction into operational commitments, allocate resources against priorities, and adjust course when conditions change. The relationship between planning capacity and effectiveness is observable across jurisdictions: states that produce and execute credible medium-term plans are states that convert direction into sustained programmes.

Weak planning produces characteristic failures: the gap between policy and execution, the gap between plan and budget, and the gap between commitment and monitoring. These gaps compound, producing plans that are published and ignored, with the result that the act of planning is discredited and the capacity is further weakened. The consequence is a loss of strategic direction: the state's actions become reactive rather than strategic.

Planning capacity contributes to state legitimacy. A state that produces credible plans, executes them, and reports honestly on progress demonstrates competence that sustains public confidence. The integrity of the plan is a public good, and the planner's duty is to produce plans that are honest, feasible, linked to the budget, and monitored.

Chapter 6 — Foresight and Horizon Scanning

Foresight is the systematic assessment of trends, risks, and opportunities over the planning horizon. It is the discipline by which the planner looks beyond the immediate fiscal cycle to the conditions that will shape the next plan. This chapter treats the discipline and its institutional arrangements.

6.1 What Foresight Is

Foresight is the structured exploration of possible futures to inform present decisions. It is distinguished from forecasting by its purpose: forecasting projects what is likely to happen; foresight explores what could happen and what the implications would be. Foresight does not predict; it prepares. The discipline produces not a single projection but a range of possibilities, each with implications for the plan's assumptions and commitments.

Foresight is conducted over horizons longer than the budget cycle. The budget horizon is one year; the plan horizon is typically five years; foresight extends to ten, twenty, or thirty years. The longer the horizon, the greater the uncertainty and the less useful point forecasts become. Foresight addresses uncertainty by constructing multiple futures rather than projecting a single one. The planner uses foresight to test the plan's resilience: would the plan succeed under each of the futures considered, and if not, what would the plan need to change?

Foresight is an input to strategy, not a substitute for it. The foresight function produces the range of futures; the strategy function chooses the objectives and means. A planner who treats foresight as strategy is abdicating the choice; a planner who treats strategy as foresight is pretending that choices are predictions. The two disciplines are sequential: foresight first, strategy second. The relationship is maintained through the planning cycle, treated in Chapter 16.

6.2 Horizon Scanning

Horizon scanning is the systematic collection and assessment of signals that may indicate change. A signal is a piece of information that, if interpreted correctly, suggests a trend, a risk, or an opportunity that is not yet reflected in the baseline. Signals may be demographic, economic, technological, environmental, political, or social. The scanner's task is to collect signals broadly, to filter them for relevance, and to assess their significance for the planning horizon.

Sources for horizon scanning include the scientific literature, the technical press, government reports from other jurisdictions, international organisation assessments, patent filings, demographic data, and expert elicitation. The scanner does not rely on a single source type; the discipline requires breadth. The scanner also does not treat all sources as equivalent; the discipline requires assessment of source quality and bias. A structured scan covers defined source types on a defined schedule, with signals logged, assessed, and prioritised.

Weak signals are the particular object of horizon scanning. A weak signal is an early indicator of a change that, if it develops, would have significant implications for the plan. Weak signals are by definition not yet trends; they are isolated observations that may or may not consolidate into patterns. The scanner's challenge is to detect weak signals without being overwhelmed by noise. The discipline requires a framework for distinguishing signals that warrant further investigation from signals that do not, and a process for escalating significant signals to the strategy function.

6.3 Institutional Arrangements

Foresight is conducted through a range of institutional arrangements across mature jurisdictions. Singapore's Centre for Strategic Futures, established within the Prime Minister's Office strategy apparatus, conducts horizon scanning and scenario development as a continuous function. France's Commissariat Général du Plan, during its operational period, maintained a foresight capability that produced the prospective studies underlying the indicative plans. The United Kingdom's Government Office for Science, under the Chief Scientific Adviser, produces foresight reports on defined themes. Finland's Committee for the Future, a standing committee of the parliament, provides a parliamentary forum for foresight.

The institutional location of foresight affects its influence. A foresight function located at the centre of government — in the Prime Minister's Office, the Cabinet Office, or the strategy unit — has direct access to political authority and can feed foresight into strategic decisions. A foresight function located in a research institute or a university has independence and analytical depth but must build a channel to the decision-maker. A foresight function located within a line ministry has sectoral expertise but may lack the cross-sectoral perspective that foresight requires.

The planner's relationship to the foresight function depends on the institutional arrangement. Where a dedicated foresight body exists, the planner draws on its products and participates in its exercises. Where no dedicated body exists, the planner conducts foresight as part of the planning function, drawing on external expertise and on the statistics office for quantitative inputs. The Manual does not prescribe a single institutional form; it describes the discipline and the relationships that make foresight effective regardless of where it is housed.

6.4 The Foresight Process

The foresight process comprises four phases. The first is scoping: defining the question the foresight exercise will address, the horizon, and the scope. A foresight exercise on the future of energy supply over twenty years has a different scope from one on the future of public employment over ten years. The scoping phase produces a terms of reference that bounds the exercise.

The second phase is collection: gathering signals, data, and expert input. The collection phase uses horizon scanning, literature review, expert elicitation, and workshops. The output is a body of evidence on the trends, drivers, and uncertainties relevant to the question. The third phase is analysis: identifying the key drivers, constructing scenarios, and assessing implications. The analysis phase produces the foresight product: a set of scenarios or a structured assessment of the range of futures. The fourth phase is dissemination: communicating the foresight product to the strategy function and to political authority.

The foresight process is iterative, not linear. The collection phase may reveal that the scoping was too narrow; the analysis phase may identify gaps that require further collection; the dissemination phase may generate questions that require further analysis. Foresight is conducted as a cycle, with each iteration refining the question, the evidence, and the product. The cycle is conducted on a schedule that aligns with the planning cycle: a major foresight exercise at the start of each plan period, with lighter updates in intervening years.

6.5 Foresight and the Plan

Foresight informs the plan through the assumptions. The plan's assumptions state the conditions the plan takes as given: the demographic trajectory, the economic growth path, the geopolitical environment, the technological baseline. Foresight produces the range of plausible conditions; the plan selects from that range the assumptions on which it will rest. The selection is a judgment, not a prediction; the planner selects assumptions that are plausible, that are internally consistent, and that provide a reasonable basis for the plan's commitments.

Foresight also informs the plan through the risks. The scenarios produced by foresight identify the conditions under which the plan's assumptions may prove wrong. These conditions are treated as strategic risks, assessed in Chapter 10, and addressed through risk treatment in the plan. A plan that does not draw on foresight for its risk assessment is a plan that has not considered the conditions that could cause it to fail.

The relationship between foresight and the plan is maintained through the plan revision process. When conditions change — when a scenario begins to materialise — the plan's assumptions are revisited and, if necessary, revised. The revision is treated in Chapter 21. Foresight provides the early warning; the plan provides the commitment; the revision process provides the adaptation. The three together constitute the planner's response to uncertainty.

6.6 Worked Example: A Horizon Scan on Demographic Change

Consider a planning authority preparing a ten-year plan for health services. The planner initiates a horizon scan on demographic change to inform the plan's assumptions about the population the health system will serve. The scan addresses three questions: what is the projected population size and age structure over the horizon; what are the uncertainties in the projection; and what are the implications for health service demand.

The scoping phase defines the horizon at ten years, the geographic scope at the national level, and the questions to be addressed. The collection phase draws on the statistics office's population projections, on international organisation assessments of migration trends, and on expert elicitation on fertility and mortality assumptions. The scan also collects signals on factors that may affect the projections: changes in fertility behaviour, changes in life expectancy, changes in migration patterns, and changes in household composition.

The analysis phase identifies three key uncertainties: the migration rate, the fertility rate, and the rate of increase in life expectancy. The scan constructs three scenarios: a central scenario based on the statistics office's central projection; a high-demand scenario combining high migration, low fertility decline, and rapid life expectancy increase; and a low-demand scenario combining low migration, rapid fertility decline, and slow life expectancy increase. Each scenario is assessed for its implications for health service demand, for the age structure of the population, and for the geographic distribution of demand.

The dissemination phase communicates the scenarios to the strategy function. The planner recommends that the plan rest on the central scenario but be tested against the high-demand and low-demand scenarios. The testing identifies the plan elements that are robust across scenarios and the elements that are scenario-dependent. The robust elements are committed; the scenario-dependent elements are flagged for monitoring and revision. The scan is logged and scheduled for update in three years, with the update feeding the mid-cycle review of the plan.

6.7 Chapter Summary

Foresight is the structured exploration of possible futures to inform present decisions. It is distinguished from forecasting by its purpose and its horizon: forecasting projects what is likely; foresight explores what could happen. Foresight is conducted over horizons longer than the budget cycle and is an input to strategy, not a substitute for it.

Horizon scanning is the systematic collection and assessment of signals that may indicate change. The discipline requires breadth of sources, assessment of source quality, and a framework for distinguishing weak signals from noise. Foresight is conducted through a four-phase process: scoping, collection, analysis, and dissemination. The process is iterative and aligns with the planning cycle.

Foresight informs the plan through the assumptions and the risks. The plan's assumptions are selected from the range of plausible conditions that foresight produces; the plan's risks are identified from the scenarios that foresight constructs. The relationship between foresight and the plan is maintained through the plan revision process, which provides the adaptation when conditions change.

Chapter 7 — Scenario Methods

Scenario methods are the disciplined construction of alternative futures. Where forecasting produces a projection, scenario methods produce a set of internally consistent narratives, each representing a plausible future. This chapter treats the discipline and its application to planning.

7.1 What Scenarios Are

A scenario is a structured narrative describing a plausible future. It is not a forecast; it does not state what will happen. It is not a preferred outcome; it does not state what should happen. It is a description of what could happen, constructed to test the resilience of present decisions against the range of ways the future might develop. A scenario set is a small number of scenarios, typically three to five, chosen to span the range of plausible futures.

Scenarios are distinguished from forecasts by their relationship to uncertainty. A forecast presents a single future and attaches a probability to it; a scenario set presents multiple futures and does not attach probabilities. The distinction reflects a judgment about the nature of the uncertainty: where uncertainty is well-characterised and the underlying processes are stable, forecasting is appropriate; where uncertainty is deep and the underlying processes are in flux, scenario methods are appropriate. Planning deals primarily with the latter kind of uncertainty, which is why scenario methods are central to the discipline.

Scenarios are distinguished from visions by their relationship to desirability. A vision describes a desired future and the path to it; a scenario describes a plausible future without judging its desirability. Visions are political; scenarios are analytical. A planner who constructs scenarios that favour a preferred outcome is producing advocacy, not analysis. The discipline requires that scenarios be constructed independently of the planner's preferences and that the full range of plausible futures be represented.

7.2 Scenario Construction

Scenario construction begins with the identification of driving forces: the factors that will shape the future of the system under study. Driving forces may be social, technological, economic, environmental, political, or legal. The planner identifies the forces through horizon scanning, expert elicitation, and literature review. The output is a list of forces, each with a description of its direction and its potential impact.

The driving forces are then assessed for two characteristics: uncertainty and impact. Uncertainty is the degree to which the force's future trajectory is unknown; impact is the magnitude of the force's effect on the system. Forces with high uncertainty and high impact are the critical uncertainties: they are the axes along which the scenarios will differ. Forces with low uncertainty or low impact are treated as constants or as secondary. The critical uncertainties are typically two in number, producing a two-by-two matrix of four scenarios, though other configurations are used.

Each cell of the matrix is developed into a scenario narrative. The narrative describes the future that would result if the critical uncertainties resolved in the way defined by that cell. The narrative must be internally consistent: the combinations of outcomes must be plausible given the driving forces and the relationships among them. The narrative must also be vivid: it must convey the future in enough detail that the planner can assess the implications for the plan. The output is a set of scenario narratives, each with a name, a description, and a statement of the conditions that define it.

7.3 Scenario Types

Three types of scenario are used in planning practice. Exploratory scenarios start from the present and explore how the future might develop, without specifying a preferred endpoint. They are the type most commonly used in planning, because they address the question the planner faces: what are the range of futures the plan must be robust against. Normative scenarios start from a desired future and work backwards to identify the path to it. They are used when the plan's objective is fixed and the question is how to achieve it. Predictive scenarios attach probabilities to a small number of futures and are used when the uncertainty is well-enough characterised to support probability estimates.

The choice of scenario type depends on the planning question. A national development plan, which must be robust against a range of futures, uses exploratory scenarios. A sectoral plan with a fixed target, such as a plan to achieve universal primary education, may use normative scenarios to identify the path. A fiscal plan, where the uncertainty is largely economic and the economic models produce probability distributions, may use predictive scenarios. The planner selects the type that matches the question; the Manual does not prescribe a single type.

Scenario sets may also be distinguished by their relationship to the central case. A common configuration is a central scenario surrounded by variant scenarios. The central scenario represents the planner's best assessment of the likely future; the variant scenarios represent futures that differ from the central case on one or more critical uncertainties. This configuration is useful when the central case is well-supported but the plan must be tested against alternatives. Another configuration is a set of symmetric scenarios with no central case, used when no future is more likely than the others.

7.4 Using Scenarios in Planning

Scenarios are used in planning to test the resilience of the plan. The planner constructs the plan against the central scenario, then asks: would the plan succeed under each of the variant scenarios? If the plan succeeds under all scenarios, it is robust. If the plan fails under one or more scenarios, the planner identifies the plan elements that are not robust and considers how they could be modified to increase resilience. The output is a plan that is explicitly tested against the range of plausible futures.

Scenarios are also used to identify indicators for monitoring. Each scenario describes a future that would, if it materialised, require a different plan response. The planner identifies the indicators that would signal which future is emerging: the early indicators that distinguish one scenario from another. These indicators are then monitored, and the monitoring results feed the plan revision process. The output is a monitoring system that is designed to detect the conditions that would require plan revision.

Scenarios are not used to select a preferred future. The planner does not choose the scenario that is most attractive and plan for it; the planner plans for the range of scenarios. A planner who selects a preferred scenario is treating a scenario as a forecast, which it is not. The discipline requires that the plan be robust against the range, not optimised for one member of it. Where the plan cannot be robust against the full range, the planner identifies the conditions under which the plan would fail and the response that would be triggered, and presents these to political authority for decision.

7.5 Worked Example: Scenarios for Energy Transition

Consider a planning authority preparing a fifteen-year plan for the energy sector. The authority has identified energy transition — the shift from fossil-based to low-carbon energy sources — as the central strategic question. The planner initiates a scenario exercise to test the plan's resilience against the range of ways the transition might unfold.

The driving forces identified through horizon scanning and expert elicitation include: the pace of technological change in renewable energy and storage; the stringency of international climate agreements; the price of fossil fuels; the rate of demand growth; and the regulatory framework. The planner assesses these forces for uncertainty and impact. Two critical uncertainties are identified: the pace of technological change, and the stringency of international climate policy. These are the axes of the scenario matrix.

The planner constructs four scenarios. In the first, rapid technological change and stringent climate policy combine to produce a fast transition: renewable energy becomes cost-competitive quickly, and policy accelerates deployment. In the second, rapid technological change but weak climate policy produce a market-driven transition: renewables compete on cost but policy does not accelerate. In the third, slow technological change but stringent climate policy produce a policy-driven transition: the transition is expensive and relies on regulation. In the fourth, slow technological change and weak climate policy produce a delayed transition: fossil fuels remain dominant.

The plan is constructed against the central scenario — in this case, the second scenario, which the planner assesses as most likely. The plan is then tested against the other three. The testing reveals that the plan's commitment to a specific level of renewable capacity by year ten is robust under the first and second scenarios but not under the third and fourth. The planner modifies the commitment to a range, with the upper bound triggered by indicators of rapid technological change and the lower bound triggered by indicators of slow change. The indicators are specified and added to the monitoring system.

7.6 Chapter Summary

Scenarios are structured narratives describing plausible futures, used to test the resilience of present decisions. They are distinguished from forecasts by their handling of uncertainty and from visions by their analytical stance. Scenario construction identifies critical uncertainties through driving-force analysis and develops scenario narratives along the axes of those uncertainties.

Three scenario types are used in planning: exploratory, normative, and predictive. The choice depends on the planning question. Scenarios are used to test plan resilience and to identify monitoring indicators. The plan is constructed against the central scenario and tested against the variants; indicators are specified to detect which future is emerging.

Scenarios are not used to select a preferred future. The planner plans for the range, not for one member of it. Where the plan cannot be robust against the full range, the planner identifies the conditions of failure and the response that would be triggered, and presents these to political authority.

Chapter 8 — Trend Analysis and Driver Mapping

Trend analysis and driver mapping are the disciplines by which the planner identifies and assesses the forces shaping the planning environment. Trend analysis addresses the directions of change; driver mapping addresses the forces causing change. This chapter treats both.

8.1 Trends and Drivers

A trend is a direction of change observed over time. A driver is a force that causes change. The distinction is analytical: trends are what is observed; drivers are what is causing the observation. Population ageing is a trend; declining fertility and increasing life expectancy are the drivers. Energy demand growth is a trend; population growth, economic growth, and energy intensity are the drivers. The planner works with both: trends to describe the planning environment, drivers to understand it.

Trend analysis is the systematic identification, measurement, and projection of trends. The planner identifies the trends relevant to the plan, measures them using available data, and projects them over the planning horizon. The output is a set of trend projections that inform the baseline and the assumptions. Driver mapping is the systematic identification and assessment of the forces causing the trends. The planner identifies the drivers, assesses their direction and strength, and maps their relationships. The output is a driver map that informs the scenario construction and the strategic risk assessment.

The two disciplines are complementary. Trend analysis without driver mapping produces projections without understanding: the planner knows what has been happening but not why, and cannot assess whether the trends will continue. Driver mapping without trend analysis produces understanding without measurement: the planner knows what forces are at work but not what they are producing. Both are conducted together, with trend analysis providing the empirical base and driver mapping providing the analytical structure.

8.2 Trend Analysis

Trend analysis begins with the identification of the trends relevant to the plan. For a national development plan, the relevant trends include demographic trends, economic trends, fiscal trends, social trends, environmental trends, and technological trends. For a sectoral plan, the relevant trends are those specific to the sector plus the broader trends that affect it. The identification is conducted through horizon scanning, through review of the statistics office's publications, and through consultation with sectoral experts.

Measurement of trends uses the data produced by the statistics office and other authoritative sources. The planner does not produce data; the planner uses data. The data must be of sufficient quality and sufficient temporal depth to support trend analysis. Where the data are weak, the planner states the weakness and the implications for the trend projection. Where the data are absent, the planner does not construct the trend and notes the gap as a risk to the baseline.

Projection of trends extends the observed pattern into the planning horizon. Projection methods range from simple extrapolation for well-established trends to model-based projection for trends driven by complex processes. The planner selects the method appropriate to the trend and the available data. The projection is stated with its confidence interval where the method produces one, and with a qualitative assessment of uncertainty where it does not. The output is a set of trend projections that feed the baseline, treated in Chapter 9.

8.3 Driver Mapping

Driver mapping identifies the forces that cause the trends. The framework commonly used is STEEPL: social, technological, economic, environmental, political, and legal. The planner identifies the drivers in each category that are relevant to the planning question, assesses their direction (are they increasing or decreasing), their strength (how much change do they produce), and their time horizon (over what period do they operate).

The drivers are then mapped for their relationships. A driver map shows which drivers reinforce each other, which counteract each other, and which operate independently. The map may be a simple list, a matrix, or a diagram showing the connections. The purpose of the map is to identify the key drivers: those that have the greatest impact on the planning question and that are most central to the driver network. These are the drivers that the plan must address and that the scenarios must explore.

Driver mapping is conducted through a combination of literature review, expert elicitation, and structured workshops. The literature review identifies the drivers that have been identified in existing analysis. Expert elicitation identifies the drivers that experts judge to be most significant. Structured workshops bring experts together to assess the drivers and their relationships, and to identify the key drivers through a structured process. The output is a driver map that informs the scenario construction and the strategic risk assessment.

8.4 Cross-Impact Analysis

Cross-impact analysis is a structured method for assessing the relationships among drivers and trends. The method asks: if driver A changes, what is the effect on driver B? The assessment is made for each pair of drivers, producing a matrix of cross-impacts. The matrix identifies the drivers that have the greatest influence on others and the drivers that are most influenced by others. The former are the leverage points: changes in these drivers produce the greatest cascade of effects. The latter are the indicators: changes in these drivers signal that changes in the influencing drivers have occurred.

Cross-impact analysis is particularly useful for identifying feedback loops. A reinforcing feedback loop occurs when a change in one driver produces changes in others that feed back to amplify the original change. A balancing feedback loop occurs when the feedback dampens the original change. Feedback loops are critical for understanding the behaviour of complex systems and for assessing the plausibility of scenarios. A scenario that contains a reinforcing feedback loop may produce rapid change; a scenario that contains a balancing feedback loop may produce stability.

The output of cross-impact analysis is a structured assessment of the driver network that informs the scenario construction and the strategic risk assessment. The analysis does not produce a forecast; it produces a map of the relationships that the planner must consider. The map is used to test the internal consistency of scenarios and to identify the indicators that will signal which scenario is emerging.

8.5 The Bureau of Statistics

The statistics office is the authoritative source for the quantitative trends the planner uses. The office produces the demographic projections, the national accounts, the labour force statistics, the price indices, and the sectoral statistics that the trend analysis requires. The planner draws exclusively on the statistics office for official data, for three reasons: methodological consistency, publication standards, and legal authority. The statistics office applies consistent methods across datasets and over time, which makes the trends comparable. The office publishes data according to defined standards, which makes the data reliable. The office has legal authority for the production of official statistics, which gives the data official status.

The planner's relationship with the statistics office is defined by the exchange of requirements and products. The planner communicates the planning function's data requirements to the statistics office, including the datasets, the time series, the disaggregation, and the timeliness needed. The statistics office produces the data within its resource and methodological constraints. Where the office cannot meet a requirement, the planner adjusts the planning approach rather than producing parallel data. The production of parallel data undermines the statistics office and creates inconsistency in the official record.

The planner also uses international statistical sources. The World Bank's World Development Indicators, the IMF's Government Finance Statistics, the UN's demographic projections, and the OECD's statistics provide comparative data and methodological benchmarks. The planner uses these sources to assess the jurisdiction's position relative to comparators and to test the plausibility of the national projections. The international sources do not replace the national statistics office; they complement it.

8.6 Chapter Summary

Trend analysis and driver mapping are complementary disciplines. Trend analysis identifies, measures, and projects the directions of change. Driver mapping identifies and assesses the forces causing change. The two are conducted together, with trend analysis providing the empirical base and driver mapping providing the analytical structure.

Trend analysis uses data from the statistics office and other authoritative sources, projected over the planning horizon with appropriate methods and uncertainty assessment. Driver mapping uses the STEEPL framework, literature review, expert elicitation, and structured workshops to identify the key drivers and their relationships. Cross-impact analysis assesses the relationships among drivers and identifies feedback loops.

The statistics office is the authoritative source for quantitative trends. The planner draws exclusively on the office for official data, communicates requirements, and adjusts the planning approach where the office cannot meet a requirement. International statistical sources complement the national office and provide comparative benchmarks.

Chapter 9 — The Baseline and Situational Diagnosis

The baseline is the planner's accounting of where the jurisdiction stands at the start of the planning period. The situational diagnosis synthesises the baseline into a statement of strengths, weaknesses, constraints, and opportunities. This chapter treats both.

9.1 The Baseline

The baseline is the comprehensive description of the jurisdiction's current state, organised to support planning. It comprises the demographic baseline, the economic baseline, the fiscal baseline, the sectoral baselines, the infrastructure baseline, and the institutional baseline. Each component describes the current state in terms that are measurable, that are comparable over time, and that are relevant to the plan's objectives. The baseline is the starting point against which the plan's progress is measured and the foundation on which the plan's assumptions rest.

The baseline is constructed from the data produced by the statistics office and from the administrative data produced by the line ministries. The demographic baseline uses the census and the population projections. The economic baseline uses the national accounts, the labour force survey, and the price indices. The fiscal baseline uses the budget execution reports and the medium-term fiscal framework. The sectoral baselines use the sector-specific data: health service coverage, education enrolment and attainment, transport infrastructure condition, energy supply and demand, and so on. The infrastructure baseline uses the asset inventories and condition assessments. The institutional baseline uses the organisational assessments and the functional reviews.

The baseline must be honest. A baseline that overstates the jurisdiction's strengths or understates its weaknesses produces a plan that is built on false foundations. The planner's duty is to construct a baseline that is accurate, even when the accuracy is unwelcome. Political pressure may push toward optimism; institutional inertia may push toward conformity; budgetary pressure may push toward understatement. The planner resists these pressures and produces a baseline that is truthful. The integrity of the baseline is the foundation of the plan's credibility.

9.2 Components of the Baseline

The demographic baseline describes the population: its size, age structure, geographic distribution, household composition, and projected trajectory. The demographic baseline is the foundation of the plan's demand projections: the population the plan serves determines the scale of the services required. The demographic baseline is produced by the statistics office from the census and the vital registration system, projected forward using the office's demographic models.

The economic baseline describes the structure and performance of the economy: the gross domestic product, its composition by sector, the labour force, the productivity, the trade balance, and the projected trajectory. The economic baseline is the foundation of the plan's revenue projections: the economy's capacity to generate tax revenue determines the fiscal envelope within which the plan operates. The economic baseline is produced by the statistics office and the central bank, with projections from the finance ministry's economic forecasting unit.

The fiscal baseline describes the government's financial position: the revenue, the expenditure, the deficit, the debt, and the projected trajectory under existing policies. The fiscal baseline is the foundation of the plan's resource envelope: the resources available for new commitments are the difference between the projected revenue and the projected expenditure under existing policies. The fiscal baseline is produced by the finance ministry, consistent with the medium-term fiscal framework treated in Chapter 19.

The sectoral baselines describe the current state of each major sector: health, education, transport, energy, agriculture, environment, and others. Each sectoral baseline describes the sector's infrastructure, its services, its personnel, its financing, and its performance against key indicators. The sectoral baselines are produced by the line ministries, with the planning function providing the framework and the quality assurance. The infrastructure baseline describes the condition of the jurisdiction's physical infrastructure: roads, bridges, water systems, power systems, telecommunications, and public buildings. The institutional baseline describes the structure, capacity, and performance of the government's institutions.

9.3 The Situational Diagnosis

The situational diagnosis synthesises the baseline into a statement of the planning problem. It identifies the strengths on which the plan can build, the weaknesses the plan must address, the constraints the plan must respect, and the opportunities the plan can seize. The diagnosis is not a description; it is an assessment. It states what the baseline means for the plan, not what the baseline contains.

Strengths are the assets the plan can leverage: a young and growing workforce, a stable macroeconomic environment, a strong institutional framework, a strategic geographic position. Weaknesses are the deficits the plan must address: low productivity, high inequality, inadequate infrastructure, weak service delivery. Constraints are the conditions the plan cannot change: the jurisdiction's geography, its resource endowment, its demographic structure, its geopolitical position. Opportunities are the changes the plan can exploit: technological developments, trade agreements, demographic transitions, shifts in consumer behaviour.

The situational diagnosis is the bridge between the baseline and the strategy. The baseline describes what is; the diagnosis assesses what it means; the strategy decides what to do. A diagnosis that is descriptive rather than assessive produces a plan without strategic direction; a strategy without a diagnosis produces a plan without foundation. The diagnosis is conducted as a distinct step, with its own output, between the baseline construction and the strategy development.

9.4 Worked Example: A Sectoral Baseline for Health

Consider a planner constructing the health sector baseline for a national development plan. The baseline must describe the current state of the health system in terms that support the plan's objectives. The planner begins with the demographic baseline: the population size, age structure, and geographic distribution, projected over the plan period. The demographic baseline establishes the demand for health services.

The health baseline then describes the supply of health services: the number and distribution of health facilities, the number and distribution of health personnel, the availability of essential medicines, and the coverage of key interventions. Each element is measured against an indicator: facility density per population, physician density per population, medicine availability rate, antenatal care coverage, immunisation coverage, skilled birth attendance coverage. The indicators are disaggregated by region and by income group where the data permit, to reveal inequities that the national averages may conceal.

The baseline also describes the financing of the health system: the total health expenditure, its composition by source (government, out-of-pocket, donor), the government health expenditure as a share of total government expenditure, and the per capita government health expenditure. The financing data are compared with the indicators of service coverage and health outcomes to assess value for money: is the spending producing the services and the outcomes that it should?

The situational diagnosis synthesises the baseline. The strengths may include a well-developed primary care network in urban areas and high immunisation coverage. The weaknesses may include a shortage of specialist care in rural areas, high out-of-pocket spending, and persistent inequities in maternal health outcomes. The constraints may include the geographic distribution of the population and the fiscal envelope for health. The opportunities may include technological developments in telemedicine and the demographic transition's effect on the disease burden. The diagnosis states what the baseline means for the plan: the plan must address rural access, reduce financial protection gaps, and exploit technological opportunities, within the demographic and fiscal constraints.

9.5 Chapter Summary

The baseline is the comprehensive description of the jurisdiction's current state, comprising the demographic, economic, fiscal, sectoral, infrastructure, and institutional baselines. It is constructed from the statistics office's data and the line ministries' administrative data. The baseline must be honest: a baseline that overstates strengths or understates weaknesses produces a plan built on false foundations.

The situational diagnosis synthesises the baseline into a statement of strengths, weaknesses, constraints, and opportunities. It is the bridge between the baseline and the strategy: an assessive step that states what the baseline means for the plan. The diagnosis is conducted as a distinct step, with its own output, between the baseline construction and the strategy development.

The sectoral baseline example illustrates the discipline: the baseline describes the current state in measurable terms, disaggregated to reveal inequities, and the diagnosis states what the baseline means for the plan's objectives. The baseline and the diagnosis together provide the foundation for the strategy, within the demographic and fiscal constraints.

Chapter 10 — Strategic Risk Assessment for Planning

Strategic risk assessment for planning is the identification and assessment of risks to the plan's assumptions, feasibility, and implementation environment. It is distinct from operational and project risk management, which are treated in the Administrative State Manual. This chapter treats the planning-specific discipline.

10.1 Strategic Risk and Operational Risk

Strategic risk is the risk that the plan's assumptions prove wrong, that the plan's feasibility is undermined, or that the plan's implementation environment changes in ways that prevent execution. Operational risk is the risk that individual programmes and projects fail to deliver their outputs. The distinction is one of scope and horizon: strategic risk affects the plan as a whole, over the planning horizon; operational risk affects individual activities, over the execution period. Operational risk management is treated in the Administrative State Manual, Chapter 23, and is not re-derived here.

The planner's concern is strategic risk. The plan rests on assumptions about the demographic trajectory, the economic growth path, the fiscal envelope, the geopolitical environment, and the technological baseline. If any of these assumptions proves significantly wrong, the plan's feasibility is undermined. The planner identifies the assumptions that carry the greatest risk, assesses the probability and consequences of each, and designs risk treatment into the plan. The output is a strategic risk assessment that informs the plan's structure and the monitoring system.

Strategic risk assessment is conducted as part of the planning process, not as a separate exercise. The risk assessment informs the scenario construction, the baseline, the strategy, and the monitoring system. A plan that treats risk assessment as a separate step, conducted after the plan is drafted, is a plan that has not integrated risk into its design. The risk assessment is conducted in parallel with the baseline and the strategy, with each informing the others.

10.2 Risk Identification

Risk identification begins with the plan's assumptions. Each assumption is examined for the conditions under which it might prove wrong. A demographic assumption about population growth might prove wrong if migration rates change unexpectedly. An economic assumption about growth might prove wrong if the global economy enters recession. A fiscal assumption about revenue might prove wrong if commodity prices fall. Each assumption is paired with the conditions that would invalidate it, and those conditions are the risks.

Risk identification also examines the plan's implementation environment. The plan may be feasible on paper but unimplementable in practice if the institutional capacity is insufficient, if the political support erodes, if the security environment deteriorates, or if the international financing does not materialise. These implementation risks are identified through structured assessment of the institutions, the political context, the security situation, and the financing arrangements. The assessment draws on the institutional baseline, treated in Chapter 9, and on the planner's judgment.

Risk identification uses structured methods: assumption analysis, driver analysis, expert elicitation, and historical review. Assumption analysis examines each assumption for its sensitivity and its uncertainty. Driver analysis examines the drivers identified in Chapter 8 for their potential to produce adverse outcomes. Expert elicitation asks experts to identify the risks they see as most significant. Historical review examines the risks that materialised in previous plan periods and assesses whether similar risks are present. The output is a comprehensive list of risks, each with a description of the condition, the trigger, and the potential consequences.

10.3 Risk Assessment

Risk assessment evaluates each identified risk for probability and consequence. Probability is the likelihood that the risk condition will materialise over the planning horizon. Consequence is the magnitude of the effect on the plan if the risk materialises. The assessment may be quantitative, where the data and methods support probability and consequence estimation, or qualitative, where they do not. In planning practice, much of the assessment is qualitative, because the risks are strategic and the data are limited.

The probability and consequence assessments are combined into a risk rating. A common approach is a three-by-three matrix: low, medium, and high probability crossed with low, medium, and high consequence, producing nine cells. The cells are grouped into risk levels: low, moderate, and high. The rating guides the risk treatment: high risks require treatment in the plan; moderate risks require monitoring; low risks require no specific treatment but are noted in the risk register.

The assessment is conducted with explicit acknowledgment of uncertainty. The probability and consequence estimates are themselves uncertain, particularly for risks that have not materialised in the planner's experience. The planner states the confidence in each assessment and flags the risks where the confidence is low. Low-confidence assessments do not justify ignoring the risk; they justify a precautionary approach that treats the risk as more significant than the point estimate would suggest. The precautionary approach is particularly appropriate for risks with high consequences, where the cost of being wrong is asymmetric.

10.4 Risk Treatment in the Plan

Risk treatment in the plan takes four forms. Avoidance modifies the plan to eliminate the risk: an assumption that carries unacceptable risk is replaced with a more robust assumption; a commitment that depends on an uncertain condition is removed. Reduction modifies the plan to reduce the probability or consequence of the risk: a commitment is phased to allow adjustment; a programme is designed with modularity that permits scaling. Transfer shifts the risk to another party: a financing risk is transferred to a multilateral institution through a guarantee; a construction risk is transferred to a contractor through a fixed-price contract. Acceptance retains the risk and plans for the response: the risk is noted in the risk register, the indicators that would signal its materialisation are specified, and the response that would be triggered is identified.

The choice of treatment depends on the risk and the plan's structure. Avoidance is appropriate for risks that the plan can eliminate without undermining its objectives. Reduction is appropriate for risks that can be mitigated through design. Transfer is appropriate for risks that another party is better placed to bear. Acceptance is appropriate for risks that cannot be avoided, reduced, or transferred, and for risks where the cost of treatment exceeds the expected benefit. A combination of treatments is typically used, with each significant risk addressed through the treatment or combination of treatments that is most appropriate.

Risk treatment is documented in the plan. The plan states the significant risks, the treatment chosen for each, and the indicators that will be monitored. The documentation serves three purposes: it makes the risk treatment transparent to political authority and to the public; it provides the basis for the monitoring system; and it creates the record against which the plan's execution will be assessed. A plan that does not document its risk treatment is a plan that has not taken responsibility for the risks it carries.

10.5 Risk and the Monitoring System

The strategic risk assessment informs the monitoring system. Each significant risk has indicators that would signal its materialisation: the leading indicators that provide early warning, and the lagging indicators that confirm the materialisation. These indicators are added to the plan's monitoring framework and are reported on the same schedule as the performance indicators. The monitoring system thus serves two purposes: it tracks progress against the plan's objectives, and it tracks the risks that could undermine the plan.

When a risk indicator signals that a risk is materialising, the planner assesses the situation and recommends a response. The response may be to implement the risk treatment that was specified in the plan, to develop a new treatment, or to revise the plan. The response is determined by the nature of the risk, the severity of the materialisation, and the time available for response. A risk register is maintained, updated as conditions change, and feeds directly into the plan revision process treated in Chapter 21.

The risk assessment is revisited at each plan review. The risks identified at the start of the plan period may have materialised, may have dissipated, or may have been replaced by new risks. The review updates the risk register, re-assesses the probability and consequence of each risk, and adjusts the risk treatment as needed. The review ensures that the risk assessment remains current and that the plan's risk treatment remains appropriate to the conditions the plan faces.

10.6 Chapter Summary

Strategic risk assessment for planning is the identification and assessment of risks to the plan's assumptions, feasibility, and implementation environment. It is distinct from operational risk management and is conducted as part of the planning process, not as a separate exercise. Risk identification begins with the plan's assumptions and implementation environment, using assumption analysis, driver analysis, expert elicitation, and historical review.

Risk assessment evaluates each risk for probability and consequence, producing a risk rating that guides treatment. The assessment is conducted with explicit acknowledgment of uncertainty, with a precautionary approach for high-consequence risks. Risk treatment takes four forms: avoidance, reduction, transfer, and acceptance. The treatment is documented in the plan and made transparent to political authority and the public.

The risk assessment informs the monitoring system. Each significant risk has indicators that signal its materialisation, and these indicators are reported alongside the performance indicators. When a risk materialises, the planner recommends a response, and the risk register feeds into the plan revision process. The risk assessment is revisited at each plan review to ensure it remains current.

Chapter 11 — Strategy and Strategic Planning

Strategy is the disciplined choice of what the state will aim to achieve over the planning horizon and the identification of the means to achieve it. This chapter treats strategy as a planning discipline, distinct from policy formulation and from plan production.

11.1 What Strategy Is

Strategy is the discipline of choosing objectives and means. It answers three questions: what will the state aim to achieve over the planning period; what means will the state deploy to achieve it; and what are the trade-offs the state accepts in making these choices. Strategy is not the statement of objectives alone, nor the catalogue of means alone; it is the connection between them, with the trade-offs made explicit.

Strategy is distinguished from policy formulation by its operational character. Policy formulation asks what the state should do; strategy asks how the state will do it over time, with what means, and against what measures. A policy position may be announced without a strategy; a strategy cannot exist without a policy position to operationalise. The planner receives the policy position as an input and produces the strategy as the bridge between policy and plan.

Strategy is distinguished from plan production by its scope. The strategy states the objectives and the means at a level of generality that permits prioritisation and trade-off assessment. The plan, treated in Chapters 12 through 17, states the objectives and the means at a level of specificity that permits implementation and monitoring. The strategy is the framework; the plan is the detailed expression. A strategy that is as detailed as a plan has lost its strategic character; a plan that is as general as a strategy has lost its operational character.

11.2 The Strategic Conversation

Strategy is developed through a conversation among three elements: ends, ways, and means. Ends are the objectives the state aims to achieve. Ways are the approaches by which the objectives will be pursued. Means are the resources — financial, human, institutional — available to pursue them. The conversation is the process of aligning the three: the ends must be achievable with the means available through the ways selected; the ways must be appropriate to the ends and feasible with the means; the means must be sufficient for the ways selected and directed toward the ends.

The conversation is iterative. The planner begins with the ends as received from political authority, identifies the ways that could achieve them, and assesses the means required. Where the means are insufficient, the planner returns to the ends: which objectives can be achieved with the available means, and which must be deferred or abandoned. Where the ways are infeasible, the planner identifies alternatives. The iteration continues until the ends, ways, and means are aligned, or until the planner concludes that alignment is not possible and presents the trade-offs to political authority.

The output of the strategic conversation is a set of strategic options, each representing a different combination of ends, ways, and means. The options are presented to political authority for decision. The planner does not select the strategy; the planner develops the options and presents them with the trade-offs. Political authority selects, and the selected strategy becomes the framework for the plan. The relationship between the planner and political authority in strategy development is treated in Chapter 3.

11.3 Strategic Options

A strategic option is a coherent combination of objectives and means, with the trade-offs made explicit. Each option states what the state will aim to achieve, what means it will deploy, what it will not pursue, and what risks it accepts. The options are constructed to be genuinely distinct: each represents a different judgment about priorities, not a minor variation on a single theme. Three to five options is typical; more than five overwhelms the decision-maker, fewer than three does not present a real choice.

Each option is assessed against four criteria. Feasibility: can the objectives be achieved with the means available through the ways selected? Coherence: do the objectives, ways, and means form an internally consistent combination? Robustness: does the option succeed under the range of scenarios identified in the foresight exercise? Affordability: does the option fit within the medium-term fiscal framework? The assessment is conducted using the baseline, the foresight, and the risk assessment produced in Part II, and the fiscal framework treated in Chapter 19.

The options are presented in a strategy paper that states each option, the assessment against the four criteria, and the planner's recommendation. The recommendation is the planner's professional judgment, based on the assessment, about which option best serves the public interest as expressed through political direction. The recommendation is advisory; the decision is political authority's. The planner does not lobby for the recommendation outside the formal process and does not implement a different strategy if the recommendation is not accepted.

11.4 Strategic Planning as a Discipline

Strategic planning is the institutionalised practice of strategy development. It comprises the cycle of foresight, diagnosis, strategy development, and plan production, conducted on a defined schedule and within defined institutional arrangements. The discipline is in the cycle: strategic planning is not an ad hoc activity triggered by events but a scheduled activity that produces the strategy and the plan at defined intervals.

The discipline requires institutional capacity. A government that conducts strategic planning must maintain the capacity to conduct foresight, to construct baselines, to develop strategic options, and to produce plans. The capacity is built over time, through the accumulation of experience, the development of methods, and the training of planners. A government that lacks the capacity cannot produce a strategy by commissioning a document; the capacity must be built first, and the strategy follows.

Strategic planning is distinguished from long-range planning by its relationship to action. Long-range planning produces visions and scenarios for the distant future; strategic planning produces commitments for the medium term. The two are complementary: long-range planning informs the strategic planning by identifying the long-term forces the strategy must address, and strategic planning informs long-range planning by identifying the medium-term commitments that shape the long-term trajectory. The Manual treats strategic planning as the primary discipline; long-range planning is an input to it.

11.5 Worked Example: Strategic Options for Economic Diversification

Consider a planning authority developing a strategy for economic diversification in a jurisdiction dependent on a single commodity. The political direction is to reduce the jurisdiction's dependence on the commodity over the next ten years. The planner has conducted the foresight, the baseline, and the risk assessment, and now develops strategic options.

The baseline shows an economy in which the commodity sector accounts for 40 per cent of gross domestic product, 70 per cent of exports, and 60 per cent of government revenue. The foresight identifies two critical uncertainties: the long-term price of the commodity, and the pace of development of the sectors that could replace it. The risk assessment identifies the fiscal risk of continued dependence and the implementation risk of diversification.

The planner develops three options. The first option is rapid diversification: the state invests heavily in two or three identified sectors, financed by the commodity revenue while it lasts. The option achieves significant diversification within ten years but carries high implementation risk and concentrates investment in a few sectors. The second option is gradual diversification: the state invests moderately across a broader range of sectors, financed from current revenue. The option achieves moderate diversification within ten years with lower implementation risk but slower progress. The third option is stabilisation first: the state builds a fiscal stabilisation fund to buffer against commodity price volatility, and defers diversification investment until the fund reaches a defined threshold. The option reduces fiscal risk but achieves limited diversification within ten years.

Each option is assessed against the four criteria. The first is feasible but not robust under the scenario of slow sector development. The second is feasible, robust, and affordable, but achieves less. The third is feasible and affordable but does not achieve the objective within the period. The planner recommends the second option, with elements of the first in the sectors where the implementation risk is lowest. The recommendation is presented to political authority, which selects the option and directs the planner to produce the plan.

11.6 Chapter Summary

Strategy is the disciplined choice of objectives and means, with the trade-offs made explicit. It is distinguished from policy formulation by its operational character and from plan production by its scope. Strategy is developed through the conversation among ends, ways, and means, conducted iteratively until the three are aligned or the trade-offs are presented to political authority.

Strategic options are coherent combinations of objectives and means, assessed against feasibility, coherence, robustness, and affordability. Three to five options are presented in a strategy paper, with the planner's recommendation. The recommendation is advisory; the decision is political authority's. Strategic planning is the institutionalised practice of strategy development, conducted on a cycle and requiring institutional capacity.

The worked example illustrates the discipline: three options for economic diversification, each assessed against the four criteria, with a recommendation that combines elements of two options. The recommendation is presented to political authority, which selects and directs the planner to produce the plan.

Chapter 12 — The National Development Plan

The national development plan is the central planning artefact: the document that states the government's objectives for the planning period and the means by which they will be achieved. This chapter treats the plan's purpose, structure, and content.

12.1 The National Development Plan as Artefact

The national development plan is the document that records the results of the planning process and commits the government to a course of action over the planning period. It is the product of the foresight, the baseline, the strategy, and the risk assessment, synthesised into a single statement of what the government will do. The plan is the artefact; the planning process is the activity that produces it. Both are required.

The plan serves three purposes. It directs the government's programmes by stating the objectives and the means, providing the framework within which sectoral ministries and executing agencies operate. It anchors the budget by providing the medium-term framework within which the annual budget is set, through the plan-to-budget linkage treated in Chapter 18. It communicates the government's intentions to the public, to investors, to development partners, and to other levels of government, providing the reference against which the government's performance is assessed.

The plan is a commitment, not an aspiration. The objectives stated in the plan are objectives the government intends to achieve and has assessed as feasible. The means stated in the plan are means the government intends to deploy and has assessed as affordable. A plan that states aspirations without commitments, or commitments without means, does not meet the standard set out in Chapter 1. The integrity of the plan depends on the discipline with which the commitments are made.

12.2 Structure of the Plan

The national development plan typically comprises five sections. The first is the situational assessment, which presents the baseline and the situational diagnosis treated in Chapter 9. The assessment states where the jurisdiction stands, what the strengths and weaknesses are, and what the constraints and opportunities are. The assessment provides the foundation for the strategy.

The second section is the strategic framework, which presents the strategy treated in Chapter 11. The framework states the objectives for the planning period, the means by which they will be achieved, and the trade-offs the strategy entails. The objectives are stated at a level of generality that permits prioritisation; the means are stated at a level that permits implementation. The framework is the core of the plan.

The third section is the sectoral programmes, which decompose the strategic framework into sector-specific commitments. Each programme states the sector's objectives, the activities that will be undertaken, the outputs that will be produced, and the indicators by which progress will be measured. The sectoral programmes are the bridge between the strategy and the budget. The fourth section is the resource framework, which states the cost of the plan, the sources of financing, and the fiscal envelope within which the plan operates. The fifth section is the implementation framework, which states the institutional arrangements for execution, the monitoring system, and the plan revision process.

12.3 Comparative Forms

The form of the national development plan varies across jurisdictions. China's five-year plans, produced by the National Development and Reform Commission, are comprehensive documents that set binding and indicative targets across all sectors and regions. The plans are structured as the Communist Party's recommendations, translated into State Council proposals, approved by the National People's Congress, and decomposed into sectoral and provincial plans. The binding targets are mandatory; the indicative targets are aspirational.

Indonesia's RPJMN, produced by Bappenas, is a five-year medium-term development plan that translates the long-term plan (RPJP) into medium-term commitments. The RPJMN is structured around national priorities, with sectoral and regional programmes, and is implemented through the annual government work plan (RKPD). The plan is approved by the legislature and serves as the framework for the annual budget.

Singapore does not produce a single national development plan in the five-year format. The strategic framework is set through the future economy reports and the committee on the future economy, with implementation through the annual budget and the sectoral industry transformation maps. The approach is less plan-centric than the Chinese or Indonesian models but maintains the discipline of medium-term strategic direction. Ireland's National Development Plan, produced in conjunction with the National Planning Framework, sets out investment priorities over a ten-year horizon, integrated with the EU cohesion policy framework. The form varies; the function is constant: to state the government's objectives and means for the planning period.

12.4 The Medium-Term Plan

The national development plan is a medium-term document, typically covering five years. The five-year horizon is long enough to permit significant progress on objectives that require sustained effort, and short enough to maintain the connection between the plan and the political cycle. A plan that is shorter than five years is indistinguishable from a budget; a plan that is longer than ten years risks losing the connection to political direction and to fiscal reality.

The five-year horizon is not universal. Some jurisdictions use four-year plans aligned to the electoral cycle; others use seven-year plans aligned to long-term investment cycles. The choice of horizon depends on the jurisdiction's political cycle, its investment cycle, and its planning tradition. The Manual does not prescribe a single horizon; it notes that the horizon must be long enough to permit strategic action and short enough to maintain accountability.

The medium-term plan is distinct from the long-term vision and from the annual budget. The long-term vision, where one exists, sets the direction over a twenty- or thirty-year horizon; the medium-term plan operationalises the vision for the next five years. The annual budget allocates resources for the next fiscal year; the medium-term plan provides the framework within which the budget is set. The three documents — vision, plan, budget — form a hierarchy, with each operationalising the level above. The relationships are maintained through the planning cycle treated in Chapter 16.

12.5 Chapter Summary

The national development plan is the central planning artefact, recording the results of the planning process and committing the government to a course of action. It directs programmes, anchors the budget, and communicates intentions. The plan is a commitment, not an aspiration; the integrity of the plan depends on the discipline with which commitments are made.

The plan comprises five sections: the situational assessment, the strategic framework, the sectoral programmes, the resource framework, and the implementation framework. The form varies across jurisdictions: China's five-year plans with binding and indicative targets, Indonesia's RPJMN, Singapore's future economy approach, Ireland's National Development Plan. The function is constant.

The plan is a medium-term document, typically five years. The horizon must be long enough to permit strategic action and short enough to maintain accountability. The plan is distinct from the long-term vision and from the annual budget; the three form a hierarchy, with each operationalising the level above.

Chapter 13 — Sectoral Plans

Sectoral plans are the vertical decomposition of the national development plan into sector-specific commitments. This chapter treats their purpose, structure, and relationship to the national plan.

13.1 The Function of Sectoral Plans

A sectoral plan translates the national plan's strategic framework into commitments for a specific sector: health, education, transport, energy, agriculture, environment, or others. The sectoral plan states what the sector will achieve over the planning period, what activities it will undertake, what outputs it will produce, and what indicators will be measured. The sectoral plan is the bridge between the national strategy and the sector's operations.

The sectoral plan is produced by the line ministry responsible for the sector, with the planning authority providing the framework and the quality assurance. The line ministry has the sectoral expertise; the planning authority has the cross-sectoral perspective and the responsibility for coherence. The relationship between the two is governed by the planning cycle, with the national plan setting the framework first and the sectoral plans following.

Sectoral plans are required because the national plan cannot specify sector-level commitments in sufficient detail for implementation. The national plan states the strategic framework; the sectoral plans state the operational commitments. A national plan that attempts to specify sectoral commitments in detail becomes unmanageably long and loses its strategic character; a sectoral plan that does not go into operational detail is indistinguishable from the national plan and adds no value.

13.2 Structure and Content

A sectoral plan typically comprises four sections. The first is the sectoral baseline, which presents the current state of the sector using the indicators and data treated in Chapter 9. The baseline states what the sector's infrastructure, services, personnel, financing, and performance are at the start of the period, disaggregated by region and by population group where the data permit.

The second section is the sectoral strategy, which translates the national plan's strategic framework into sector-specific objectives. The objectives are stated in terms that are measurable and time-bound: the indicator, the baseline value, the target value, and the year by which the target will be reached. The strategy also states the approaches that will be used to achieve the objectives and the trade-offs the sector accepts.

The third section is the programme structure, which decomposes the strategy into programmes and sub-programmes. Each programme states its objective, its activities, its outputs, its inputs, and its indicators. The programme structure is the basis for the budget submission: each programme becomes a budget programme, with the plan's first-year commitments costed and submitted for legislative approval through the plan-to-budget linkage. The fourth section is the implementation and monitoring framework, which states the institutional arrangements for execution, the monitoring indicators, the reporting schedule, and the review milestones.

13.3 Relationship to the National Plan

The sectoral plan is subordinate to the national plan. The sectoral plan's objectives must be consistent with the national plan's strategic framework; the sectoral plan's resource requirements must fit within the national plan's resource framework; the sectoral plan's indicators must contribute to the national plan's monitoring system. A sectoral plan that is inconsistent with the national plan undermines the coherence of the planning system.

The consistency is maintained through the planning cycle. The national plan is produced first, establishing the strategic framework and the resource envelope. The sectoral plans are produced second, translating the framework into sector-specific commitments within the envelope. Where a sectoral plan cannot achieve the national plan's objectives within the envelope, the issue is referred back to the planning authority for resolution: either the objectives are adjusted, or the envelope is increased, or the sectoral plan is revised. The resolution is documented and forms part of the plan record.

The relationship is also maintained through the monitoring system. The sectoral plan's indicators feed into the national plan's monitoring framework, providing the data by which the national plan's progress is assessed. A sectoral plan that does not report against its indicators, or that reports indicators that are inconsistent with the national plan's framework, breaks the monitoring chain and prevents the national plan's progress from being assessed accurately.

13.4 Inter-Sectoral Coordination

Sectoral plans interact. A health sector plan depends on the water and sanitation sector plan for the infrastructure that underpins public health. An education sector plan depends on the transport sector plan for the school access that underpins enrolment. An agriculture sector plan depends on the energy sector plan for the irrigation pumping that underpins production. These interdependencies are not resolved within a single sectoral plan; they are resolved through inter-sectoral coordination.

Inter-sectoral coordination is conducted through several mechanisms. The planning authority maintains a cross-sectoral review of all sectoral plans, checking for consistency and identifying interdependencies. Inter-ministerial committees, established for specific cross-cutting issues, bring the relevant sectoral ministries together to align their plans. The budget process, through the plan-to-budget linkage, provides a fiscal discipline that forces prioritisation across sectors.

Coordination is not the same as integration. Sectoral plans remain sectoral: each is produced by the ministry with the sectoral expertise and is accountable for the sector's performance. Coordination ensures that the sectoral plans fit together; it does not merge them. A planning system that attempts to integrate all sectoral plans into a single document loses the sectoral expertise and the sectoral accountability. A planning system that does not coordinate the sectoral plans produces a collection of documents that do not fit together. The balance is maintained through the coordination mechanisms, applied with sufficient rigour to ensure coherence and sufficient restraint to preserve sectoral responsibility.

13.5 Chapter Summary

Sectoral plans translate the national plan's strategic framework into sector-specific commitments. They are produced by the line ministry with the planning authority providing the framework and quality assurance. The sectoral plan is the bridge between the national strategy and the sector's operations, stating what the sector will achieve, what activities it will undertake, and what indicators will be measured.

A sectoral plan comprises the sectoral baseline, the sectoral strategy, the programme structure, and the implementation and monitoring framework. The plan is subordinate to the national plan: its objectives must be consistent with the national framework, its resources must fit within the national envelope, and its indicators must feed the national monitoring system.

Sectoral plans interact through interdependencies that are resolved through inter-sectoral coordination. The planning authority maintains a cross-sectoral review; inter-ministerial committees align plans on cross-cutting issues; the budget process forces prioritisation. Coordination ensures coherence without merging the plans; the balance is maintained through coordination mechanisms applied with rigour and restraint.

Chapter 14 — Spatial and Territorial Plans

Spatial planning is the discipline of organising the use of land and the location of activities across the jurisdiction's territory. This chapter treats spatial plans as a distinct planning discipline, parallel to but not subordinate to sectoral plans.

14.1 Spatial Planning as a Discipline

Spatial planning is the organisation of land use, settlement patterns, and infrastructure across geographic space. It addresses questions that sectoral plans cannot answer: where infrastructure will be located, where settlements will grow, where economic activity will concentrate, where environmental assets will be protected. Spatial planning is necessary because the location of activities affects their efficiency, their equity, and their environmental impact, and because the location of infrastructure is a long-term commitment that shapes development for decades.

Spatial planning is distinguished from land-use regulation. Land-use regulation is the legal framework that governs the use of specific parcels of land: zoning, building codes, development permits. Spatial planning is the strategic framework that determines the pattern of land use across the territory: where growth will be encouraged, where it will be constrained, where infrastructure will be provided. Land-use regulation implements spatial planning; spatial planning provides the framework that land-use regulation enforces.

Spatial planning interacts with sectoral planning. A transport sector plan identifies the infrastructure needed; a spatial plan identifies where it should go. A health sector plan identifies the services needed; a spatial plan identifies where facilities should be located. An agriculture sector plan identifies the production targets; a spatial plan identifies where agricultural land should be protected from conversion. The interaction is managed through the planning cycle, with spatial plans and sectoral plans produced in a sequence that permits each to inform the other.

14.2 Levels of Spatial Planning

Spatial planning is conducted at three levels. The national spatial plan sets the framework for the territory as a whole: the urban system, the infrastructure corridors, the protected areas, the development zones. The national plan is strategic, identifying the broad pattern of land use and the major infrastructure commitments. It does not specify parcel-level land use; that is the function of lower-level plans.

Regional plans, where the jurisdiction has a regional tier of government, translate the national spatial plan into commitments for each region. The regional plan identifies the region's settlement pattern, its infrastructure network, its economic development zones, and its environmental protection areas. The regional plan is more detailed than the national plan but less detailed than the local plan.

Local plans, produced by municipal or district authorities, translate the regional plan into parcel-level land-use commitments. The local plan is the document that land-use regulation enforces: it specifies the permitted uses for each parcel, the development standards, and the infrastructure commitments. The local plan is the level at which spatial planning meets land-use regulation. The three levels — national, regional, local — form a hierarchy, with each operationalising the level above.

14.3 Comparative Practice

France's tradition of spatial planning, rooted in the aménagement du territoire, produces a hierarchy of plans from the national scheme (schéma directeur) through regional plans (schémas régionaux) to local plans (plans locaux d'urbanisme). The tradition emphasises the role of the state in balancing regional development and in preventing the concentration of population and economic activity in a single region.

Singapore's Concept Plan, produced by the Urban Redevelopment Authority, is a long-term spatial plan that sets the framework for land use and infrastructure over a forty- to fifty-year horizon. The Concept Plan is translated into the Master Plan, a statutory document that sets the detailed land-use zoning and development controls. The approach is notable for the integration of spatial planning with transport, housing, and economic strategy, and for the long horizon that permits strategic land reservation.

China's territorial spatial planning, reformed in 2019 under the Ministry of Natural Resources, integrates land use, urban and rural planning, and main functional zone planning into a unified system. The plans are produced at national, provincial, municipal, and county levels, with each level binding on the level below. The approach reflects the scale of China's territory and the rate of its urbanisation, which require strong central direction of spatial development. The European Union's spatial planning framework, expressed through the European Spatial Development Perspective and the Territorial Agenda, provides a cross-border dimension that national plans must consider.

14.4 The Spatial Plan and the National Development Plan

The spatial plan and the national development plan are distinct documents with distinct purposes. The national development plan states the government's objectives and means across all sectors; the spatial plan states the geographic pattern of land use and infrastructure. The two intersect: the national plan's infrastructure commitments have spatial implications, and the spatial plan's infrastructure commitments have budgetary implications.

The relationship is managed through the planning cycle. The national development plan is produced first, establishing the strategic framework and the sectoral commitments. The spatial plan is produced in parallel or subsequently, translating the national plan's infrastructure commitments into a geographic pattern and identifying the land-use implications of the sectoral programmes. Where the spatial plan identifies conflicts — where two sectoral commitments require the same land, or where a commitment conflicts with environmental protection — the conflicts are referred back to the planning authority for resolution.

The spatial plan is not subordinate to the national development plan in the way that sectoral plans are. Spatial planning is a distinct discipline with its own expertise, its own legal framework, and its own accountability. The relationship is one of coordination, not subordination. The planning authority coordinates the two plans to ensure consistency; the spatial planning authority produces the spatial plan within the coordinated framework. The distinction matters because it preserves the integrity of spatial planning as a discipline while ensuring that the two plans are mutually consistent.

14.5 Chapter Summary

Spatial planning is the organisation of land use, settlement patterns, and infrastructure across geographic space. It is distinguished from land-use regulation, which implements spatial planning at the parcel level. Spatial planning interacts with sectoral planning, with each informing the other through the planning cycle.

Spatial planning is conducted at three levels: national, regional, and local. The national plan sets the strategic framework; the regional plan translates it for each region; the local plan specifies parcel-level land use. Comparative practice includes France's aménagement du territoire, Singapore's Concept Plan and Master Plan, China's territorial spatial planning, and the European Union's spatial development perspective.

The spatial plan and the national development plan are distinct documents with distinct purposes. The relationship is one of coordination, not subordination. The planning authority coordinates the two plans to ensure consistency; the spatial planning authority produces the spatial plan within the coordinated framework, preserving the integrity of spatial planning as a discipline.

Chapter 15 — The Capital Investment Plan

The capital investment plan is the multi-year statement of the government's investment in physical infrastructure and capital assets. This chapter treats its purpose, structure, and relationship to the national plan and the budget.

15.1 The Capital Investment Plan

The capital investment plan is the document that states the government's capital investments over the planning period: the projects to be undertaken, their cost, their financing, their sequencing, and their expected outputs. The plan covers investments in transport infrastructure, energy infrastructure, water and sanitation, public buildings, communications, and other physical assets. It is the capital counterpart to the recurrent budget, and it is the mechanism through which the government's infrastructure commitments are made operational.

The capital investment plan is distinct from the annual capital budget. The plan covers the full planning period, typically five years; the budget covers one fiscal year. The plan states the government's investment strategy; the budget allocates resources for the next year's implementation. The plan-to-budget linkage, treated in Chapter 18, connects the two: the first-year commitments in the capital investment plan become the capital budget for the next fiscal year.

The capital investment plan is also distinct from project appraisal. Project appraisal is the assessment of individual projects for feasibility, cost-effectiveness, and risk; it is treated in the Administrative State Manual, Chapter 22. The capital investment plan is the selection and sequencing of projects within the strategic framework and the fiscal envelope. The planner's concern is the portfolio of projects and its alignment with the strategy, not the appraisal of individual projects, which is a technical function conducted by the relevant sectoral ministry or infrastructure agency.

15.2 Project Identification and Prioritisation

Project identification is the process of generating the list of candidate projects from which the capital investment plan is constructed. Projects are identified by sectoral ministries, by regional authorities, by state-owned enterprises, and by the planning authority. The identification is informed by the sectoral plans, the spatial plan, the baseline, and the foresight. A project is identified because it serves a strategic objective, addresses a baseline gap, or exploits a foresight-identified opportunity.

Prioritisation is the process of ranking the identified projects and selecting those that will be included in the plan. Prioritisation criteria include strategic alignment (does the project serve a plan objective?), economic return (what is the cost-benefit assessment?), distributional impact (does the project benefit underserved regions or populations?), and implementation readiness (can the project be executed within the plan period?). The criteria are applied through a structured assessment, with each project scored and ranked.

The prioritisation produces a list of selected projects and a list of deferred projects. The selected projects are those that meet the criteria and fit within the fiscal envelope; the deferred projects are those that meet the criteria but cannot be funded within the envelope, or that are not yet ready for implementation. The deferred projects are maintained in a pipeline and may be selected in subsequent plan periods as resources permit or as implementation readiness improves. A capital investment plan that does not maintain a pipeline of deferred projects loses the capacity to sequence investment over multiple periods.

15.3 Sequencing and the Fiscal Envelope

Sequencing is the process of determining the order in which the selected projects will be implemented. Sequencing considers implementation readiness, dependency (does one project depend on the completion of another?), and resource availability. A project that is ready for implementation and that has no dependencies may be sequenced early; a project that depends on the completion of another or that requires lengthy preparation may be sequenced later. The sequence produces the annual capital budget profile for the plan period: the investment in each year, by project.

The fiscal envelope is the constraint within which the sequencing operates. The envelope is determined by the medium-term fiscal framework, treated in Chapter 19, and by the government's financing capacity. The capital investment plan must fit within the envelope: the total cost of the selected projects, over the plan period, must not exceed the available capital resources. Where the selected projects exceed the envelope, the planner returns to the prioritisation and adjusts the selection.

The fiscal envelope is not a single number. It comprises domestic resources (government revenue allocated to capital investment), external financing (loans and grants from development partners), and private financing (public-private partnerships and other private capital). Each source has its own constraints: domestic resources are limited by the fiscal position; external financing is limited by debt sustainability; private financing is limited by the project's revenue-generating potential. The planner assesses the envelope by source and sequences the projects to match the availability of each source.

15.4 Maintenance and the Capital-Recurrent Balance

The capital investment plan must address the maintenance of existing assets as well as the creation of new ones. A jurisdiction that invests in new infrastructure without maintaining the existing stock accumulates a maintenance backlog that erodes the value of the investment and eventually requires costly rehabilitation. The capital investment plan includes a maintenance component: the resources required to maintain the existing asset stock at the standard that preserves its functionality.

The balance between capital investment and maintenance is a planning judgment. The judgment considers the condition of the existing asset stock, the rate of deterioration, the cost of maintenance versus the cost of rehabilitation, and the strategic priority of new investment. A jurisdiction with a large maintenance backlog may prioritise maintenance over new investment for a period; a jurisdiction with adequate maintenance may prioritise new investment. The judgment is documented in the capital investment plan, with the rationale and the trade-offs stated.

The capital-recurrent balance is also a fiscal issue. Capital investment is typically financed through a combination of current revenue and borrowing; maintenance is typically financed through current revenue. A capital investment plan that relies heavily on borrowing increases the debt burden and the future debt service; a plan that defers maintenance reduces current expenditure but increases future rehabilitation costs. The planner works with the finance ministry to assess the fiscal implications of the capital investment plan and to ensure that the plan is consistent with the medium-term fiscal framework and with debt sustainability.

15.5 Chapter Summary

The capital investment plan is the multi-year statement of the government's investment in physical infrastructure and capital assets. It is distinct from the annual capital budget and from project appraisal. The plan states the projects to be undertaken, their cost, their financing, their sequencing, and their expected outputs, over the planning period.

Project identification generates the candidate list from sectoral, regional, and planning sources. Prioritisation ranks the projects by strategic alignment, economic return, distributional impact, and implementation readiness, producing a selected list and a deferred pipeline. Sequencing determines the order of implementation, considering readiness, dependency, and resource availability, within the fiscal envelope.

The capital investment plan must address the maintenance of existing assets as well as the creation of new ones. The balance between capital investment and maintenance is a planning judgment, documented with the rationale and trade-offs. The capital-recurrent balance is also a fiscal issue, assessed with the finance ministry to ensure consistency with the medium-term fiscal framework and debt sustainability.

Chapter 16 — The Planning Cycle

The planning cycle is the temporal structure of planning: the sequence of phases, their timing, and their interlock. This chapter treats the annual, medium-term, and long-term cycles and their synchronisation.

16.1 The Annual Planning Cycle

The annual planning cycle is the sequence of activities by which the government prepares, approves, and begins to implement the next fiscal year's commitments. The cycle begins approximately nine months before the start of the fiscal year, with the planning authority issuing guidance to sectoral ministries on the preparation of their annual plans. The guidance states the strategic framework, the fiscal envelope, and the deadlines for submission.

The sectoral ministries prepare their annual plans, drawing on their sectoral plans and translating the first-year commitments into specific activities, outputs, and budget requirements. The annual plans are submitted to the planning authority for review and to the finance ministry for costing. The planning authority checks consistency with the national plan; the finance ministry checks consistency with the fiscal framework. Where inconsistencies are identified, the plans are revised through a negotiation between the sectoral ministry, the planning authority, and the finance ministry.

The annual plans are consolidated into the budget, which is submitted to the legislature for approval. The legislature's approval authorises the expenditure and gives legal force to the annual plan. The cycle concludes with the start of the fiscal year, at which point the annual plan becomes the operating framework for the sectoral ministries. The cycle is repeated each year, with each annual plan drawing on the medium-term plan and contributing to its execution.

16.2 The Medium-Term Cycle

The medium-term cycle is the sequence of activities by which the government produces the national development plan. The cycle begins approximately eighteen months before the start of the plan period, with the initiation of the foresight exercise and the baseline construction. The foresight and baseline provide the inputs to the strategy development, which is conducted over the following six months.

The strategy is presented to political authority for decision, and the selected strategy becomes the framework for plan production. The plan is drafted, consulted on, and approved over the following six to nine months. The approval, typically by the legislature, gives the plan its legal force and establishes it as the framework for the annual planning cycles over the plan period.

The medium-term cycle produces one plan every five years (or whatever the plan horizon is). The cycle is not repeated annually; it is repeated at the end of each plan period. Within the plan period, the annual cycle operationalises the plan, and the mid-cycle review, treated in Chapter 21, assesses progress and may trigger plan revision. The medium-term cycle is the strategic cycle; the annual cycle is the operational cycle; the two are interlocked, with each annual cycle drawing on the medium-term plan and each medium-term plan drawing on the experience of the previous period.

16.3 The Long-Term Cycle

The long-term cycle produces the long-term vision or strategy, typically covering a twenty- to thirty-year horizon. The long-term cycle is not repeated at fixed intervals; it is initiated when the existing vision is no longer adequate, either because conditions have changed significantly or because the vision's horizon has been reached. The long-term cycle is less structured than the medium-term and annual cycles, reflecting the greater uncertainty of the long horizon and the lesser need for precise timing.

The long-term vision is produced through a foresight-intensive process, using the methods treated in Chapters 6 and 7. The vision identifies the long-term forces shaping the jurisdiction, the range of plausible futures, and the preferred future around which the government's long-term strategy will be oriented. The vision is not a plan; it does not state specific commitments or allocate specific resources. It is a direction, providing the context within which the medium-term plan is produced.

The long-term vision informs the medium-term cycle but does not bind it. The medium-term plan translates the vision into five-year commitments, but the translation involves choices that the vision does not determine. The vision may identify the desirability of a low-carbon economy; the medium-term plan determines the specific investments and policies that will be undertaken in the next five years to move toward that economy. The relationship is one of direction and operationalisation, with the vision providing the direction and the plan providing the operationalisation.

16.4 Synchronisation Across Cycles

The three cycles must be synchronised. The medium-term cycle must be timed so that the plan is approved before the first annual cycle of the plan period begins. The long-term cycle must be timed so that the vision is available before the medium-term cycle begins. The synchronisation ensures that each cycle has the inputs it needs from the cycle above and that the cycles do not operate in isolation.

Synchronisation requires a planning calendar that states the timing of each phase of each cycle and the interdependencies among them. The calendar is maintained by the planning authority and is shared with the sectoral ministries, the finance ministry, and the legislature. The calendar is the instrument by which the planning authority manages the cycles and ensures that the participants in each cycle know what is expected of them and when.

The cycles must also be synchronised with the political cycle. A new government may wish to produce a new plan, reflecting its political direction; the planning cycle must be able to accommodate this, either by accelerating the medium-term cycle or by producing an interim plan that bridges to the next regular cycle. The relationship between the planning cycle and the political cycle is treated in Chapter 3; the operational requirement is that the planning authority maintains the capacity to adjust the cycle in response to political events while preserving the discipline of the planning process.

16.5 Chapter Summary

The planning cycle comprises three interlocked cycles: the annual cycle, the medium-term cycle, and the long-term cycle. The annual cycle prepares, approves, and begins to implement the next fiscal year's commitments, drawing on the medium-term plan. The medium-term cycle produces the national development plan every five years, drawing on the long-term vision. The long-term cycle produces the vision, initiated when the existing vision is no longer adequate.

The three cycles must be synchronised. The medium-term cycle must be timed so that the plan is approved before the first annual cycle begins; the long-term cycle must be timed so that the vision is available before the medium-term cycle begins. Synchronisation requires a planning calendar maintained by the planning authority and shared with the participants.

The cycles must also be synchronised with the political cycle. A new government may require a new plan or an interim plan. The planning authority maintains the capacity to adjust the cycle in response to political events while preserving the discipline of the planning process.

Chapter 17 — Drafting, Consultation, Approval, and Promulgation

The production of a plan comprises four phases: drafting, consultation, approval, and promulgation. This chapter treats each phase and the discipline that distinguishes plan-drafting from general administrative writing.

17.1 Drafting the Plan

Plan-drafting is a distinct writing craft, related to but not reducible to general administrative writing. The Administrative State Manual, Chapter 49, treats administrative writing; this chapter treats the planning-specific craft. The distinction lies in the plan's function: the plan is a commitment, not a discussion, and the drafting must reflect this. Every sentence in the plan is either a statement of commitment, a statement of fact supporting the commitment, or a statement of assumption underlying the commitment. Sentences that discuss, that speculate, or that advocate are not appropriate to the plan.

The plan is drafted by the planning authority, with inputs from the sectoral ministries and the finance ministry. The drafting begins after the strategy has been selected and the strategic framework established. The drafting translates the framework into the plan's five sections: the situational assessment, the strategic framework, the sectoral programmes, the resource framework, and the implementation framework. Each section is drafted to a standard structure, with the content determined by the planning process.

The drafting discipline requires precision in language. Objectives are stated in measurable terms; means are stated in specific terms; assumptions are stated explicitly; indicators are stated with baselines and targets. Vague language — "to improve," "to strengthen," "to enhance" — is replaced with specific commitments: "to increase the percentage of rural households with piped water from 45 per cent to 75 per cent by year five." The precision is not stylistic; it is functional. The plan's commitments must be measurable if they are to be monitored, and the monitoring must be accurate if the plan's execution is to be assessed.

17.2 Consultation

Consultation is the process by which the draft plan is reviewed by those who will be affected by it or who will participate in its implementation. Consultation serves three purposes: it improves the quality of the plan by exposing it to expertise and perspectives the planning authority does not possess; it builds ownership among the implementing agencies, increasing the likelihood of faithful execution; and it provides a check on the plan's feasibility by allowing those who will execute it to identify implementation challenges.

The consultation typically proceeds in stages. The first stage is internal to government: the draft is circulated to the sectoral ministries, the finance ministry, the regional authorities, and other government agencies for comment. The comments are reviewed, and the draft is revised. The second stage is external: the revised draft is published for public comment, with a defined period for submission. The public comments are reviewed, and the draft is revised again. The third stage is the finalisation, in which the planning authority produces the final draft for approval.

Consultation is not negotiation. The planning authority is not required to accept every comment; it is required to consider every comment and to revise the draft where the comment identifies a genuine improvement. The planning authority maintains a record of the comments received and the response to each, documenting the reasons for acceptance or rejection. The record provides transparency and creates the basis for accountability: the public and the implementing agencies can see that their comments were considered and can assess the quality of the consideration.

17.3 Approval

Approval is the process by which the plan acquires legal force. The process varies by jurisdiction. In some jurisdictions, the plan is approved by the legislature, giving it statutory force. In others, the plan is approved by the head of government or the cabinet, giving it executive force. In others, the plan is approved by a combination of executive and legislative action, with the executive approving the strategic framework and the legislature approving the resource framework through the budget process.

The approval process determines the plan's authority. A plan approved by the legislature has greater authority than a plan approved by the executive alone: the legislature's approval represents a broader political commitment and provides a stronger basis for holding the government accountable for execution. A plan approved by the executive alone is more flexible — it can be revised without legislative action — but it is also more vulnerable to political change. The choice of approval process is a constitutional and political matter; the Manual describes the options without prescribing one.

The planner's role in the approval process is to support the decision-makers. The planner prepares the briefings, the supporting memoranda, and the responses to questions that arise during the approval process. The planner does not advocate for the plan outside the formal process; the planner provides the information the decision-makers need to make the decision. Once the plan is approved, the planner's role shifts to implementation support and monitoring, treated in Chapter 20.

17.4 Promulgation

Promulgation is the process by which the approved plan is published and made official. Promulgation typically involves publication in the official gazette, the release of the plan document to the public, and the communication of the plan's commitments to the implementing agencies. Promulgation gives the plan its public character: it is no longer a draft or a proposal but the government's stated commitment, available for public scrutiny and public accountability.

The promulgated plan is the reference document against which execution is assessed. The monitoring system, treated in Chapter 20, reports against the plan's indicators and targets. The audit function, treated in Chapter 2, assesses execution against the plan's commitments. The public and the legislature use the promulgated plan as the basis for holding the government accountable. The plan's promulgation is therefore not a formality; it is the act that makes the plan a commitment.

The promulgated plan is also the reference for revision. When the plan is revised, the revision is documented and the revised plan is promulgated in the same manner as the original. The revisions are tracked, so that the plan's evolution over its lifecycle is transparent. A plan that is revised without promulgation of the revisions loses its public character and its accountability; the public and the legislature cannot assess execution against a plan that has been changed without their knowledge. The discipline of promulgation applies to the original plan and to every revision.

17.5 Chapter Summary

The production of a plan comprises drafting, consultation, approval, and promulgation. Drafting is a distinct writing craft: the plan is a commitment, not a discussion, and the language is precise, measurable, and specific. Consultation improves quality, builds ownership, and tests feasibility, through internal and external stages, with a record of comments and responses.

Approval gives the plan legal force, through legislative, executive, or combined action. The approval process determines the plan's authority: legislative approval provides greater authority; executive approval provides greater flexibility. The planner supports the decision-makers with briefings and memoranda, without advocating outside the formal process.

Promulgation publishes the approved plan and makes it official, through gazette publication, public release, and communication to implementing agencies. The promulgated plan is the reference for monitoring, audit, and public accountability. Revisions are promulgated in the same manner, with the revisions tracked to maintain transparency over the plan's lifecycle.

Chapter 18 — The Plan-to-Budget Linkage

The plan-to-budget linkage is the discipline by which the plan's commitments are translated into the annual budget. This chapter treats the linkage, its mechanisms, and the characteristic failures that arise when it is weak.

18.1 The Linkage

The plan-to-budget linkage is the process by which the medium-term plan's first-year commitments become the budget's allocations. The plan states what the government intends to achieve over five years; the budget allocates resources for the next fiscal year. The linkage is the mechanism that connects the two, ensuring that the budget funds the activities the plan says will be undertaken in that year, and that the plan's commitments are backed by the resources the budget provides.

The linkage is necessary because the plan and the budget are produced by different processes, on different cycles, and often by different institutions. The plan is produced by the planning authority on a five-year cycle; the budget is produced by the finance ministry on an annual cycle. Without a linkage, the two documents may diverge: the budget may fund activities the plan does not prioritise, and the plan may commit to activities the budget does not fund. The divergence is not a technical problem; it is a failure of governance, because the government's stated intentions and its actual allocations do not match.

The linkage is maintained through three mechanisms: costing, ceilings, and reconciliation. Costing establishes the resource requirements of the plan's commitments. Ceilings establish the fiscal envelope within which the budget is set. Reconciliation adjusts the plan's commitments or the budget's allocations until the two are consistent. Each mechanism is treated below. The mechanisms operate within the planning cycle treated in Chapter 16, with the plan produced first and the budget produced within the plan's framework.

18.2 Costing the Plan

Costing is the process of estimating the resource requirements of each commitment in the plan. Each sectoral programme is costed by activity, by year, over the plan period. The costing covers recurrent costs (personnel, operations, maintenance) and capital costs (infrastructure, equipment). The output is a cost profile for each programme and for the plan as a whole, stating the resources required in each year of the plan period.

Costing is conducted by the sectoral ministries, with the finance ministry providing the cost standards and the quality assurance. The sectoral ministry has the technical knowledge to estimate the costs of its activities; the finance ministry has the cross-sectoral perspective to ensure consistency in costing methods and to challenge estimates that appear inflated or deflated. The costing is documented, with the assumptions stated: the unit costs, the activity volumes, the inflation assumptions, and the exchange rate assumptions where relevant.

The costing must be realistic. A costing that understates the resource requirements produces a plan that cannot be executed within the budget; a costing that overstates the requirements produces a plan that appears unaffordable and may be scaled back unnecessarily. The realism is tested through the reconciliation mechanism, which compares the costing to the fiscal envelope and identifies the gap. Where the gap is significant, the costing is reviewed and the plan's commitments are adjusted to fit within the envelope, or the envelope is examined to determine whether additional resources can be found.

18.3 Budget Ceilings

Budget ceilings are the limits on expenditure that the finance ministry sets for each sectoral ministry for the budget year. The ceilings are derived from the medium-term fiscal framework, treated in Chapter 19, which projects the government's revenue and expenditure over the plan period. The ceilings are the operational expression of the fiscal envelope: they translate the aggregate envelope into sectoral limits that guide the budget preparation.

Ceilings may be indicative or binding. Indicative ceilings are issued early in the budget preparation process as guidance to sectoral ministries; they may be revised as the budget preparation proceeds and as the fiscal position becomes clearer. Binding ceilings are issued later in the process and represent the final allocation that the sectoral ministry must work within. The sequence — indicative ceilings first, binding ceilings later — permits the sectoral ministries to prepare their budgets on the basis of a realistic fiscal framework while preserving the finance ministry's ability to adjust the framework as conditions change.

The relationship between the ceilings and the plan is direct. The ceilings for the first year of the plan period should reflect the plan's first-year cost profile; the ceilings for subsequent years should reflect the plan's cost profile for those years, adjusted for any changes in the fiscal position. Where the ceilings are significantly below the plan's cost profile, the gap indicates that the plan is not affordable within the fiscal envelope, and the reconciliation mechanism is engaged. A budget process in which the ceilings are set without reference to the plan produces a budget that is not linked to the plan, regardless of the formal relationship between the two documents.

18.4 Reconciliation

Reconciliation is the process of adjusting the plan's commitments or the budget's allocations until the two are consistent. The process begins with the comparison of the plan's first-year cost profile to the budget ceilings. Where the cost profile exceeds the ceilings, the gap is identified by sectoral programme. The gap is then addressed through one of three routes: the plan's commitments are reduced to fit within the ceilings; the ceilings are increased to accommodate the commitments; or a combination of the two is negotiated.

The reconciliation is conducted through a structured negotiation between the planning authority, the finance ministry, and the sectoral ministries. The planning authority represents the plan's strategic priorities; the finance ministry represents the fiscal envelope; the sectoral ministries represent the operational requirements. The negotiation is not a free-for-all; it is conducted against the plan's strategic framework and the fiscal framework, with each adjustment justified by reference to one or the other. The output is a set of agreed first-year commitments that fit within the ceilings and that are consistent with the plan's strategic framework.

The reconciliation may identify commitments that cannot be funded within the envelope and must be deferred. The deferral is documented, with the commitment recorded in the plan's pipeline for consideration in subsequent budget cycles. A reconciliation that does not document the deferrals loses the record of what the plan intended but could not fund, and the deferred commitments may be forgotten rather than reconsidered. The documentation is the mechanism by which the plan's integrity is maintained across budget cycles: the plan states what the government intends, the budget states what the government funds, and the reconciliation documents the difference.

18.5 Comparative Practice

The United Kingdom's spending review, conducted by HM Treasury, is a comparative example of the plan-to-budget linkage. The spending review sets departmental expenditure limits over a three- or four-year period, within the fiscal framework set by the Budget. The departments' settlements are negotiated with the Treasury, with the settlements reflecting the government's strategic priorities as expressed in the plan or equivalent strategic document. The spending review approach integrates planning and budgeting within a single process, which strengthens the linkage but may subordinate the strategic dimension to the fiscal dimension.

Australia's portfolio budget statements provide another example. Each portfolio produces a budget statement that links the portfolio's programmes to the government's strategic outcomes, with the resources allocated to each programme and the expected results. The statements are produced within the fiscal framework set by the Charter of Budget Honesty Act and the annual budget. The approach is notable for the explicit linkage between programmes and outcomes, which makes the plan-to-budget connection transparent and auditable.

France's loi de finances, produced annually by the finance ministry within the framework of the loi de programmation des finances publiques, translates the multi-year fiscal framework into annual budget allocations. The approach is notable for the separation between the multi-year framework (the programming law) and the annual budget (the finance law), which preserves the distinction between the strategic and the operational while maintaining the linkage. Indonesia's budget process links the RPJMN to the annual RKPD through the medium-term expenditure framework, with the planning authority (Bappenas) and the finance ministry sharing responsibility for the linkage.

18.6 Chapter Summary

The plan-to-budget linkage is the process by which the plan's first-year commitments become the budget's allocations. The linkage is necessary because the plan and the budget are produced by different processes and institutions; without it, the two documents diverge. The linkage is maintained through costing, ceilings, and reconciliation.

Costing estimates the resource requirements of each commitment, conducted by sectoral ministries with finance ministry quality assurance. Ceilings translate the fiscal envelope into sectoral limits, issued as indicative guidance early and binding limits later. Reconciliation adjusts the commitments or the allocations until the two are consistent, through structured negotiation. Deferred commitments are documented to maintain the plan's integrity across cycles.

Comparative practice includes the UK spending review, Australia's portfolio budget statements, France's loi de finances within the programming framework, and Indonesia's RPJMN-to-RKPD linkage. Each approach reflects the jurisdiction's institutional arrangements; the function is constant: to connect the plan's commitments to the budget's allocations.

Chapter 19 — The Medium-Term Fiscal Framework as a Planning Instrument

The medium-term fiscal framework is the fiscal envelope within which planning occurs. This chapter treats the framework as a planning instrument, distinct from its budget-execution role treated in the Administrative State Manual.

19.1 The Framework

The medium-term fiscal framework is the statement of the government's fiscal position and policy over the medium term, typically three to five years. It comprises projections of revenue, expenditure, deficit, and debt, based on the government's current policies and the economic outlook. The framework is produced by the finance ministry, in consultation with the planning authority and the central bank, and is updated at least annually. The framework is the fiscal envelope within which the plan operates: the plan's commitments must fit within the resources the framework projects.

The framework is distinct from the budget. The budget allocates resources for one fiscal year; the framework projects the fiscal position over the medium term. The budget is a legal document, approved by the legislature; the framework is a policy document, approved by the government and often published for transparency. The budget is binding; the framework is indicative, in the sense that the projections are updated as conditions change. The distinction matters because the framework provides the context within which the budget is set, but it does not determine the budget: the budget is determined through the political process, within the constraint the framework provides.

The framework is also distinct from the plan. The plan states the government's objectives and commitments; the framework states the fiscal resources available to fund them. The two are interdependent: the plan's commitments must be costed and fitted within the framework, and the framework's expenditure projections must reflect the plan's commitments. The interdependence is managed through the plan-to-budget linkage treated in Chapter 18.

19.2 Components of the Framework

The framework comprises four components. The first is the revenue projection, which estimates the government's revenue from taxes, fees, grants, and other sources over the medium term. The projection is based on the economic forecast, the tax policy, and the administrative capacity of the revenue authority. The revenue projection is the upper bound on the government's expenditure: the government cannot spend more than it earns or borrows, and the borrowing is itself constrained by debt sustainability.

The second component is the expenditure projection, which estimates the government's expenditure under current policies. The projection covers both recurrent expenditure (personnel, operations, interest) and capital expenditure (infrastructure investment). The projection is based on the cost of existing programmes, adjusted for demographic and price changes, and on the committed capital investment. The expenditure projection is the baseline against which the plan's additional commitments are assessed.

The third component is the fiscal balance, which is the difference between revenue and expenditure. A deficit (expenditure exceeding revenue) must be financed by borrowing; a surplus (revenue exceeding expenditure) permits debt reduction or reserve accumulation. The fiscal balance is subject to fiscal rules, which may limit the deficit as a share of gross domestic product or require a balanced budget over the cycle. The fourth component is the debt projection, which estimates the government's debt over the medium term, based on the fiscal balance and the financing requirements. The debt projection is subject to debt sustainability analysis, which assesses whether the debt trajectory is sustainable under a range of economic scenarios.

19.3 Fiscal Rules and the Fiscal Responsibility Law

Fiscal rules are quantitative limits on fiscal aggregates, established to impose discipline on fiscal policy. Common rules include a deficit ceiling (a maximum deficit as a share of gross domestic product), a debt ceiling (a maximum debt-to-gross-domestic-product ratio), and an expenditure ceiling (a maximum growth rate of expenditure). The rules are typically established by fiscal responsibility legislation, which gives them legal force and may require the government to explain deviations and to take corrective action.

The European Union's Stability and Growth Pact, which sets a deficit ceiling of 3 per cent of gross domestic product and a debt ceiling of 60 per cent, is a comparative example of fiscal rules with legal force. The rules apply to member states and are enforced through the European Commission's excessive deficit procedure. The United Kingdom's fiscal rules, set by the Charter for Budget Responsibility, establish targets for the deficit, debt, and welfare expenditure, with the Office for Budget Responsibility providing independent assessment. New Zealand's Public Finance Act establishes the principles of responsible fiscal management, with the government required to set fiscal objectives and report against them.

The planner's relationship to fiscal rules is one of constraint. The rules limit the fiscal envelope within which the plan operates: a deficit ceiling limits the government's capacity to borrow to fund the plan's commitments; a debt ceiling limits the accumulation of debt over time. The planner must understand the rules, must cost the plan within the rules, and must identify where the plan's commitments conflict with the rules. Where a conflict arises, the planner presents the conflict to political authority, with the options for resolution: the commitments are reduced, the rules are adjusted, or the conflict is accepted and the consequences are stated.

19.4 The Framework and the Plan

The framework and the plan are produced in a sequence that permits each to inform the other. The framework is produced first, or updated first, establishing the fiscal envelope. The plan is produced within the envelope, with the plan's commitments costed and fitted to the available resources. Where the plan's commitments exceed the envelope, the reconciliation process treated in Chapter 18 is engaged, and the plan or the envelope is adjusted.

The framework is not static over the plan period. The revenue and expenditure projections are updated annually as the economic outlook changes, as policies change, and as the actual fiscal outturn differs from the projection. The updates may change the envelope: a revenue shortfall reduces the resources available; an expenditure overrun reduces the resources available for new commitments. The plan must be robust against these changes, through the risk treatment treated in Chapter 10 and the plan revision process treated in Chapter 21.

The framework also constrains the plan's financing strategy. The plan's capital investment may be financed from current revenue, from domestic borrowing, from external borrowing, or from private financing. Each source has constraints: current revenue is limited by the fiscal position; domestic borrowing is limited by the domestic capital market and by debt sustainability; external borrowing is limited by external debt sustainability and by exchange rate risk; private financing is limited by the project's revenue-generating potential and by the government's capacity to manage the fiscal risks of public-private partnerships. The planner works with the finance ministry to identify the financing mix that supports the plan's commitments within the framework's constraints.

19.5 Chapter Summary

The medium-term fiscal framework is the statement of the government's fiscal position and policy over the medium term, comprising revenue, expenditure, deficit, and debt projections. It is the fiscal envelope within which the plan operates. The framework is distinct from the budget (annual, binding) and from the plan (strategic, multi-year), but interdependent with both.

The framework's four components are the revenue projection, the expenditure projection, the fiscal balance, and the debt projection. Fiscal rules, established by fiscal responsibility legislation, impose quantitative limits on fiscal aggregates. The planner's relationship to the rules is one of constraint: the planner costs the plan within the rules and identifies conflicts for political resolution.

The framework and the plan are produced in sequence, with the framework establishing the envelope and the plan fitting within it. The framework is updated annually, and the plan must be robust against the changes. The framework also constrains the plan's financing strategy, with each financing source subject to specific limits. The planner works with the finance ministry to identify the financing mix that supports the plan within the constraints.

Chapter 20 — Plan Execution and the Planner's Monitoring Role

Plan execution is an administrative function, treated in the Administrative State Manual. This chapter covers the planner's role in execution, which is monitoring: tracking progress against the plan, identifying deviations, and advising on corrective action.

20.1 The Planner's Role in Execution

The planner does not execute the plan. Execution is the function of the sectoral ministries, the executing agencies, and the officials who deliver the programmes and projects. The planner's role in execution is monitoring: the systematic tracking of progress against the plan's commitments, the identification of deviations from the plan, and the advice to political authority and to the executing agencies on corrective action. The distinction is fundamental: the planner produces and maintains the plan; the executors deliver it; the planner monitors the delivery.

The monitoring role is distinct from the performance management role treated in the Administrative State Manual, Chapter 20. Performance management is the discipline by which managers track and improve the performance of their programmes; it is conducted by the executing agencies. The planner's monitoring is the discipline by which the planning authority tracks the execution of the plan as a whole; it is conducted at the plan level, not the programme level. The two are complementary: the executing agencies' performance management feeds the planner's plan-level monitoring, and the planner's monitoring identifies plan-level issues that the executing agencies cannot resolve on their own.

The monitoring role is also distinct from the audit role. Audit, treated in Chapter 2 and in the Administrative State Manual, Chapters 25 and 26, is the independent assessment of execution against the plan. The planner's monitoring is the ongoing assessment, conducted by the planning authority as the plan is executed. The two are complementary: the planner's monitoring provides the real-time picture that the audit function subsequently verifies, and the audit's findings feed back into the planner's monitoring and revision process.

20.2 The Monitoring System

The monitoring system is the set of indicators, data sources, reporting arrangements, and review processes by which the planner tracks plan execution. The system is designed during plan production and is stated in the plan's implementation framework. The indicators are drawn from the plan's objectives and measures, treated in Chapters 12 and 13, and include both output indicators (what is being produced) and outcome indicators (what is being achieved).

The data sources for monitoring are the administrative data produced by the executing agencies, the survey data produced by the statistics office, and the financial data produced by the budget execution system. The planner does not produce data; the planner uses data produced by others. The data must be timely, reliable, and disaggregated to the level the monitoring requires.

Where the data are weak, the monitoring is weak, and the planner states the weakness and the implications for the assessment of progress.

The reporting arrangements state who reports what to whom and on what schedule. The executing agencies report to the planning authority on a quarterly or semi-annual basis, with the report covering the indicators, the activities undertaken, the outputs produced, the resources spent, and the issues encountered. The planning authority consolidates the reports into a plan-level monitoring report, which is presented to political authority on an annual basis. The monitoring report states the progress against the plan's commitments, the deviations identified, and the corrective action recommended.

20.3 Identifying and Assessing Deviations

A deviation is a difference between the plan's commitment and the actual execution. Deviations may be positive (execution exceeds the commitment) or negative (execution falls short). Positive deviations are not necessarily good: they may indicate that the commitment was set too low, or that resources were diverted from other commitments. Negative deviations are not necessarily bad: they may indicate that conditions changed and the commitment was appropriately deferred, or that the commitment was infeasible and the deviation prevented waste. The assessment of a deviation requires understanding its cause and its implication for the plan.

The assessment begins with the cause. The planner identifies why the deviation occurred: was it due to implementation failure (the executing agency did not deliver), to external conditions (the assumptions changed), to resource constraints (the budget was insufficient), or to a change in priorities (the government redirected the commitment)? The cause determines the response: implementation failure requires action by the executing agency; changed assumptions require plan revision; resource constraints require budget adjustment; changed priorities require political decision.

The assessment then considers the implication. A deviation in one commitment may affect others: a delay in one infrastructure project may delay dependent projects; a shortfall in revenue may require cuts across multiple programmes. The planner assesses the cascading effects and presents them to political authority as part of the corrective action recommendation. The assessment also considers the trend: is the deviation a one-time event, or is it part of a pattern that will worsen over the plan period? A trend deviation requires more fundamental action than a one-time deviation.

20.4 Advising on Corrective Action

The planner's advice on corrective action is the output of the monitoring process. The advice states the deviation, the cause, the implication, and the recommended action. The recommended action may be to accelerate execution (where the deviation is due to implementation failure), to revise the plan (where the deviation is due to changed assumptions), to adjust the budget (where the deviation is due to resource constraints), or to seek political direction (where the deviation is due to changed priorities).

The advice is presented to political authority through the annual monitoring report and through ad hoc briefings when significant deviations arise. The advice is factual and analytical: it states what has happened, why it has happened, and what the options are. The advice is not advocacy: the planner does not lobby for a particular action outside the formal process. The advice is also not decision: the planner recommends, political authority decides, and the executing agencies implement.

The advice is followed up. The planner tracks whether the recommended action was taken, whether it had the intended effect, and whether the deviation was corrected. The follow-up is part of the monitoring cycle: each monitoring report covers not only the current period's deviations but also the status of the actions recommended in previous reports. The follow-up ensures that the monitoring system does not become a reporting exercise that produces recommendations without consequences, but a management tool that drives corrective action.

20.5 The Implementation Review

The implementation review is the comprehensive assessment of plan execution conducted at the mid-point of the plan period. The review covers all the plan's commitments, assesses the progress against each, identifies the cross-cutting issues, and recommends whether the plan should be revised. The review is the input to the plan revision process treated in Chapter 21.

The review is conducted by the planning authority, with inputs from the executing agencies, the finance ministry, and the statistics office. The review is more thorough than the annual monitoring report: it covers the full plan rather than the current year's execution, and it assesses the plan's strategic coherence rather than just its operational progress. The review asks whether the plan's strategy remains valid, whether the plan's assumptions remain sound, and whether the plan's commitments remain feasible.

The implementation review is also a public document, published to provide transparency on the plan's execution. The publication serves two purposes: it informs the public and the legislature of the plan's progress, enabling accountability; and it signals to the executing agencies and the development partners that the planning authority is monitoring execution and is prepared to recommend revision where necessary. The publication is part of the discipline of planning: a plan that is monitored in secret is a plan whose execution cannot be assessed by those whom the plan is intended to serve.

20.6 Chapter Summary

The planner's role in execution is monitoring: tracking progress against the plan, identifying deviations, and advising on corrective action. The planner does not execute the plan; execution is the function of the sectoral ministries and executing agencies. The monitoring role is distinct from performance management (conducted by executing agencies) and from audit (conducted independently).

The monitoring system comprises indicators, data sources, reporting arrangements, and review processes, designed during plan production. The system uses administrative data, survey data, and financial data produced by others. The reporting arrangements state who reports what to whom and on what schedule, with the planning authority consolidating reports into an annual monitoring report.

Deviations are assessed for cause and implication, with the recommended action tailored to the cause. The advice is factual, presented through the annual report and ad hoc briefings, and is followed up to ensure corrective action. The implementation review, conducted at the mid-point of the plan period, is the comprehensive assessment that feeds the plan revision process and is published for transparency.

Chapter 21 — Plan Revision and Adaptation

Plans are living instruments. This chapter treats the discipline of plan revision: when plans are revised, how revisions are made, and how the plan's integrity is maintained through change.

21.1 The Case for Revision

A plan is a commitment for a defined period, but the conditions on which the plan rests do not remain constant over the period. Assumptions may prove wrong, conditions may change, priorities may shift, and opportunities may arise that the plan did not anticipate. A plan that cannot be revised when conditions change is a plan that will become irrelevant within its own period; a plan that is constantly revised is a plan that has no commitment value. The discipline of plan revision navigates between these extremes, maintaining the plan's relevance while preserving its commitment character.

Revision is not a sign of plan failure. A plan that is revised because the assumptions proved wrong is a plan whose foresight was imperfect, which is inevitable given the uncertainty of the future. A plan that is revised because conditions changed is a plan whose environment shifted, which is also inevitable. The failure is not in the revision; the failure is in the refusal to revise, which produces a plan that is published and ignored as conditions diverge from the assumptions.

Revision is also not a substitute for planning. A government that revises its plan so frequently that the plan is never stable has not produced a plan; it has produced a rolling forecast. The discipline requires that revision be exceptional, not routine: the plan is a commitment for the period, and the revision is triggered by specific conditions, not by a general desire to update. The conditions that trigger revision are treated below.

21.2 When to Revise

Three conditions trigger plan revision. The first is a significant change in the assumptions. If the demographic projection, the economic growth path, the fiscal envelope, or the geopolitical environment changes significantly, the plan's assumptions are no longer valid, and the plan's commitments must be reassessed against the new assumptions. The threshold for significance is a judgment: a 10 per cent change in the projected growth rate, a 20 per cent change in the projected revenue, or a structural change in the demographic trajectory would typically qualify.

The second condition is a significant deviation in execution. If the plan's commitments are consistently under-executed or over-executed, the plan's feasibility is in question, and the commitments must be reassessed. The implementation review, treated in Chapter 20, identifies the deviations that warrant revision. The third condition is a change in political direction. A new government, or a significant shift in the incumbent government's priorities, may require the plan to be revised to reflect the new direction. The relationship between political direction and plan content is treated in Chapter 3.

The three conditions are not mutually exclusive. A change in assumptions may cause execution deviations, which may in turn trigger a political reassessment. The planner's role is to identify the condition that has arisen, to assess its implications for the plan, and to recommend whether revision is warranted. The recommendation is presented to political authority, which decides whether to proceed with the revision. A planner who revises the plan without political authority is exceeding the role; a planner who does not recommend revision when the conditions arise is failing in the role.

21.3 The Revision Process

The revision process mirrors the planning process, in abbreviated form. The planner begins with an updated baseline, reflecting the conditions that triggered the revision. The strategy is reassessed, with the strategic options updated to reflect the new conditions. The plan's commitments are revised, with the costing and the fiscal envelope updated. The revised plan is consulted on, approved, and promulgated through the same processes as the original, treated in Chapter 17.

The revision is documented as an amendment to the plan, not as a new plan. The amendment states the changes made, the reasons for the changes, and the implications for the plan's commitments and indicators. The original plan and the amendment are maintained together, so that the plan's evolution over its lifecycle is transparent. A revision that produces a new plan, without reference to the original, loses the record of what was committed and why it was changed, and undermines the accountability that the plan is intended to provide.

The revision process is subject to the same discipline as the original planning process. The revised commitments must be costed and fitted within the fiscal envelope; the revised indicators must be measurable and monitored; the revised assumptions must be stated explicitly. A revision that relaxes the discipline — that states commitments without costing, or that sets indicators without baselines — is a revision that undermines the plan's integrity. The discipline applies equally to the original plan and to every revision.

21.4 Deviation Management

Not every deviation requires revision. The plan must tolerate some deviation, because execution never proceeds exactly as planned. The discipline of deviation management distinguishes between deviations that can be managed within the plan and deviations that require revision. A deviation that can be managed within the plan is addressed through corrective action by the executing agencies, monitored by the planner, and reported through the annual monitoring report. A deviation that requires revision is addressed through the revision process.

The threshold for revision is a judgment that depends on the deviation's magnitude, persistence, and implication. A deviation that is small and one-time is managed within the plan. A deviation that is large, persistent, or that affects multiple commitments is a candidate for revision. The planner assesses the deviation against these criteria and recommends whether revision is warranted. The assessment is documented, with the reasoning stated, so that the decision to revise or not to revise is transparent.

Deviation management also includes the management of positive deviations. A positive deviation — execution that exceeds the commitment — may indicate that the commitment was set too low, that resources were diverted from other commitments, or that conditions were more favourable than assumed. The planner assesses the cause and the implication, and recommends whether the positive deviation should be reflected in revised commitments for subsequent years, or whether it should be treated as a one-time event. The management of positive deviations is as important as the management of negative ones: a plan that only addresses shortfalls and not surpluses is a plan that does not maintain its coherence across the full range of execution experience.

21.5 Worked Example: A Mid-Cycle Review

Consider a national development plan in its third year of a five-year period. The plan was produced on the assumption of 4 per cent annual economic growth. In the third year, the growth rate falls to 1 per cent, due to a global recession. The revenue projection underlying the plan's resource framework is revised downward by 15 per cent. The planner initiates a mid-cycle review.

The review begins with an updated baseline. The economic baseline is revised to reflect the recession; the fiscal baseline is revised to reflect the revenue shortfall; the sectoral baselines are revised to reflect the impact of the recession on service demand and on the executing agencies' capacity. The situational diagnosis is updated, with the recession identified as a major new constraint.

The strategy is reassessed. The plan's original objectives are reviewed against the new fiscal envelope: which objectives can still be achieved, which must be deferred, which must be abandoned. The planner develops options: a first option that protects the social sector commitments and defers capital investment; a second option that protects capital investment and reduces social sector commitments; a third option that spreads the reduction across all sectors. The options are presented to political authority, which selects the first option.

The plan is revised to reflect the selected option. The capital investment plan is re-sequenced, with some projects deferred to the next plan period; the social sector commitments are maintained but with extended timelines; the indicators are revised to reflect the new trajectories. The revision is documented as an amendment, stating the changes, the reasons, and the implications. The revised plan is approved and promulgated, and the monitoring system is updated to track the revised commitments. The revision is not a failure of the original plan; it is the appropriate response to the change in conditions, and the discipline of the revision process maintains the plan's integrity through the change.

21.6 Chapter Summary

Plans are living instruments, revised when conditions change. Revision is not a sign of plan failure, nor is it a substitute for planning. The discipline navigates between a plan that cannot be revised and a plan that is constantly revised, maintaining relevance while preserving commitment.

Three conditions trigger revision: a significant change in the assumptions, a significant deviation in execution, or a change in political direction. The planner identifies the condition, assesses the implications, and recommends whether revision is warranted. The revision process mirrors the planning process in abbreviated form, with an updated baseline, a reassessed strategy, and revised commitments, documented as an amendment.

Deviation management distinguishes between deviations that can be managed within the plan and deviations that require revision, based on magnitude, persistence, and implication. Positive deviations are managed as carefully as negative ones. The worked example illustrates a mid-cycle review triggered by a revenue shortfall, with options developed, a selection made, and the plan revised and promulgated as an amendment.

Chapter 22 — Crisis and Contingency Planning

Crisis and contingency planning is the discipline of preparing the plan for the conditions that would require its suspension or radical revision. This chapter treats the planning, not the response, which is covered in the Administrative State Manual.

22.1 Crisis and the Plan

A crisis is an event or sequence of events that disrupts the normal execution of the plan and requires an exceptional response. Crises may be natural (earthquakes, floods, pandemics), economic (recessions, financial collapses), political (constitutional crises, conflicts), or technological (infrastructure failures, cyber incidents). A crisis does not abolish the plan, but it may require the plan's suspension, acceleration, or revision. The planner's role is to prepare the plan for the conditions that crises create, so that the response is disciplined rather than improvised.

The relationship between the plan and the crisis response is governed by two principles. The first is that the plan provides the framework for the response: the crisis response uses the plan's institutions, the plan's indicators, and the plan's resource framework, adapted to the crisis. The second is that the crisis response may require the plan's suspension: the plan's normal commitments may be set aside while the crisis is addressed, and the plan's resources may be redirected to the response. The suspension is temporary and is formalised through the plan revision process treated in Chapter 21.

Crisis and contingency planning is distinct from crisis management. Crisis management, treated in the Administrative State Manual, Chapter 16, is the operational discipline of responding to a crisis: activating the emergency operations centre, coordinating the response, managing the public communication. Crisis and contingency planning is the planning discipline of preparing the plan for the conditions that crises create: identifying the contingencies, assessing their implications, and designing the plan's response. The two are complementary: the planner prepares the plan; the crisis manager executes the response.

22.2 Contingency Identification

Contingency identification is the process of identifying the events that could trigger a crisis and require a plan response. The process draws on the strategic risk assessment treated in Chapter 10, with a focus on the risks that would require plan suspension or radical revision. The identification is conducted through structured methods: scenario analysis, historical review, and expert elicitation. The output is a list of contingencies, each with a description of the event, the trigger conditions, and the likely implications for the plan.

Contingencies are categorised by their implications. A contingency that requires plan acceleration — a recession that requires the front-loading of capital investment to sustain employment — has different implications from a contingency that requires plan suspension — a conflict that requires the redirection of resources to security. A contingency that requires plan revision — a pandemic that changes the service delivery model — has different implications from a contingency that requires plan abandonment — a constitutional crisis that invalidates the plan's political direction. The categorisation determines the response that is planned for each contingency.

The list of contingencies is maintained as part of the plan's risk register, treated in Chapter 10, and is reviewed at each plan review. New contingencies may be added as conditions change; existing contingencies may be removed as the risks dissipate. The list is not exhaustive; it cannot predict every crisis. The discipline is to maintain a list of the contingencies that are most likely and most consequential, and to plan the response to those, while maintaining the capacity to respond to contingencies that were not anticipated.

22.3 Contingency Plan Structure

A contingency plan is a document that states the response to a specific contingency. The plan comprises four elements. The first is the trigger: the conditions that would activate the contingency plan, stated in measurable terms where possible. A trigger for a drought contingency plan might be a reservoir level below a defined threshold for a defined period. The trigger must be unambiguous, so that the decision to activate the plan is not delayed by debate over whether the conditions have been met.

The second element is the response: the actions that will be taken when the contingency plan is activated. The response states which plan commitments are suspended, which are accelerated, which are revised, and what new commitments are undertaken. The response also states the institutional arrangements: who is in charge, who reports to whom, and how the response is coordinated. The third element is the resource framework: the resources that will be allocated to the response, including the sources of financing and the mechanism for releasing the resources. The fourth element is the exit: the conditions under which the contingency plan is deactivated and the normal plan is resumed, and the process for transitioning back.

The contingency plan is maintained as an annex to the main plan, not as a separate document. The annex is updated when the main plan is revised and is tested periodically through exercises that simulate the contingency. The testing identifies weaknesses in the plan — unclear triggers, infeasible responses, insufficient resources — and the weaknesses are addressed through plan revision. A contingency plan that is never tested is a plan whose feasibility is unverified; a contingency plan that is tested and not revised is a plan whose weaknesses are known and not addressed.

22.4 Integration with the Main Plan

The contingency plan is integrated with the main plan through three mechanisms. The first is the risk register: the contingencies identified in the contingency plan are recorded in the main plan's risk register, with the indicators that would signal their materialisation. The second is the resource framework: the resources required for the contingency response are identified in the main plan's resource framework, with the financing sources and the release mechanisms. The third is the monitoring system: the contingency triggers are monitored alongside the main plan's indicators, so that the activation of a contingency plan is detected as early as possible.

The integration ensures that the contingency plan is not a separate exercise that is forgotten until the crisis arises. A contingency plan that is not integrated with the main plan is a document that will not be available when the crisis occurs, because the planning authority will not know where it is, the finance ministry will not have identified the resources, and the monitoring system will not have detected the trigger. The integration is the mechanism by which the contingency plan is maintained as a living part of the planning system.

The integration also ensures that the contingency plan is consistent with the main plan. The contingency response uses the main plan's institutions, indicators, and resource framework; the consistency ensures that the response does not have to be improvised when the crisis arises. Where the main plan is revised, the contingency plan is revised to maintain the consistency. Where the contingency plan is activated and the response is executed, the experience is fed back into the next revision of the main plan, so that the planning system learns from the crisis.

22.5 Chapter Summary

Crisis and contingency planning is the discipline of preparing the plan for the conditions that would require its suspension or radical revision. The plan provides the framework for the crisis response and may be suspended while the response is executed. Crisis and contingency planning is distinct from crisis management, which is the operational response.

Contingency identification produces a list of events that could trigger a crisis, categorised by their implications: acceleration, suspension, revision, or abandonment. The list is maintained in the risk register and reviewed at each plan review. A contingency plan states the trigger, the response, the resource framework, and the exit, and is maintained as an annex to the main plan.

The contingency plan is integrated with the main plan through the risk register, the resource framework, and the monitoring system. The integration ensures that the contingency plan is available, consistent, and tested. Where the main plan is revised, the contingency plan is revised; where the contingency plan is activated, the experience is fed back into the main plan.

Chapter 23 — Continuity and Recovery Planning

Continuity and recovery planning is the discipline of preparing for the preservation of essential government functions during a disruption and for the restoration of normal functions after a disruption. This chapter treats the planning discipline; the operational doctrine is covered in the Administrative State Manual.

23.1 Continuity of Government and Continuity of Operations

Continuity of government is the preservation of the constitutional and institutional structures of the state during a disruption. Continuity of operations is the preservation of the essential functions of government agencies during a disruption. The two are related but distinct: continuity of government addresses the survival of the constitutional order; continuity of operations addresses the delivery of essential services. Both are planning disciplines, conducted in advance of the disruption, and both are distinguished from the operational response treated in the Administrative State Manual, Chapter 16.

Continuity planning is the process of identifying the essential functions that must be preserved during a disruption, the resources required to preserve them, and the arrangements for operating from alternative facilities if the primary facilities are unavailable. Essential functions are those that must be performed without interruption: the security functions, the fiscal functions, the public health functions, and the functions that protect life and property. The identification of essential functions is a planning judgment, made in advance and reviewed periodically.

The planner's role in continuity planning is to ensure that the continuity arrangements are consistent with the plan. The plan's commitments identify the functions that the government has prioritised; the continuity arrangements identify the functions that must be preserved during a disruption. The two should be consistent: a function that is prioritised in the plan should be preserved in a disruption; a function that is not prioritised in the plan may be suspended in a disruption. Where the two are inconsistent, the planner raises the issue for resolution.

23.2 Recovery Planning

Recovery planning is the discipline of preparing for the restoration of normal government functions after a disruption. Recovery is distinguished from the immediate response: the response addresses the crisis; the recovery addresses the aftermath. Recovery may be short-term (the restoration of services within weeks or months) or long-term (the reconstruction of infrastructure and institutions over years). The planner's role is to prepare the framework for recovery before the disruption occurs, so that the recovery can begin promptly when the crisis subsides.

Recovery planning addresses three questions. The first is the recovery objective: what state of government functions is the recovery aiming to restore? The objective may be a return to the pre-disruption state, or it may be a revised state that incorporates lessons from the disruption. The second is the recovery financing: what resources will be required, and from what sources?

Recovery is expensive, and the financing must be identified in advance, through reserves, insurance, contingency financing, or external assistance. The third is the recovery governance: who is in charge of the recovery, and how is the recovery coordinated across the agencies involved?

Recovery planning is integrated with the plan through the plan revision process. A disruption that requires recovery will also require plan revision: the plan's commitments will have been affected by the disruption, and the recovery will require new or revised commitments. The plan revision treated in Chapter 21 is the mechanism by which the recovery is incorporated into the planning framework. A recovery that is not incorporated into the plan produces a parallel set of commitments that are not coordinated with the plan's other commitments and that may conflict with them.

23.3 The Recovery as a Planning Opportunity

A disruption may create a planning opportunity. The disruption may have revealed weaknesses in the pre-disruption plan: the baseline may have been wrong, the assumptions may have been unrealistic, the priorities may have been inappropriate. The recovery is an opportunity to address these weaknesses, by revising the plan to reflect the lessons learned. The recovery is also an opportunity to build back better: to reconstruct infrastructure to a higher standard, to redesign services to be more effective, to reform institutions to be more resilient.

The opportunity must be balanced against the risk of opportunism. A disruption may be used to justify changes that were not supported by the planning process and that would not have been adopted under normal conditions. The planner's role is to ensure that the changes made during recovery are justified by the lessons learned and are consistent with the plan's strategic framework, not by the opportunity to make changes that would otherwise not have been possible. The discipline of plan revision, treated in Chapter 21, applies: the changes are documented, the reasons are stated, and the implications for the plan's commitments are assessed.

The recovery also creates a monitoring challenge. The recovery's progress must be tracked against the recovery objectives, which may be different from the plan's original commitments. The monitoring system, treated in Chapter 20, must be adapted to track the recovery, with indicators that reflect the recovery's objectives and milestones. The adapted monitoring system is temporary: as the recovery is completed, the monitoring system reverts to the plan's original indicators, which may themselves have been revised through the plan revision process.

23.4 Comparative Practice

New Zealand's recovery planning for the Canterbury earthquakes provides a comparative example. The recovery was governed by a dedicated authority, the Canterbury Earthquake Recovery Authority, with the powers to plan and execute the recovery. The recovery plan addressed the reconstruction of infrastructure, the restoration of services, and the redesign of the central business district. The recovery was integrated with the national planning framework through the plan revision process, with the recovery commitments incorporated into the government's medium-term plan.

Japan's recovery planning for the 2011 earthquake and tsunami provides another example. The recovery was governed by the Reconstruction Agency, established to coordinate the recovery across the affected prefectures. The recovery plan addressed the reconstruction of housing, infrastructure, and livelihoods, with a ten-year horizon. The recovery was financed through a combination of national budget allocations, local government resources, and external assistance. The experience led to revisions in the national disaster management plan and in the national planning framework.

Indonesia's recovery planning for the 2004 Indian Ocean tsunami is a third example. The recovery was governed by a dedicated agency, BRR, with a five-year mandate. The recovery plan addressed the reconstruction of housing, infrastructure, and livelihoods across the affected provinces. The recovery was financed through a combination of national budget, international assistance, and non-governmental resources. The experience led to the establishment of the national disaster management authority and to revisions in the national planning framework for disaster-prone regions.

23.5 Chapter Summary

Continuity and recovery planning prepares for the preservation of essential functions during a disruption and for the restoration of normal functions after. Continuity of government addresses the constitutional order; continuity of operations addresses the essential services. The planner's role is to ensure consistency between the continuity arrangements and the plan's commitments.

Recovery planning addresses the recovery objective, the financing, and the governance. Recovery is integrated with the plan through the plan revision process. A disruption may create a planning opportunity, but the opportunity must be balanced against the risk of opportunism, with changes justified by lessons learned and consistent with the plan's strategic framework.

Comparative practice includes New Zealand's Canterbury earthquake recovery, Japan's 2011 recovery, and Indonesia's 2004 tsunami recovery. Each was governed by a dedicated authority, financed through a combination of sources, and integrated with the national planning framework through plan revision.

Chapter 24 — Spatial and Regional Development Planning

Spatial and regional development planning is the discipline of addressing disparities in development across the territory. This chapter treats the discipline as distinct from land-use regulation and from sectoral planning.

24.1 Regional Disparities

Regional disparities are differences in economic activity, income, employment, infrastructure, and social indicators across the regions of a jurisdiction. Disparities are a persistent feature of most jurisdictions: the capital region is typically more developed than the peripheral regions; the urban areas are typically more developed than the rural areas; the coastal regions may be more developed than the inland regions. The disparities are not necessarily a problem, but where they are large and persistent, they may undermine national cohesion, drive migration to the capital, and create political pressures that the plan must address.

The planner's first task in spatial and regional development planning is to measure the disparities. The measurement uses the regional data from the statistics office: gross regional product per capita, employment rates, poverty rates, infrastructure coverage, and social indicators. The measurement is disaggregated to the lowest geographic level the data support, to reveal the pattern of disparities within regions as well as across them. The measurement is the foundation for the diagnosis.

The diagnosis assesses the causes of the disparities. Causes may be geographic (distance from markets, resource endowment, climate), historical (patterns of settlement, colonial legacies, past investment decisions), institutional (the distribution of fiscal resources, the capacity of local government), or policy-driven (the concentration of public investment in the capital, the neglect of rural infrastructure). The diagnosis identifies the causes that the plan can address and the causes that the plan must treat as constraints.

24.2 Regional Development Strategies

A regional development strategy is a plan for addressing the disparities in a specific region or set of regions. The strategy states the region's development objectives, the investments and policies that will be undertaken, the institutional arrangements for delivery, and the indicators by which progress will be measured. The strategy is subordinate to the national development plan and consistent with the national spatial plan treated in Chapter 14.

Regional development strategies may take several forms. A growth-pole strategy concentrates investment in a designated centre, with the expectation that the growth will diffuse to the surrounding area. A corridor strategy concentrates investment along a transport corridor, with the expectation that the corridor will attract economic activity and connect the regions it passes through. A lagging-region strategy targets the regions with the greatest disparities, with investments designed to raise their development level. The choice of strategy depends on the diagnosis of the disparities and the geographic and institutional context.

The strategy must be feasible. A regional development strategy that promises more than the available resources can deliver is a strategy that will fail and that will discredit the planning function. The feasibility is assessed through the costing and reconciliation process treated in Chapter 18, with the strategy's resource requirements fitted within the fiscal envelope. Where the strategy's requirements exceed the envelope, the strategy is revised or the envelope is examined, through the same process as for the main plan.

24.3 The Relationship to the National Plan

Regional development strategies are subordinate to the national development plan. The national plan sets the strategic framework, including the priorities for regional development; the regional strategies translate the framework into region-specific commitments. The regional strategies are produced by the regional planning authorities, where they exist, or by the national planning authority in consultation with the regional and local authorities. The strategies are consistent with the national plan's resource framework and with the national spatial plan.

The relationship is maintained through the planning cycle. The national plan is produced first, establishing the framework. The regional strategies are produced second, translating the framework. Where a regional strategy cannot achieve the national plan's objectives within the regional allocation, the issue is referred to the national planning authority for resolution, through the same process as for sectoral plans treated in Chapter 13.

The relationship is also maintained through the monitoring system. The regional strategies' indicators feed into the national plan's monitoring framework, providing the data by which the regional dimensions of the national plan's progress are assessed. A regional strategy that does not report against its indicators, or that reports indicators inconsistent with the national framework, breaks the monitoring chain and prevents the national plan's regional progress from being assessed.

24.4 Comparative Practice

The European Union's cohesion policy is a comparative example of regional development planning at a supranational level. The policy allocates structural and investment funds to the less-developed regions of the member states, with the allocation based on regional gross domestic product per capita and other indicators. The funds are used for infrastructure, innovation, human capital, and social inclusion, within the framework of partnership agreements between the member state and the Commission. The policy is notable for the use of regional indicators to allocate resources and for the requirement that the funds be used within a planning framework.

China's regional development strategies provide another example. The Western Development Strategy, launched in 2000, targets the western provinces with infrastructure investment, industrial development, and environmental protection. The Northeast Revitalization Strategy targets the old industrial base of the northeast. The Rise of Central China Strategy targets the central provinces.

Each strategy is produced by the National Development and Reform Commission in consultation with the provincial governments, and is implemented through the five-year plan system.

Brazil's regional development policies provide a third example. The Amazon development policies, implemented through the Amazon Development Agency, address the disparities in the Amazon region. The Northeast development policies, implemented through the Northeast Development Agency, address the disparities in the Northeast. The policies are integrated with the national multi-year plan (plano plurianual) and are financed through the federal budget. Each example reflects the jurisdiction's specific geography and institutional framework; the function is constant: to address regional disparities through planned investment and policy.

24.5 Chapter Summary

Spatial and regional development planning addresses disparities in development across the territory. The planner's first task is to measure the disparities using regional data, then to diagnose the causes. The diagnosis distinguishes causes the plan can address from causes the plan must treat as constraints.

Regional development strategies state the objectives, investments, policies, institutional arrangements, and indicators for a specific region. Strategies may take the form of growth-pole, corridor, or lagging-region approaches. The strategy must be feasible, assessed through the costing and reconciliation process.

Regional strategies are subordinate to the national plan and consistent with the national spatial plan. The relationship is maintained through the planning cycle and the monitoring system. Comparative practice includes the EU cohesion policy, China's regional development strategies, and Brazil's regional development policies.

Chapter 25 — Comparative Planning Traditions

This chapter treats the planning traditions of mature jurisdictions as the reference against which the planner's own practice is assessed. The traditions are presented as practice, not as models to be copied.

25.1 France: Indicative Planning and the Commissariat

France's planning tradition is rooted in the Commissariat Général du Plan, established in 1946 to coordinate the reconstruction of the French economy. The Commissariat produced a series of five-year plans, from the First Plan (1947) through the Eleventh Plan (2002), that guided the allocation of investment and the coordination of sectoral policies. The plans were indicative: they did not command the private sector, but they signalled the government's priorities and coordinated the public sector's investment. The Commissariat was dissolved in 2006, with its functions transferred to France Stratégie and the Centre d'analyse stratégique.

The French tradition is notable for three contributions to planning practice. The first is the method of concertation: the plan was developed through a structured consultation with the social partners, the sectoral ministries, and the regions, producing a consensus that strengthened the plan's implementation. The second is the use of indicative targets: the plan set targets that were not legally binding but that guided the public sector's investment and signalled the private sector's opportunities. The third is the integration of planning with the budget: the plan's investment commitments were reflected in the annual budget through the loi de programmation des finances publiques.

The French tradition's lesson for the planner is the value of concertation as a planning method. A plan that is developed through structured consultation with those who will implement it is a plan that is more likely to be implemented, because the implementers have participated in its development. The lesson is not the specific institutional form of the Commissariat, which was a product of the French administrative tradition, but the method of consultation that the Commissariat developed.

25.2 Singapore: Strategic Foresight and Integrated Planning

Singapore's planning tradition is characterised by the integration of strategic foresight, long-term planning, and implementation within a unified administrative system. The Strategy Group, within the Prime Minister's Office, coordinates the government's strategic planning. The Centre for Strategic Futures conducts foresight exercises and scenario development. The Urban Redevelopment Authority produces the Concept Plan, a forty- to fifty-year spatial plan, and the Master Plan, the statutory land-use plan. The Ministry of Finance produces the annual budget within a multi-year fiscal framework.

The Singaporean tradition is notable for three contributions. The first is the institutionalisation of foresight: the Centre for Strategic Futures is a permanent body that conducts foresight as a continuous function, not as an ad hoc exercise. The second is the long planning horizon: the Concept Plan's forty- to fifty-year horizon permits the reservation of land for future uses and the alignment of infrastructure investment with long-term demographic and economic projections. The third is the integration of planning across functions: the strategic, spatial, and fiscal planning functions are coordinated through the unified administrative system, producing a coherence that is difficult to achieve when the functions are separated.

The lesson is the value of institutionalised foresight and integrated planning. A government that maintains a permanent foresight capability and that coordinates its planning functions across the strategic, spatial, and fiscal domains is a government that can plan over the long term with coherence. The lesson is not the specific institutional form, which is a product of Singapore's size and administrative tradition, but the principles of institutionalised foresight and functional integration.

25.3 China: The Five-Year Plan System

China's planning tradition is centred on the five-year plan system, administered by the National Development and Reform Commission. The system has produced fourteen five-year plans, from the First Five-Year Plan (1953) through the Fourteenth Five-Year Plan (2021–2025). The plans set binding targets, which are mandatory and are enforced through the performance management system, and indicative targets, which are aspirational and are not enforced. The plans are produced at national, provincial, and municipal levels, with each level binding on the level below.

The Chinese tradition is notable for three contributions. The first is the binding target: the use of mandatory targets, enforced through the performance management system, gives the plan a commitment character that indicative plans do not have. The second is the decomposition of national targets to the provincial and municipal levels: the national plan's targets are allocated to the provinces and municipalities, which are responsible for achieving them. The third is the integration of the plan with the budget and with the performance management system: the plan's commitments are reflected in the budget and in the performance assessments of officials.

The lesson is the value of enforcement mechanisms. A plan that is backed by binding targets and by a performance management system that holds officials accountable for achievement is a plan that is more likely to be implemented. The lesson is not the specific enforcement mechanism, which is a product of the Chinese political system, but the principle that a plan without enforcement is a plan whose commitments are aspirational rather than binding.

25.4 The United Kingdom: The Green Book and Spending Reviews

The United Kingdom's planning tradition is characterised by the HM Treasury Green Book and the spending review system. The Green Book, first published in 1944, is the government's manual for the appraisal and evaluation of policies, programmes, and projects. It provides the methodology for cost-benefit analysis, for the assessment of non-market impacts, and for the treatment of uncertainty. The spending review, conducted periodically, sets departmental expenditure limits over a three- or four-year period, within the fiscal framework established by the Budget.

The British tradition is notable for three contributions. The first is the systematic application of appraisal methodology: the Green Book's methods are applied across government, providing a consistent basis for the assessment of public investment. The second is the spending review as a planning instrument: the spending review sets medium-term expenditure limits, which provide the fiscal envelope within which departments plan. The third is the integration of planning with the fiscal framework: the spending review is conducted within the fiscal framework, and the departments' plans are fitted within the expenditure limits.

The lesson is the value of systematic appraisal. A government that applies consistent appraisal methodology across its investment decisions is a government that makes better-informed choices. The lesson is not the specific methodology of the Green Book, which reflects the British administrative tradition, but the principle that appraisal should be systematic, consistent, and applied across government.

25.5 Indonesia, South Korea, and the Nordic Traditions

Indonesia's planning tradition is centred on Bappenas, the Ministry of National Development Planning, and the RPJMN system. The RPJMN is a five-year medium-term development plan that translates the long-term plan (RPJP, covering twenty-five years) into medium-term commitments. The RPJMN is implemented through the annual government work plan (RKPD), which is linked to the annual budget. The system is notable for the hierarchy of plans — long-term, medium-term, annual — and for the integration of planning with the budget through the medium-term expenditure framework.

South Korea's planning tradition is rooted in the Economic Planning Board, established in 1961, which produced the five-year economic development plans that drove the country's industrialisation. The Economic Planning Board was reorganised in 1994 and its functions absorbed into the Ministry of Economy and Finance, but the tradition of medium-term planning with strong fiscal integration continues. The Korean tradition is notable for the use of the plan as an instrument of industrial policy, with the plan identifying the sectors to be developed and the instruments to be used.

The Nordic traditions — Sweden, Denmark, Norway, Finland — are characterised by the integration of planning with the fiscal framework, the use of long-term fiscal projections, and the practice of forward budgeting. The Nordic traditions are also notable for the use of the committee of the future, a parliamentary body that provides a forum for long-term thinking. Finland's Committee for the Future, established in 1993, is a standing committee of the parliament that assesses the long-term implications of policy and produces reports on future-oriented issues.

25.6 What Transfers and What Does Not

The comparative traditions provide lessons for the planner, but the lessons are principles, not models. The specific institutional forms — the French Commissariat, the Singaporean Strategy

Group, the Chinese NDRC, the British Treasury — are products of their jurisdictions' administrative traditions, political systems, and historical circumstances. They cannot be transplanted intact to another jurisdiction. What transfers are the principles: the value of concertation, the value of institutionalised foresight, the value of enforcement mechanisms, the value of systematic appraisal, the value of plan hierarchies, the value of long-term thinking.

The planner's use of the comparative traditions is to assess the planner's own practice against the principles the traditions embody. A planner whose practice does not include concertation is missing a lesson from the French tradition. A planner whose practice does not include institutionalised foresight is missing a lesson from the Singaporean tradition. A planner whose plan is not backed by enforcement mechanisms is missing a lesson from the Chinese tradition. The assessment is comparative, as required by the standard set out in Chapter 1.

The planner's use of the comparative traditions is also to identify the principles that the planner's own jurisdiction has not yet adopted. The identification is the basis for institutional development: a jurisdiction that has not adopted institutionalised foresight may consider establishing a foresight capability; a jurisdiction that has not adopted systematic appraisal may consider introducing a Green Book equivalent. The identification is the planner's contribution to the development of the planning function, presented to political authority through the normal advisory process.

25.7 Chapter Summary

The comparative planning traditions provide lessons for the planner. The French tradition contributes the method of concertation. The Singaporean tradition contributes institutionalised foresight and integrated planning. The Chinese tradition contributes binding targets and enforcement mechanisms. The British tradition contributes systematic appraisal and the spending review. The Indonesian, Korean, and Nordic traditions contribute plan hierarchies, industrial policy, and long-term fiscal thinking.

The lessons are principles, not models. The specific institutional forms are products of their jurisdictions' administrative traditions and cannot be transplanted. What transfers are the principles: concertation, institutionalised foresight, enforcement, systematic appraisal, plan hierarchies, long-term thinking.

The planner uses the comparative traditions to assess the planner's own practice against the principles and to identify the principles not yet adopted. The identification is the basis for institutional development, presented to political authority through the normal advisory process.

Chapter 26 — The Planner's Judgment

The planner's judgment is the faculty by which the planner navigates the choices that the discipline does not determine. This chapter treats the judgment as a planning-specific application of the general administrative judgment covered in the Administrative State Manual.

26.1 Judgment in Planning

The planner's judgment is exercised in the choices that the discipline of planning does not determine. The discipline determines the methods: the foresight methods, the baseline construction, the strategy development, the plan production, the monitoring, and the revision. The discipline does not determine the choices: which assumptions to adopt, which risks to treat, which options to recommend, which deviations to flag, which revisions to propose. These choices are the planner's judgment, exercised within the framework the discipline provides.

Judgment is not the substitute for discipline. A planner who exercises judgment without discipline is guessing; a planner who applies discipline without judgment is following a procedure without understanding. The two are complementary: the discipline provides the framework, the judgment makes the choices within the framework. The standard set out in Chapter 1 requires both: the planner must understand the functions of planning statecraft (the discipline) and must be able to execute them to a professional standard (the judgment).

Judgment is developed through experience. The planner who has constructed many baselines develops a judgment about what a credible baseline looks like. The planner who has developed many strategies develops a judgment about what a feasible strategy looks like. The planner who has monitored many plans develops a judgment about what a significant deviation looks like. The development is gradual, through the accumulation of experience and through the reflection on that experience. The Manual cannot substitute for the experience; it can only describe the judgment that the experience develops.

26.2 Judgment Under Uncertainty

Planning is conducted under uncertainty. The plan's assumptions are projections, not facts; the plan's commitments are bets on the future, not guarantees. The planner's judgment under uncertainty is the faculty of making decisions when the information is incomplete and the outcomes are unknown. The judgment is not the elimination of uncertainty; it is the navigation of it.

The judgment under uncertainty is exercised through three mechanisms. The first is the use of scenarios: the planner does not bet on a single future but tests the plan against a range of futures, as treated in Chapter 7. The second is the use of risk treatment: the planner identifies the risks and designs the plan's response, as treated in Chapter 10. The third is the use of plan revision: the planner maintains the capacity to revise the plan when conditions change, as treated in Chapter 21. The three mechanisms together allow the planner to make commitments under uncertainty without pretending that the uncertainty does not exist.

The judgment under uncertainty also involves the communication of uncertainty. The planner states the assumptions, the confidence in each assumption, and the implications if the assumption proves wrong. The planner does not present the plan as a certainty; the planner presents it as a commitment that rests on stated assumptions and that will be revised if the assumptions prove wrong. The communication is part of the judgment: a planner who communicates uncertainty honestly is a planner whose advice is trusted; a planner who communicates false certainty is a planner whose advice is distrusted when the uncertainty materialises.

26.3 Judgment Under Political Pressure

The planner's judgment under political pressure is the faculty of maintaining the integrity of the discipline when political authority pushes toward a different outcome. Political pressure may push toward optimistic baselines, toward feasible-looking but infeasible commitments, toward risk assessments that minimise the risks, toward monitoring reports that flatter rather than inform. The planner's judgment is the faculty of resisting these pressures and producing work that is accurate.

The resistance is not defiance. The planner serves political authority, as treated in Chapter 3, and does not substitute personal judgment for political direction. The resistance is the maintenance of the discipline: the planner constructs the baseline as the data support it, not as the political authority wishes it; the planner assesses the risks as the analysis reveals them, not as the political authority prefers them; the planner reports the progress as the indicators show it, not as the political authority would like it. The planner presents the work to political authority with the reasoning stated and the trade-offs identified, and lets the political authority decide.

The judgment under political pressure also involves the choice of battles. Not every pressure requires resistance; some pressures reflect legitimate political priorities that the planner must accommodate. The planner's judgment is the faculty of distinguishing the pressures that must be resisted (those that would undermine the integrity of the discipline) from the pressures that must be accommodated (those that reflect legitimate political direction). The distinction is not always clear, and the planner may err in either direction. The development of the judgment is the development of the capacity to make the distinction, through experience and through the observation of how senior planners have navigated similar pressures.

26.4 Judgment Under Fiscal Constraint

The planner's judgment under fiscal constraint is the faculty of making choices when the resources are insufficient to fund all the plan's commitments. Fiscal constraint is a constant in planning: the government's objectives almost always exceed the available resources, and the planner must choose which commitments to fund, which to defer, and which to abandon. The judgment is the faculty of making these choices in a way that serves the public interest.

The judgment under fiscal constraint is exercised through prioritisation, treated in Chapter 15 for capital investment and in Chapter 11 for strategy. The prioritisation criteria — strategic alignment, economic return, distributional impact, implementation readiness — provide the framework; the judgment makes the choices within the framework. The choices are not mechanical: the criteria may conflict, and the planner must weigh the conflicts. A commitment with high strategic alignment but low economic return may be prioritised over a commitment with high economic return but low strategic alignment, if the strategic priority is sufficiently important. The weighing is the judgment.

The judgment under fiscal constraint also involves the communication of the choices. The planner does not simply cut commitments to fit the envelope; the planner presents the choices to political authority, with the trade-offs identified and the implications stated. The presentation allows political authority to make the final decision, informed by the planner's analysis. A planner who cuts commitments without presenting the choices is making political decisions that are not the planner's to make; a planner who presents the choices without a recommendation is failing to provide the professional judgment that political authority needs.

26.5 Judgment Under Time Pressure

The planner's judgment under time pressure is the faculty of producing a plan or a revision when the time available is less than the discipline would require. Time pressure arises in crises, in political transitions, and in ad hoc requests from political authority. The judgment is the faculty of determining what can be done in the available time, what must be deferred, and what compromises are acceptable.

The judgment under time pressure is exercised through the abbreviation of the planning process. The full process — foresight, baseline, strategy, production, consultation, approval — may not be possible; the planner must determine which phases can be abbreviated and which must be maintained. The baseline may be constructed from existing data rather than from new analysis; the strategy may be developed from existing options rather than from new development; the consultation may be limited to the essential stakeholders rather than the full range. The abbreviation is a judgment, not a default: the planner states what was abbreviated, what the implications are, and what will be done to address the gaps when time permits.

The judgment under time pressure also involves the communication of the limitations. A plan produced under time pressure is a plan with limitations, and the planner states the limitations honestly. A planner who produces a plan under time pressure and presents it as if it were a full plan is misleading political authority and the public. A planner who states the limitations is providing the information that political authority needs to assess the plan's reliability and to decide whether to rely on it or to commission a more thorough process when time permits.

26.6 Worked Example: A Judgment Under Multiple Pressures

Consider a planner preparing a mid-cycle revision of a national development plan, triggered by a revenue shortfall caused by a global recession. The political authority has directed the planner to protect the social sector commitments and to defer capital investment. The finance ministry has indicated that the fiscal envelope will be 15 per cent below the plan's original resource framework. The planner must produce the revision within three months, rather than the twelve months that a full revision would require.

The planner faces four pressures simultaneously: fiscal constraint (the envelope is reduced), political direction (the social sector is protected), time pressure (three months), and uncertainty (the recession's depth and duration are unknown). The planner's judgment must navigate all four. The judgment begins with the abbreviation of the process: the baseline is updated from existing data, the strategy is developed from the existing options, the consultation is limited to the sectoral ministries and the finance ministry. The abbreviation is documented, with the implications stated.

The judgment continues with the choices within the abbreviated process. The social sector commitments are protected, as directed, but the protection is qualified: the commitments are maintained but the timelines are extended, reflecting the reduced capacity of the executing agencies in a recession. The capital investment is re-sequenced, with the projects that are furthest advanced maintained and the projects that are in early preparation deferred. The deferral is documented, with the deferred projects recorded in the pipeline for the next plan period. The revision is presented to political authority with the trade-offs identified: the social sector is protected but slower; the capital investment is reduced but focused; the fiscal envelope is respected but at the cost of the plan's strategic ambition.

The judgment in the example is not a single decision but a series of decisions, made under multiple pressures, within an abbreviated process. The judgment is documented, so that the reasoning is transparent and the revision is auditable. The judgment is also bounded: the planner does not decide whether to protect the social sector (that is a political decision); the planner decides how to protect it within the fiscal and temporal constraints. The distinction between the political decision and the planning judgment is the discipline that maintains the planner's role.

26.7 Chapter Summary

The planner's judgment is the faculty of making choices within the framework the discipline provides. The discipline determines the methods; the judgment makes the choices. Judgment is not a substitute for discipline, nor is discipline a substitute for judgment. The two are complementary, and the standard requires both.

Judgment is exercised under uncertainty (through scenarios, risk treatment, and revision), under political pressure (through the maintenance of discipline and the choice of battles), under fiscal constraint (through prioritisation and the communication of trade-offs), and under time pressure (through the abbreviation of process and the communication of limitations). Each context requires a different application of the judgment, but all require the same discipline: the planner makes choices within the framework the discipline provides, documents the reasoning, and communicates the limitations honestly.

The worked example illustrates a judgment under multiple pressures: a mid-cycle revision with fiscal, political, temporal, and uncertainty pressures. The judgment is a series of decisions, documented for transparency and auditability. The distinction between the political decision and the planning judgment is the discipline that maintains the planner's role.

Chapter 27 — Drafting and Communication for Planning

Plan-drafting and planning communication are distinct crafts, related to but not reducible to general administrative writing. This chapter treats the planning-specific elements.

27.1 Plan-Drafting as a Craft

Plan-drafting is the craft of producing the plan document. The craft is treated in Chapter 17 in terms of the plan's structure and the precision of its language; this chapter treats the craft in terms of the writing discipline. The discipline is in the service of the plan's function: the plan is a commitment, and the writing must convey the commitment without ambiguity. Every sentence in the plan is either a statement of commitment, a statement of fact supporting the commitment, or a statement of assumption underlying the commitment.

The writing discipline requires precision, consistency, and economy. Precision means that each commitment is stated in measurable terms, with the indicator, the baseline, the target, and the deadline. Consistency means that the same term is used for the same concept throughout the plan, and that the plan's commitments, indicators, and assumptions are internally consistent. Economy means that the plan says what it needs to say and no more: the plan is not the place for discussion, for advocacy, or for the display of analytical sophistication. The Administrative State Manual, Chapter 49, treats administrative writing in general; this chapter treats the planning-specific elements.

The plan is drafted by the planning authority, with inputs from the sectoral ministries. The drafting is not the assembly of contributions from the sectoral ministries; the drafting is the synthesis of those contributions into a coherent document, with a single voice and a consistent structure. A plan that reads as a collection of sectoral chapters is a plan that lacks coherence and that signals the absence of a planning authority capable of imposing coherence. The drafting is the planning authority's responsibility and cannot be delegated to the sectoral ministries.

27.2 The Planning Brief

The planning brief is the document by which the planner communicates analysis and recommendations to political authority during the planning process. The brief is not the plan; the brief is the input to the decisions that produce the plan. The brief may address a strategic choice, a risk assessment, a fiscal constraint, or any other issue that requires a decision before the plan can be finalised. The brief is the planner's primary tool for providing honest advice, as required by the standard set out in Chapter 1.

The brief comprises four sections. The first states the issue: what decision is required, and why. The second states the analysis: what the data show, what the options are, and what the trade-offs are. The third states the recommendation: what the planner advises, and why. The fourth states the implications: what happens if the recommendation is accepted, and what happens if it is not.

The brief is concise — typically two to four pages — and is written for a decision-maker who has limited time and needs the essential information.

The brief is supported by annexes that provide the detailed analysis. The annexes may include the data tables, the scenario analysis, the costing, and the risk assessment. The annexes are for the decision-maker who wishes to examine the analysis in detail; the brief is for the decision-maker who wishes to make the decision. The separation of the brief and the annexes allows the planner to communicate at two levels: the brief for the decision, the annexes for the verification. A planner who puts all the analysis in the brief overwhelms the decision-maker; a planner who puts all the analysis in the annexes deprives the decision-maker of the basis for the decision.

27.3 The Planning Memorandum

The planning memorandum is the document by which the planner communicates within the planning authority and with the other agencies involved in the planning process. The memorandum may record a meeting, communicate a decision, request an input, or document an analysis. The memorandum is the planner's internal communication tool, and it is subject to the same discipline as the brief: precision, consistency, and economy.

The memorandum is distinguished from the brief by its audience and its purpose. The brief is for political authority and is for a decision; the memorandum is for professional colleagues and is for communication. The memorandum may be more technical than the brief, because the audience is professional. The memorandum may be longer than the brief, because the purpose is to communicate fully rather than to summarise for a decision. But the memorandum is subject to the same writing discipline: it says what it needs to say and no more.

The memorandum is also the planner's record. The planning process generates a series of memoranda that document the analysis, the consultations, the decisions, and the revisions. The series is the planning authority's institutional memory, and it is the basis for the accountability of the planning function. A planning authority that does not maintain its memoranda is a planning authority that cannot explain how it arrived at its plan and that cannot learn from its experience. The maintenance of the memoranda is a planning discipline, not an administrative afterthought.

27.4 The Planning Presentation

The planning presentation is the oral communication of the plan or of a planning issue to a decision-making body. The presentation may be to the cabinet, to a ministerial committee, to the legislature, or to a public consultation. The presentation is distinguished from the brief and the memorandum by its form: the presentation is oral, supported by visual aids, and delivered in a limited time. The discipline of the presentation is the discipline of conveying the essential information in the available time, without overwhelming the audience.

The presentation is structured around the decision the audience is asked to make. The structure states the issue, the analysis, the options, the recommendation, and the implications, in the order that leads the audience to the decision. The visual aids support the structure: they present the data, the options, and the trade-offs in a form that the audience can grasp quickly. The visual aids are not the presentation; the presentation is the planner's oral communication, with the visual aids as support. A planner who reads the visual aids is not presenting; the planner is reciting.

The presentation is followed by questions. The questions are the audience's opportunity to probe the analysis, to test the recommendation, and to seek clarification. The planner's response to the questions is part of the presentation: the response must be accurate, must be candid about what the analysis does not show, and must not overstate the planner's confidence. A planner who cannot answer a question should say so, and should offer to provide the answer after the presentation. A planner who invents an answer is providing false information and is undermining the credibility of the planning function.

27.5 Communicating to the Public

The plan is a public document, and the planner's communication of the plan to the public is part of the planning discipline. The public communication is not the plan itself; the public communication is the explanation of the plan, in terms that the public can understand, with the commitments, the trade-offs, and the implications stated honestly. The public communication is distinguished from political communication: the planner does not advocate for the plan or defend it against criticism; the planner explains it.

The public communication takes several forms. The plan document is published, with an executive summary that states the plan's objectives, means, and measures in plain language. The planning authority may publish explanatory materials: FAQs, infographics, sectoral summaries. The planning authority may hold public consultations, where the public can ask questions and provide comments. The planning authority may appear before legislative committees, where the elected representatives can question the plan on the public's behalf.

The public communication is subject to the same discipline as the other forms of planning communication: precision, consistency, and economy. The communication does not overstate the plan's benefits or understate its costs. The communication does not promise what the plan does not commit. The communication acknowledges the plan's limitations and the uncertainties on which it rests. A planner who communicates the plan honestly to the public is a planner who contributes to the public's understanding of the government's commitments and to the accountability that the plan is intended to provide.

27.6 Chapter Summary

Plan-drafting is the craft of producing the plan document, with precision, consistency, and economy. The plan is drafted by the planning authority as a synthesis of sectoral inputs, not as an assembly of sectoral chapters. The planning brief communicates analysis and recommendations to political authority, in four sections: issue, analysis, recommendation, implications, with detailed annexes.

The planning memorandum communicates within the planning authority and with other agencies, and serves as the institutional memory. The planning presentation communicates orally to decision-making bodies, structured around the decision, with visual aids as support. The response to questions is part of the presentation and must be accurate and candid.

The public communication of the plan is part of the planning discipline. The communication explains the plan in plain language, with commitments, trade-offs, and implications stated honestly. The communication does not advocate or defend; it explains. The communication is subject to the same discipline as the other forms: precision, consistency, and economy.

Chapter 28 — The Planner's Toolkit

The planner's toolkit is the set of instruments the planner uses in daily work. This chapter treats the toolkit and closes the Manual on the craft and the profession.

28.1 The Daily Toolkit

The planner's daily toolkit comprises the instruments the planner uses to conduct the planning discipline: the planning brief, the planning memorandum, the planning meeting, the planning presentation, the site visit, and the planning review. Each instrument is treated in this chapter or in Chapter 27. The toolkit is not a set of tools the planner carries; it is a set of skills the planner exercises, supported by the documents and the processes that the planning authority maintains.

The daily toolkit is exercised within the planning authority's information systems. The systems maintain the plan, the baseline, the monitoring data, the risk register, and the planning calendar. The planner uses the systems to access the information, to produce the documents, and to communicate with the other agencies. The systems are the infrastructure of the planning function, and their quality affects the planner's effectiveness. A planning authority with weak systems is a planning authority where the planner spends time managing the systems rather than conducting the discipline.

The planner's relationship to the systems is that of a user, not a developer. The planner specifies the requirements: what data the systems must hold, what reports the systems must produce, what interfaces the systems must provide. The development and maintenance of the systems is an information technology function, treated in the Administrative State Manual, Chapter 13. The planner's role is to ensure that the systems support the discipline and to flag where they do not.

28.2 The Planning Brief and Memorandum

The planning brief and the planning memorandum, treated in Chapter 27, are the planner's primary written tools. The brief is for communication to political authority; the memorandum is for communication within the planning authority and with other agencies. Both are subject to the writing discipline of precision, consistency, and economy, and both are maintained as part of the planning authority's institutional memory.

The planner uses the brief and the memorandum throughout the planning cycle. In the foresight phase, the brief communicates the foresight findings and recommends the assumptions. In the baseline phase, the brief communicates the baseline and recommends the diagnosis. In the strategy phase, the brief communicates the options and recommends the selection. In the production phase, the memorandum coordinates the drafting and the consultation. In the monitoring phase, the brief communicates the deviations and recommends the corrective action. In the revision phase, the brief communicates the need for revision and recommends the approach.

The effective use of the brief and the memorandum requires judgment about what to communicate and to whom. A planner who briefs on every issue overwhelms the decision-maker; a planner who briefs on no issue deprives the decision-maker of the information needed to decide. The judgment is developed through experience and through the observation of how senior planners have calibrated their communication. The calibration is part of the planner's craft, treated in Chapter 26.

28.3 The Planning Meeting

The planning meeting is the instrument by which the planner conducts the consultation and the coordination that the planning process requires. The meeting may be with the sectoral ministries, with the finance ministry, with the regional authorities, with the external experts, or with the political authority. The meeting is distinguished from the brief and the memorandum by its form: the meeting is interactive, with the participants able to question, to challenge, and to contribute. The meeting is the instrument for the issues that require dialogue rather than one-way communication.

The planning meeting is prepared. The planner sets the agenda, circulates the briefing materials in advance, and identifies the decisions the meeting is asked to make. The meeting is chaired to ensure that the agenda is covered, that all participants have the opportunity to contribute, and that the decisions are made and recorded. The meeting is documented in a memorandum that states the decisions, the actions, and the responsibilities. A planning meeting that is not prepared, not chaired, and not documented is a meeting that consumes time without producing decisions.

The planning meeting is also a political instrument. The participants in the meeting have institutional positions and interests, and the meeting's dynamics reflect those positions. The planner's role is to manage the dynamics in the service of the planning discipline: to ensure that the meeting addresses the issues, that the decisions are based on analysis rather than on institutional position, and that the outcomes are consistent with the plan's strategic framework. The management is part of the planner's craft, treated in Chapter 26.

28.4 The Site Visit

The site visit is the instrument by which the planner observes the conditions that the plan addresses. The visit may be to a construction site, to a service facility, to a region, or to a community. The visit is distinguished from the briefing and the memorandum by its source of information: the visit provides direct observation, not the filtered information that comes through reports and indicators. The visit is the instrument for the issues that the planner must see to understand.

The site visit is prepared. The planner identifies what is to be observed, what questions are to be asked, and what the visit is expected to reveal. The visit is conducted with the relevant officials, who provide the local knowledge and the access. The visit is documented in a memorandum that records the observations, the impressions, and the implications for the plan. A site visit that is not prepared and not documented is a visit that may produce impressions but that does not produce actionable information.

The site visit is particularly important for the baseline and for the monitoring. The baseline constructed from reports may not reveal the conditions that a site visit reveals: the state of the infrastructure, the capacity of the institutions, the quality of the services. The monitoring conducted from indicators may not reveal the implementation challenges that a site visit reveals: the delays, the bottlenecks, the unintended consequences. The planner who does not conduct site visits is a planner who relies on filtered information and who may miss what the filters remove.

28.5 The Planning Review

The planning review is the instrument by which the planner assesses the quality of the planning function. The review may be of a plan, of a planning process, or of the planning authority's performance. The review is distinguished from the monitoring, treated in Chapter 20, by its object: the monitoring assesses the plan's execution; the review assesses the planning function itself. The review is the planner's instrument for learning from experience and for improving the discipline.

The review is conducted at defined points in the planning cycle. At the end of each plan period, the planning authority conducts a review of the plan: what it achieved, what it did not achieve, what the planning process contributed to the achievement and to the shortfall. The review is documented and is used to inform the next plan's production. At the end of each planning process, the planning authority conducts a review of the process: what worked, what did not, what should be done differently next time. The review is documented and is used to improve the planning authority's methods.

The review is also conducted by external bodies. The audit function, treated in Chapter 2 and in the Administrative State Manual, Chapter 26, may assess the planning authority's performance. The legislature may conduct reviews through its committees. External experts may be commissioned to conduct reviews. The external reviews provide a perspective that the internal review cannot provide, because the external reviewers are not invested in the planning authority's methods and can assess them with greater objectivity. The planner's response to the external reviews is to engage with them honestly, to learn from them, and to improve the discipline, not to defend against them.

28.6 The Planner's Career

The planner's career is the development of the craft through experience. The career begins with the entry-level positions in a planning authority or a sectoral ministry, where the planner conducts the components of the planning process under the supervision of senior planners. The career progresses through positions of increasing responsibility, where the planner conducts the full planning process and manages the relationships with the sectoral ministries and the finance ministry. The career culminates in the senior positions, where the planner leads the planning authority and advises political authority directly.

The career path, rank, and certification are matters for each jurisdiction's personnel authority. The Manual describes the craft; the personnel authority determines how the craft is organised into roles and rewarded. The planner's competencies — the foresight methods, the baseline construction, the strategy development, the plan production, the monitoring, the revision, the judgment — are the substance of the craft. The competencies are developed through training, through experience, and through the mentorship of senior planners.

The planner's career is also a public service. The planner serves the public through the planning function, by producing plans that are honest, feasible, and linked to the budget, and by monitoring and revising those plans as conditions change. The satisfaction of the career is the satisfaction of contributing to the government's capacity to govern, through the discipline of planning. The standard set out in Chapter 1 is the standard the planner trains toward throughout the career: the professional execution of the planning discipline, assessed comparatively and applied ethically, in service of the public and the constitutional order.

28.7 Chapter Summary

The planner's toolkit comprises the planning brief, the planning memorandum, the planning meeting, the planning presentation, the site visit, and the planning review. The toolkit is exercised within the planning authority's information systems, which the planner uses but does not develop. The brief and the memorandum are the primary written tools, used throughout the planning cycle.

The planning meeting is the instrument for issues that require dialogue. The site visit is the instrument for direct observation of conditions. The planning review is the instrument for assessing the quality of the planning function, conducted at the end of each plan period and each planning process, and by external bodies.

The planner's career is the development of the craft through experience, from entry-level positions to senior leadership. The career path and certification are matters for each jurisdiction's personnel authority. The planner's career is a public service, contributing to the government's capacity to govern through the discipline of planning. The standard of Chapter 1 is the standard the planner trains toward throughout the career.

Appendix A — Planning Document Templates

This appendix provides templates for the four principal plan documents: the national development plan, the sectoral plan, the spatial plan, and the capital investment plan. Each template states the document's structure and the content each section must contain.

A.1 The National Development Plan Template

The national development plan template states the structure and content of the central planning artefact, treated in Chapter 12. The template is a guide, not a straitjacket: each jurisdiction adapts the structure to its constitutional and administrative arrangements. The adaptation must preserve the five sections and the content each must contain.

Section 1: Situational Assessment. This section presents the baseline and the situational diagnosis, treated in Chapter 9. It comprises the demographic baseline, the economic baseline, the fiscal baseline, the sectoral baselines, the infrastructure baseline, and the institutional baseline, followed by the diagnosis identifying strengths, weaknesses, constraints, and opportunities.

Section 2: Strategic Framework. This section presents the strategy, treated in Chapter 11. It states the plan's objectives for the period, the means by which they will be achieved, and the trade-offs the strategy entails. The objectives are stated at a level of generality that permits prioritisation; the means are stated at a level that permits implementation.

Section 3: Sectoral Programmes. This section decomposes the strategic framework into sector-specific commitments, treated in Chapter 13. Each programme states its objective, its activities, its outputs, its inputs, and its indicators, with baselines and targets for each indicator.

Section 4: Resource Framework. This section states the cost of the plan, the sources of financing, and the fiscal envelope within which the plan operates, treated in Chapters 18 and 19. The costing is by sectoral programme and by year; the financing is by source (domestic revenue, external financing, private financing); the envelope is consistent with the medium-term fiscal framework.

Section 5: Implementation Framework. This section states the institutional arrangements for execution, the monitoring system, and the plan revision process, treated in Chapters 16, 20, and 21. The institutional arrangements identify the executing agencies and their responsibilities; the monitoring system states the indicators, the data sources, and the reporting schedule; the revision process states the conditions that trigger revision and the process for conducting it.

A.2 The Sectoral Plan Template

The sectoral plan template states the structure and content of the sectoral plan, treated in Chapter 13. The sectoral plan is subordinate to the national development plan and consistent with its strategic framework.

Section 1: Sectoral Baseline. This section presents the current state of the sector, using the indicators and data treated in Chapter 9. The baseline states the sector's infrastructure, services, personnel, financing, and performance, disaggregated by region and by population group where the data permit.

Section 2: Sectoral Strategy. This section translates the national plan's strategic framework into sector-specific objectives. The objectives are stated in measurable, time-bound terms: the indicator, the baseline value, the target value, and the year by which the target will be reached.

Section 3: Programme Structure. This section decomposes the strategy into programmes and sub-programmes. Each programme states its objective, its activities, its outputs, its inputs, and its indicators. The programme structure is the basis for the budget submission.

Section 4: Implementation and Monitoring Framework. This section states the institutional arrangements for execution, the monitoring indicators, the reporting schedule, and the review milestones. The indicators feed into the national plan's monitoring framework.

A.3 The Spatial Plan Template

The spatial plan template states the structure and content of the spatial plan, treated in Chapter 14. The spatial plan is a distinct document with its own discipline, coordinated with but not subordinate to the national development plan.

Section 1: Spatial Baseline. This section presents the current pattern of land use, settlement, and infrastructure across the territory. The baseline states the urban system, the infrastructure corridors, the protected areas, and the development zones, with maps and data.

Section 2: Spatial Strategy. This section states the spatial objectives for the plan period: where growth will be encouraged, where it will be constrained, where infrastructure will be provided, where environmental assets will be protected. The strategy is consistent with the national development plan's strategic framework.

Section 3: Land-Use Framework. This section states the land-use commitments that implement the spatial strategy. The framework identifies the zones, the permitted uses, the development standards, and the infrastructure commitments. The framework is translated into land-use regulation at the local level.

Section 4: Infrastructure Framework. This section states the infrastructure commitments that support the spatial strategy. The framework identifies the transport, energy, water, and communications infrastructure, with the sequencing and the financing, consistent with the capital investment plan.

Section 5: Implementation and Monitoring. This section states the institutional arrangements for execution, the monitoring indicators, and the coordination mechanisms with the sectoral plans and the national development plan.

A.4 The Capital Investment Plan Template

The capital investment plan template states the structure and content of the capital investment plan, treated in Chapter 15. The plan covers the government's capital investments over the planning period.

Section 1: Investment Strategy. This section states the capital investment strategy, consistent with the national development plan's strategic framework. The strategy identifies the sectors and regions of investment priority, the balance between new investment and maintenance, and the financing strategy.

Section 2: Project Portfolio. This section lists the selected projects, with each project stated by name, sector, location, cost, financing, sequencing, and expected output. The portfolio is the result of the prioritisation process treated in Chapter 15.

Section 3: Deferred Projects Pipeline. This section lists the projects that were identified but not selected, maintained for consideration in subsequent plan periods. The pipeline preserves the record of investment options and permits sequencing over multiple periods.

Section 4: Financing Framework. This section states the financing of the capital investment plan, by source (domestic revenue, domestic borrowing, external borrowing, private financing) and by year. The framework is consistent with the medium-term fiscal framework treated in Chapter 19.

Section 5: Maintenance Component. This section states the resources required to maintain the existing asset stock, with the standard of maintenance and the trade-off between maintenance and new investment. The component ensures that the capital investment plan addresses the full lifecycle of the asset stock, not only the creation of new assets.

Appendix B — The Plan-to-Budget Reconciliation Checklist

This appendix provides the checklist the planner uses to verify that the plan's priorities are reflected in the budget. The checklist is used during the reconciliation process treated in Chapter 18.

B.1 Costing Completeness

The costing completeness check verifies that all the plan's commitments have been costed. The planner confirms that each sectoral programme has a cost profile by activity and by year, covering recurrent costs and capital costs. The planner confirms that the costing assumptions are stated: the unit costs, the activity volumes, the inflation assumptions, and the exchange rate assumptions. The planner confirms that the costing is realistic, tested against the finance ministry's cost standards and against the experience of previous plan periods.

The check identifies commitments that have not been costed, costings that are incomplete, and costings that rest on unstated or unrealistic assumptions. Each gap is flagged for correction before the reconciliation proceeds. A reconciliation conducted on an incomplete costing produces a budget that is not linked to the plan, because the budget funds a costing that does not fully reflect the plan's commitments.

B.2 MTFF Compliance

The medium-term fiscal framework compliance check verifies that the plan's resource requirements fit within the fiscal envelope. The planner compares the plan's total cost profile over the plan period to the expenditure ceiling projected in the medium-term fiscal framework, treated in Chapter 19. The planner confirms that the plan's financing strategy is consistent with the framework's revenue projection, debt projection, and fiscal rules.

The check identifies gaps where the plan's cost profile exceeds the envelope, and confirms that the gap is addressed through the reconciliation process. The check also identifies commitments that depend on financing sources that are not confirmed: external financing that has not been pledged, private financing that has not been secured, domestic borrowing that exceeds the debt sustainability threshold. Each unconfirmed source is flagged as a risk to the plan's financing.

B.3 Sectoral Allocation Alignment

The sectoral allocation alignment check verifies that the budget's sectoral allocations reflect the plan's sectoral priorities. The planner compares the budget's allocation by sectoral programme to the plan's first-year cost profile by sectoral programme. The planner confirms that the allocations are consistent with the plan's strategic framework, with the priority sectors receiving the allocations the plan assigns them.

The check identifies sectoral programmes where the budget allocation differs significantly from the plan's cost profile. Each difference is examined: is it due to a costing revision, to a fiscal constraint, to a change in priority, or to an error? The examination is documented, and the difference is resolved through the reconciliation negotiation. A budget that allocates resources without reference to the plan's sectoral priorities is a budget that is not linked to the plan, regardless of the formal relationship.

B.4 Capital-Recurrent Balance

The capital-recurrent balance check verifies that the budget maintains the balance between capital investment and recurrent expenditure that the plan requires. The planner compares the budget's capital-to-recurrent ratio to the plan's ratio, and confirms that the capital investment is not being crowded out by recurrent expenditure, or that recurrent expenditure is not being cut to fund capital investment beyond the plan's intent.

The check also verifies that the maintenance component of the capital investment plan is funded. A budget that funds new capital investment but defers maintenance is a budget that builds the asset stock while allowing it to deteriorate, accumulating a maintenance backlog that will require costly rehabilitation in future periods. The maintenance funding is identified separately in the budget and is confirmed against the capital investment plan's maintenance component.

B.5 Fiscal Risk Flags

The fiscal risk flags check verifies that the plan's fiscal risks are identified and treated in the budget. The planner reviews the strategic risk assessment, treated in Chapter 10, and confirms that the risks with fiscal implications are reflected in the budget's contingency provisions, in the risk treatment documented in the plan, or in the monitoring indicators that would signal the risk's materialisation.

The check identifies fiscal risks that are not treated: revenue risks that are not reflected in contingency provisions, expenditure risks that are not reflected in contingency provisions, financing risks that are not reflected in alternative financing strategies, and debt sustainability risks that are not reflected in the borrowing profile. Each untreated risk is flagged for the finance ministry's attention, with the planner's recommendation for treatment.

Appendix C — The Foresight Workbook

This appendix provides templates and worksheets for foresight exercises, treated in Chapters 6 and 7. The workbook is designed for the planner to use directly in foresight exercises.

C.1 Horizon Scan Log Template

The horizon scan log is the record of signals identified through horizon scanning, treated in Chapter 6. The log is maintained on a defined schedule, with signals logged, assessed, and prioritised. The log template comprises the following fields for each signal: the date of identification, the source, the signal description, the category (social, technological, economic, environmental, political, legal), the potential impact, the uncertainty, the assessment, and the disposition (escalated for further investigation, monitored, or archived).

The log is reviewed periodically, with the signals reassessed in light of new information. Signals that were archived may be reactivated if new information suggests they are more significant than initially assessed. Signals that were escalated are tracked through to the analysis phase, where they inform the driver mapping and the scenario construction. The log is the foresight function's institutional memory and the basis for the foresight product.

C.2 Driver Map Template

The driver map is the structured assessment of the forces shaping the planning environment, treated in Chapter 8. The map template comprises the following fields for each driver: the driver description, the category (social, technological, economic, environmental, political, legal), the direction (increasing or decreasing), the strength (the magnitude of the effect), the time horizon, the relationships to other drivers, and the assessment of whether the driver is a critical uncertainty.

The map is constructed through literature review, expert elicitation, and structured workshops. The output is a list of drivers, with the critical uncertainties identified. The critical uncertainties are the axes along which the scenarios are constructed. The map is reviewed and updated at each foresight exercise, with new drivers added and existing drivers reassessed.

C.3 Scenario Construction Worksheet

The scenario construction worksheet is the template for developing scenario narratives, treated in Chapter 7. The worksheet comprises the following fields for each scenario: the scenario name, the critical uncertainties and their resolution in this scenario, the narrative description, the key features, the implications for the plan, and the indicators that would signal this scenario is emerging.

The worksheet is completed for each scenario in the set, typically three to five. The scenarios are developed to be internally consistent and mutually distinct, with each representing a different combination of the critical uncertainties. The worksheet is the basis for the scenario narratives that are communicated to the strategy function and that inform the plan's assumptions and risk treatment.

C.4 Implication Analysis Matrix

The implication analysis matrix is the template for assessing the implications of each scenario for the plan, treated in Chapters 7 and 10. The matrix comprises a row for each plan element (each objective, each commitment, each assumption) and a column for each scenario. Each cell states the implication of the scenario for the plan element: does the plan element succeed, fail, or require modification under this scenario?

The matrix identifies the plan elements that are robust across all scenarios and the elements that are scenario-dependent. The robust elements are committed; the scenario-dependent elements are flagged for monitoring and revision. The matrix also identifies the indicators that would signal which scenario is emerging, which are added to the plan's monitoring framework. The matrix is the link between the foresight exercise and the plan's design.

Appendix D — The Planner's Reading List

This appendix provides an annotated reading list covering the comparative planning tradition, foresight and scenario methods, plan-to-budget linkage, and planning theory. The list includes the reference standards that the Manual draws on throughout.

D.1 Comparative Planning Tradition

The comparative planning tradition provides the reference against which the planner's own practice is assessed, as required by the standard set out in Chapter 1. The readings in this section treat the planning traditions of the jurisdictions covered in Chapter 25: the French indicative planning tradition, the Singaporean integrated planning tradition, the Chinese five-year plan system, the British Green Book and spending review tradition, and the Indonesian, Korean, and Nordic traditions.

The planner should read the original documents where available: the reports of the French Commissariat Général du Plan, the publications of Singapore's Centre for Strategic Futures and Strategy Group, the texts of the Chinese five-year plans, the UK HM Treasury Green Book, Indonesia's RPJMN documents, and the reports of Finland's Committee for the Future. The original documents provide the detail that secondary analyses cannot, and they convey the voice of the planning tradition in a way that summaries do not.

Secondary analyses that provide comparative treatment include the OECD's work on strategic foresight and on public investment, the World Bank's Public Investment Management assessments, and the academic literature on comparative planning. These analyses provide the cross-jurisdictional perspective that the planner needs to assess the planner's own practice against the mature jurisdictions' standard.

D.2 Foresight and Scenario Methods

The readings on foresight and scenario methods support the disciplines treated in Chapters 6, 7, and 8. The foundational texts on scenario methods include the work of Pierre Wack, who developed the scenario method at Shell in the 1970s, and the publications of the Global Business Network, which adapted the method for broader use. The work of Peter Schwartz on The Art of the Long View remains a practical introduction to the scenario method.

The readings on foresight institutions include the publications of the European Commission's Joint Research Centre, which supports foresight across the EU member states, and the OECD's work on strategic foresight, which provides comparative analysis of foresight practices across governments. The Finnish Committee for the Future's reports provide a parliamentary perspective on foresight.

The readings on horizon scanning include the UK Government Office for Science's horizon scanning reports and the methodology papers on weak signal detection. The readings on driver mapping and cross-impact analysis are found in the futures studies literature and in the methodological publications of the foresight institutions. The planner should read these as methodological references, applying the methods to the planner's own context.

D.3 Plan-to-Budget Linkage and Fiscal Frameworks

The readings on plan-to-budget linkage support the discipline treated in Chapter 18. The IMF's Government Finance Statistics Manual provides the methodological framework for government finance statistics, which underpins the fiscal baseline. The IMF's Fiscal Rules Database and the associated analyses provide comparative data on fiscal rules across jurisdictions. The OECD's Budgeting and Public Expenditures publication provides annual comparative analysis of budget practices.

The readings on the medium-term fiscal framework include the World Bank's work on medium-term expenditure frameworks and the IMF's technical guidance on fiscal framework design. The UK HM Treasury's Green Book and the supplementary guidance on business cases provide the appraisal methodology. Australia's Charter of Budget Honesty Act and the associated portfolio budget statements provide a comparative example of the legislative framework for fiscal discipline.

The readings on fiscal responsibility legislation include the EU Stability and Growth Pact and the associated regulations, the UK Charter for Budget Responsibility, and New Zealand's Public Finance Act. These readings provide the legal and institutional frameworks within which the fiscal envelope is set and within which the plan must operate.

D.4 Planning Theory and Practice

The readings on planning theory provide the intellectual foundation for the discipline. The classical texts include Albert Hirschman's work on development planning, which treats the relationship between planning and the sequencing of investment, and Peter Hall's work on urban and regional planning, which provides the comparative perspective on planning traditions. The work of Yehezkel Dror on planning in government remains relevant for its treatment of the planner's judgment.

The readings on public investment management include the World Bank's Public Investment Management Reference Guide and the associated assessments, which provide the framework for the capital investment plan treated in Chapter 15. The OECD's work on public investment provides comparative analysis of investment practices across governments.

The readings on monitoring and evaluation include the World Bank's Independent Evaluation Group's publications and the OECD's work on evaluation. The Administrative State Manual, treated throughout this Manual as the companion volume, provides the general administrative doctrine within which the planning discipline operates. The planner should read the Manual in conjunction with the Administrative State Manual, as the two are designed to be complementary.