

Joint Learning Event
on
Managing for Development Results
(JLE-MfDR)

Course Documentation
Yaoundé, Cameroon
25 - 27 May 2010

Introduction

The Train4Dev Joint Donors' Competence Development Network (Train4Dev) commissioned MDF Training & Consultancy to develop a programme of Joint Learning Events on Managing for Development Results (JLE on MfDR). The programme aims to conduct 10 three-day country-specific learning events that will target donor staff and their partners in government and civil society by 31 December 2010.

From 24 to 27 May 2010 a Joint Learning Event on Managing for Development Results (JLE-MfDR) took place in Yaoundé, Cameroon. A total of 36 representatives (11 F, 25 M) from Cameroonian government institutions (14), civil society organisations (13) as well as development partners (9), such as the World Bank, UNDP, AfD, GTZ and SNV participated in the event. In the end, no representatives of the European Union participated due to other engagements (see also the list of participants in Annex 1). For more general information on the JLE see Section 1.

The JLE-MfDR course-flow was very well maintained, although it was difficult to start in time. Participants agreed to work from 8.30am till 5pm but in reality the training nearly always started around 9.30am and ended around 5pm, with no one leaving before then. The standard programme was enriched by a session on statistics and its use for MfDR presented by Mr. Okouda Barnabé, Coordinator of the Project CAMERCAP on Day 2 of the course. Furthermore, the module on risk management was given more attention than in previous trainings (Day 2). Evidence-based decision-making was further developed in the sense that it covered key performance indicators, risk management, the process of decisionmaking and a self-assessment of these processes by the three groups of participants: government, civil society and development partners. To this end, a short paper and matrix to assess evidence-based decision-making, developed in Mongolia, was translated and used for the exercise (see Annex 3). For more information regarding the course content see Section 2.

With an average score of 3.50 (3 being good, 4 being very good), this JLP-MfDR, together with the JLP-MfDR in Malawi, was the most appreciated JLP-MfDR event, held to date. Scores related to content and methodologies were all close to the average course appreciation of 3.5. The highest scores were:

Value added by being a joint programme:	3.62
Relevance of group exercises:	3.57
Relevance of materials provided:	3.57
Appropriate venue:	3.70
Quality of accommodation:	3.82

In line with these scores fall the evaluation results of the trainers and resource person. The team of facilitators was very well appreciated by the participants, Dr.Ondoua scoring 3.70, Mr.Etono 3.38 and Mr.Snelder receiving an average of 3.57. For a complete listing of the evaluation of the course see Section 3.

This report is meant to serve as an "aide mémoire" for participants and trainers and as a source of information for future learning events.

I. General Information JLE-MfDR

1.1 Key data

Title of the Training course:	Joint Learning Event on Managing for Development Results (JLE-MfDR)
Country and City:	Cameroon, Yaoundé
Sectors:	Governance (Decentralisation), Water and Forest, Health
Dates of the event:	24 – 27 May 2010
Resident/Non-resident:	Most participants commuting

1.2 Participants

A total of 36 participants (11 F, 25 M) were present:

Government:	14	(3 F, 11 M)
Donor:	9	(5 F, 4 M)
CSO's:	13	(3 F, 10 M)
TOTAL	36	(11 F, 25 M)

The JLE Cameroon had a very nice balance of the number of participants coming from the three categories: Government, Civil Society and Development Partners. Representatives of government Ministries dealing with development partners, such as the Ministries of Planning, Finances, Water and Forests were present. Unfortunately the Ministry of Health was not represented although invited and confirmed. Civil society participants also came from various organisations and were well represented. From the development partner side UNDP, WB, AfD, SNV and GTZ were actively involved. The European Union didn't send anyone to participate in the event.

1.3 Implementing Agency and Trainers

Implementing Agency: GTZ

GTZ organised the event in a perfect manner (Dana Rosen and Jeanne Tonye) : logistics in terms of preparing training and workshop materials, support staff present before, during and after the course to ensure smooth running of the event, arranging hotel facilities, opening and closing speech of Dr. Kalk, the head of GTZ's Regional Office for Central Africa.

The implementation team consisted of 2 trainers and 1 resource person, who also acted actively as trainer. Short profiles are provided below.

Trainers:

Dr. Viviane Ondoua Biwolé

Her areas of expertise are MfDR, public management, gender and entrepreneurship.

Dr.Ondoua is a focal point of the Ministry of the Public Service and Administrative Reform (MINFOPRA) in the national programme "PROMAGAR", which seeks to introduce MfDR in six Pilot Ministries. She is also an active participant in the activities of the Secretariate that implements PROMAGAR. From 22-26 February 2010, she attended an international workshop on MfDR in Uganda, Kampala. Dr.Ondoua also assumes the function of General Inspector of the Ministry and has a very good overview of the realities in the Ministries and the efforts to modernise Public Management. Dr.Ondoua has been a trainer since 1998. She has excellent capacities to work in a team, in a multi-cultural setting and to cooperate with development partners.

Mr. Appolinaire Etono

His main areas of expertise are training, consulting and coaching in organisational issues, including gender.

Mr. Etono is General Director of a training and consultancy firm DCBC in Yaoundé. He regularly organises and facilitates training sessions on different themes, but mostly ones linked to people and organisations. He has ample experience in supporting Civil Society Organisations with institutional development and organisational strengthening questions. He works mostly with (I)NGOs but recently also with international firms active in Africa (Ivory Coast, Gabon). Mr. Etono is also involved in the planning, monitoring and evaluation of different development programmes. In combining organisational competences and his mastery of PM&E tools, he is in a good position to support Civil Society towards a stronger focus of their work on MfDR.

Mr. Herman Snelder

His main areas of expertise are training, consulting and coaching in management, organisational and institutional issues.

Mr.Snelder is the Managing Director of MDF, Training&Consultancy, based in the Netherlands. He is involved in the design and implementation of (tailor-made) training programmes and the facilitation of workshops, as well as in consultancies - mostly in the field of development cooperation, particularly related to management and organisation of development interventions. MDF's clients include: the Dutch Government, Dutch Embassies, the European Commission, OECD/DAC and several Non-Governmental Organisations. Mr.Snelder facilitated the Mutual Learning Initiative on MfDR (2006-2007). Within the Joint Learning Programme on MfDR, Mr.Snelder is the lead facilitator on MfDR and has, in the past, conducted workshops in Zambia, Mongolia and Cambodia (UNDP-funded).

II. The Joint Learning Event on MfDR

Preparation in Country

In preparing for the training, it was agreed with the in-country team, to deliver the standard programme on JLE-MfDR. The trainers intended to visit two Ministries and the National Institute of Statistics the day before the event. However, as a result of a surprise day off to celebrate the 50th anniversary of Cameroon's Independence, this plan could not be realised. Instead, preparatory sessions took place with several GTZ representatives who stressed the need to talk about positive experiences (best practices) and be as practical as possible during the event

Below the different sessions are briefly discussed and the main products of the group work sessions are included.

DAY 1

Introduction

The Regional Director of GTZ, Dr. Andreas Kalk, opened the learning event, stressing the importance of JLEs as unique occasions, which should be used, not only for learning more about MfDR, but also to create even better linkages between partners.

Mr. Baté from the Ministry of Planning stressed the importance of MfDR for the government of Cameroon and emphasised that he was looking forward to gaining an even better understanding of the concepts and implementation practicalities of MfDR.

Day 1 was implemented according to the following programme:

Day 1	
	Introduction
A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➢ Welcome, objectives and programme ➢ Development effectiveness and overview MfDR ➢ Experiences of Singapour and Rwanda
	MfDR in practice
B	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➢ Exchange in small peer groups on challenges and learning needs ➢ Short introduction on MfDR programme in Cameroun: PROMAGAR
	Shared goals and strategies
C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➢ Short introduction on result chains ➢ demonstration of case result chains ➢ Introduction group work
	Shared goals and strategies
D	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➢ Groups develop/discuss result chains

During the first introductory session the objectives, programme as well as working schedule of the event were briefly explained. The trainer referred to the participant's file containing all presentations as well as background reading material (so-called "briefing notes" on the main subjects of the event, all in french). The trainer emphasized that the event would be highly interactive and with hands-on exercises. The intention to make the event as dynamic and active as possible was clearly stated and lastly, the idea of the personal logbook was explained to all participants.

MfDR Concepts and Some Experiences

The development of MfDR and its key concepts were illustrated. Participants were interested to know the difference between MfDR and other existing concepts such as five-year planning, logical framework, objectives, etc. It was emphasised that MfDR, while using some of the same tools as these other concepts, differs significantly in its focus on change, both at the level of the beneficiaries and that of the "users" of services. In order to change people's approach to management and make it more dynamic, one has to focus not only on discussion instruments but also organisational behaviours and decision-making. Examples of Rwanda and Singapour were presented and discussed.

Challenges and Learning Needs

After this introduction to MfDR the first group exercise was presented:

Groups discussed the MfDR situation in Cameroon and focused on two themes in particular:

1. Shared goals and partnerships;
2. Managing for results.

Lead questions guiding the groups' discussions were:

1. What are major challenges in your current situations?
2. Looking at these challenges, what are your learning needs for this workshop, or afterwards?

The working groups were created by participants from the same background: development partners, civil society partners and government

On the morning of the next day, one representative from each group presented the results to the plenary. They included the following observations:

Challenges regarding MfDR

Civil Society	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Civil Society should become more visible as a network of organisations • Civil Society needs support from the government (legal framework and norms) • Professionalism and specialisation of CSOs • Inclusion of Civil Society as a partner in development (programmes) • Strengthening capacities of CSOs in lobbying and advocacy
Development Partners	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sector strategies being prepared

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How to bridge between action plans and monitoring based on realistic indicators? • Undertake activities based on reliable data • Organisational culture • Coordination mechanisms and platforms • Communication • Participation • What contribution is expected from the development partners in PROMAGAR?
Government	<p>MfDR can only be successful through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ownership in the introduction of RBM and MfDR • Sensitising public opinion • Strengthening capacities • Improving governance • Political will • Meritocracy • Sincere dialogue between the government and development partners • Motivation and financial remuneration of public servants • Cohesion between strategies in order for the DSCE to succeed¹

Learning needs regarding MfDR

Civil Society	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improving report writing • Capitalising expertise • Programme-based budgeting for CSOs • Introducing elaborate systems of information and M&E
Development Partners	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supporting culture changes in public organisations • What can be changed in the current culture of Cameroun? • Liaison between budgets and performance • Formulating and introducing key performance indicators? • Simplifying and aligning procedures • Division of responsibilities • Adoption of one coherent monitoring system used by all donors
Government	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identification of the connexion between daily activities and strategies at ministerial and national

¹ Suggested in the discussion after presentation

	<p>levels</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear formulation of sector results, indicators and objectives • Defintion of an M&E framework • Greater understanding of concepts of RBM and MfDR • Optimizing the identification of needs to ensure more precise budget proposals
--	--

Introduction of a Cameroonian case-study

Following the presentation of the group exercise's results, the resource person, Dr. Viviane Ondoua, introduced the course participants to the national programme "PROMAGAR", which seeks to introduce MfDR in six Cameroonian Pilot Ministries.

Result chains

A power point presentation on result chains, presented by the resource person, introduced them as one particular kind of MfDR tool. Result chains are logical diagrams linking different result levels - impact, outcome and output. To further illustrate the use of result chains, Dr.Ondoua chose to present the case study of themodernisation of public service institutions in Cameroon. Afterwards, the participants were split up into five working groups to prepare their own result chains: three on governance/decentralisation-related topics, one on health and one on the green sector (forest, natural resources).

Evaluation of Day 1

There was no formal or informal evaluation at the end of the day but participants continued discussing their result chains even after the official closing of the first working day at 5pm.

DAY 2

Introduction

Day 2 took place just as planned in the original programme, with two minor exceptions: the risk management session and the Q&A session on the use of statistics in MfDR/ for development programmes. There was no official opening/recapitulation of the first day's events as participants dove straight into finalising the result chains their respective groups had begun the prior afternoon.

Mr. Okouda Barnabé, a former employee of the National Institute of Statistics who is currently the coordinator of the Capacity Building for Economic Management Project (CAMERCAP) programme, answered questions participants had prepared prior to his visit and gave an enthusiastic and inspiring introduction into statistics.

Day 2

Shared goals and strategies

- A
 - Sub groups finalise result chains including indicators for outcome
 - Participants visit results of other groups and review their chains and indicators
 - Trainers give feedback on result chains

Evidence-based decision making – KPI's

- B
 - Introduction Key Performance Indicators
 - Presentation of MfDR case indicators
 - Review of Key Performance Indicators of sub groups

Evidence-based decision making – information management

- C
 - Introduction and discussion on risk assessment en risk management
 - Preparing questions on evidence based decision making

Evidence-based decision making – information management

- D
 - Q&A session on indicators, reporting mechanisms, information flow and use of information for reporting and decision making

Result Chains

Results of the group work were presented and a Q&A session in the plenary served to discuss the practice of identifying result chains. Trainers gave more technical feedback on: how to develop result chains, the differences and similarities between result chains and the Logical Framework, the definition of objectives vis à vis results, the logic of the chain, flexibility, the theory of change behind this logic, the differences between outputs and outcome, etc.

Key Performance Indicators

The trainers explained the use of Key Performance Indicators, which were then further illustrated, using the example of changes in the public administration. This introduction was followed by reviewing the indicators the participants had identified for the outcome in their case studies. Consequently, all participants identified indicators for one chosen outcome together, stressing the importance of one of the elements of a “SMART” indicator, namely its characteristic of being “agreed upon”. The lesson derived from this group work was that indicators are not merely results of technical exercises but results of participatory processes in which all parties involved need to agree on realistic ambitions.

Risk Management

In the afternoon, the group discussed the experiences and practices of risk management in an interactive session that made use of various real examples.

Evidence-based decision-making and statistics

The process of evidence-based decision-making was presented and discussed briefly. Then participants were divided into sub-groups to prepare questions on evidence-based decision-making.

Mr. Barnabé first answered all of the questions the participants had prepared for him and then presented the structure and functioning of Cameroon's National Institute of Statistics. He stressed the demand-driven approach of the Institute and the importance of methodology that leads to results that cannot be changed for political purposes.

DAY 3

Introduction

On the third and final day of the training, more attention than originally envisaged was given to evidence-based decision-making.

Day 3

➤ *Recap. Personal logbook*

Leadership

- Introduction to leadership (ppt)
- A** ➤ Presentation leadership of mayor Yaoundé (parking conditions)
- Discussion on leadership

Cap scan and evidence based decision making:

- Introduction to the cap scan
- B** ➤ Assignment : assessment of evidence based decision making
- Presentation and short discussion on assessment and use of cap scan

Change towards MfDR: action planning

- C** ➤ Participants assess own situation and prepare key elements of action plans

Follow-up actions and wrap-up

- Presentation of action plans for development partners, government and civil society organisations
- D** ➤ Presentation of CoP on MfDR
- Wrap-up, evaluation and closure

Recapitulation

This session took stock of experiences and lessons learned up to this point. It enabled the facilitators to answer some of the questions regarding the tools and approaches introduced in the first two days of the training.

Leadership

The focus on leadership as a key element of MfDR was well appreciated by participants. Although many tools/instruments already exist, participants stressed that progress is slow. It was therefore concluded that it may just be more important and useful to look into less-visible aspects such as leadership, staff performance and culture to enable change in the future.

CAP Scan and Evidence-based Decision-making

First the CAP Scan tool was explained to the participants. To get a feel of what CAP Scan is and how it works the three groups of participants (development partners, government and civil society) were asked to assess various components of leadership and evidence-based decision-making.

Progressive stages in the assessment:

- Ignorance: no attention, neither signs of significant awareness among key-stakeholders for this component.
- Awareness: among key stakeholders there is awareness on the importance of this component, but hardly anything serious is done to work on this component.
- Exploration: the component is beginning to get serious attention. Key stakeholders are exploring the issue.
- Transition: the component gets mainstream attention, but there is still a lot of room for improvements.
- Full implementation: the component is dealt with satisfactorily.

Appréciation

Apprécier la qualité de prise de décisions:

Dans les secteurs

Phases progressives

Ignorance: ne reçoit pas une attention par les acteurs concernés

Conscience: quelques acteurs sont conscients, mais pas d'activités pour améliorer

Exploration: Le sujet attire de plus en plus d'attention et certaines initiatives sont prises

Transition: Le composant reçoit une attention sérieuse mais il reste beaucoup à faire

Implementation complète: Le composant est réalisé

Qu'est ce que vous proposez pour améliorer les composants Leadership, Suivi/Evaluation, Planification et Budget et Statistiques

Prise de décision sur base des données factuelles

Composantes	0	1	2	3	4
	Critère pour chaque phase progressive				
	Ignorance	Conscience	Exploration	Transition	Implementation
Leadership					
<i>Système effective pour informer les décideurs</i>			P,	S,G	
<i>Décideurs reconnaissent l'utilité des données et s'assurent qu'elles sont prises en compte dans les décisions</i>			P,S,G		
<i>Système de planification et budget sont liés entre eux à partir du terrain jusqu'à la capitale</i>			G	P,S	
<i>Managers prennent des décisions sur base de systèmes qui mesurent la performance</i>		G	S		P
Suivi et Evaluation					
<i>Capacité de suivi et évaluation à un niveau acceptable</i>			G		P,S
<i>Les données de performance sont utilisées pour analyse et préparation des plans</i>		G	S	P,S	
<i>Managers sont capables d'obtenir à temps et sous forme utilisable les données sur les produits et les effets</i>			P	G,S	
Planification et Budget					
<i>Processus transparente de décision sur priorités et budgets</i>		G	P	S	
<i>Données sont collectées pour soutenir le processus budgétaires</i>			S	P	G
<i>Participation dans le processus de planification et allocation de budget</i>			P	S	G
Statistiques					
<i>Données sont desagregées</i>			P	S	G
<i>Données sont d'une bonne qualité</i>		S		G	P
<i>Données sont produites à temps</i>		G,S			P

ACCOUNTABILITY

PARTNERSHIP

S

P S

P

Action Planning

The last assignment on action planning in specific actor groups was explained. The groups were asked to make an inventory of possible changes, select a few and elaborate on how to implement these changes (activities, actors, resources, timeframe) according to the format of the (personal) action plan.

What follows are the results of the group work:

PLANS D' ACTIONS DES PARTICIPANTS

GROUPE: Représentants du Gouvernement

Changement (tangibile & mesurable)	Actions à entreprendre	Responsable	Ressources	Période de mise en oeuvre
Respect strict des calendriers et canevas de préparation des budgets (procédures et processus)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Transmission du rapport Budget -Signature à temps de la circulaire présidentielle -Tenue des conférences budgétaires -Elaboration du document budgétaire 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - PM - PR - MINEPAT/MINFI - MINFI/MINEPAT 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ressources humaines/matérielles et financières Idem Idem 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Octobre - 30 Juin - Juillet-Août - Septembre
Généralisation des systèmes de mesure des performances.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Concevoir des outils d'évaluation des performances - Vulgarisation desdits outils - Utilisation effective desdits outils 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - MINFOPRA/ MINFI/ MINEPAT - MINFI/ MINFOPRA MINEPAT + Toutes les Administrations. - Les chefs de Départements 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Idem Idem 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Octobre/Décembre
Renforcement de la fonction « Audit » dans les administrations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Inspection Générale à redynamiser - Audit externe à instaurer 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - PR/PM - Tous les Chefs de Départements ministériels 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Permanent

Changement (tangible & mesurable)	Actions à entreprendre	Responsable	Ressources	Période de mise en oeuvre
		- Associations Nationale		

GROUPE: Représentants Société Civile

Changement (Tangible & mesurable)	Actions à entreprendre	Responsable	Ressources	Période de mise en oeuvre
Adopter les statistiques comme outil d'aide à la décision	- Sensibiliser; - Valider les données; - Développer les outils de collecte	- Organisation + Expertise externe - Etat		Début 2011
Renforcer les capacités en planification et budgétisation	Organiser des ateliers de restitution interne sur la GRD, GAR...(Supports)	- Organisations partenaires - PTF - Etat		Novembre-Décembre 2010
Renforcer les capacités des décideurs en leadership	Former, suivre et <i>coaching</i> (conseils à distance)	- Partenaires + expertise extérieure - Etat		2010
Former sur le monitoring et le reporting	Former, coacher, capitaliser			Novembre-Décembre 2010

GROUPE: Représentants Bailleurs de Fonds

Changement (Tangible & mesurable)	Actions à entreprendre	Responsable	Ressources	Période de mise en oeuvre
Harmonisation des procédures	- Recueillir les critiques et besoins du Gouvernement. - Conduire un suivi sectoriel conjoint (PTF + Gouvernement). - Développer des programmes communs (basket funds, appui budgétaire sectoriel)	- Comité Multi Bailleurs (CMB) - Chef de file (PTF et Gvt) - CMB et/ou Chefs de file (PTF et Govt)		ASAP
Amélioration de la communication et de la participation entre Bailleurs, Gouvernement et Société Civile	Développer et formaliser des cadres de concertation sectoriels (technique)	- CMB Sous-groupes - Ministères		ASAP

III. Evaluation of the Workshop

3.1 Participants who completed the evaluation form:

Donor: HQ		Donor: field		Government		CSO		Private Sector		Total	
F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M
1	5	3	4	3	4	3	7	--	--	10	20

3.2 Evaluation Summary:

	Average rating 1 = very poor, 2= poor, 3= good, 4= excellent)					
	Donor HO	Donor FO	Government	CSO	Private sector	Total
1. Achievement of training objective	3.17	3.57	3.71	3.50	---	3.50
2. Value added by being a joint programme	3.20	4.00	3.57	3.60	--	3.62
3. Meeting expectations	2.83	3.33	3.43	3.70	--	3.40
4. Relevance for content of work	3.60	3.43	3.00	3.40	--	3.31
5. Adequate balance theory and practise	3.17	3.29	3.71	3.50	--	3.37
6. Adequate mix of methods	3.67	3.57	3.71	3.20	--	3.50
7. Relevance of materials provided	3.33	3.57	3.57	3.70	--	3.57
8. Relevance of group exercises	3.00	3.50	3.86	3.78	--	3.57
9. Average rating of trainer's performance						
<i>Viviane Ondoua</i>	3.67	3.91	3.67	3.58	--	3.70
<i>Appolinaire Etono</i>	3.43	3.20	3.46	3.42	--	3.38
<i>Herman Snelder</i>	3.57	3.62	3.46	3.62	--	3.57
10. Relevance of pre-course information	3.17	3.00	3.17	3.20	--	3.14
11. Appropriate venue	3.67	4.00	3.71	3.50	--	3.70
12. Quality of accommodation	4.00	4.00	4.00	3.00	--	3.82
13. Quality of food and refreshment	3.50	3.43	3.57	3.20	--	3.40
Average	3.36	3.57	3.56	3.49		3.50
Overall Average:	3.50					

3.3 Analysis and Recommendations

General Conclusions:

With an overall average score of 3.50 the seminar was to date the most appreciated JLE-MfDR, next to the one held in Malawi. With a total of 36 participants, equally distributed among the three target groups, the JLE-MfDR in Cameroon met the targets set by the Train4Dev Network.

Highest scores:

Value added by being a joint programme:	3.62
Relevance of group exercises:	3.57
Relevance of materials provided:	3.57
Appropriate venue:	3.70
Quality of accommodation:	3.82

In line with these scores fall the evaluation results of the trainers and resource person. The team of facilitators was very well appreciated by the participants, Dr. Ondoua scoring 3.70, Mr. Etono 3.38 and Mr. Snelder receiving an average of 3.57.

Lowest scores:

Relevance of pre-course information:	3.14
Relevance of content for own work:	3.31
Adequate balance theory and practice:	3.38

Again, the pre-course information, as in all other JLP-MfDR events, scored lowest, although in this case the rating was above 3.0 for the first time.

Scores related to content and methodologies were all close to the average course appreciation of 3.5. In conclusion, it is safe to say that the course set-up in general is appreciated and organising the event as a Joint Learning Event with participants from all sectors (development partners, government and civil society) has considerable added value!

The two most appreciated events to date (JLP Malawi and JLP Cameroon) seem to indicate that local resource persons play a crucial role in ensuring the overall success of the event. While the general course flow is working and the trainer team performs well, additional value can be created by including a well-informed resource person. Both in Malawi and in Cameroon, recommendations from the in-country team were instrumental in identifying the right resource person.

Experience has shown that well-chosen case-studies (adapted to the respective country context) in combination with a team of facilitators that has the skills to present information in a varied and appealing manner, increases participants' enthusiasm for the subject matter and motivates them to actively participate.

Trainers' Recommendations

- Try to organise a learning event with higher officials as leadership is the key issue for progressing on MfDR in Cameroon.
- Try to stimulate participants to strengthen the Communauté Africaine de Pratiques sur la gestion axée sur les Résultats de Développement (CoP) in Cameroon, already existing with 11 members and 3 of them present in the JLE.
- Organise an (informal) follow-up of the action plans. It is important to keep the spirit and energy of the enthusiastic participants going.
- Consider giving a boost to PROMAGAR as this is a well-developed plan including all elements of MfDR. Particular attention could go to the Human Resource and Leadership aspects in the programme
- Tailoring the JLE to the country context before it takes place is very useful. However, it is equally important to adjust the programme during the course given time constraints, felt importance of certain subjects, participants' wishes, etc. Therefore flexibility of trainers to adapt and know "what to how" to do their work remains extremely important.

Annex 1 List of Participants

Fiche de Présence

Atelier de formation Train4Dev sur la gestion axée sur les résultats
 25.-27. mai 2010, Hôtel Mt.Fébé

√

NOM, Prénom	Institution/Fonction	Point Focaux – oui/non? pour?	25.5.	26.5.	27.5.
1. M. AKOA, Albert Anicet	Fédération des Communes et Villes Unies du Cameroun (CVUC)/Maire de Ngoulemankong		√	√	√
2. M. ABAKAR, Oumar	MINFOF/Chargé d'Etude DAG/Fonds Commun	Ordonnateur /MINFOF	√	√	√
3. M. BATE, Moses Ayuk	MINEPAT		√	√	√
4. Mme. BILOUNGA, Stéphanie	MINFI/Chargée d'Etude, Secrétariat Général		√	√	√
5. Mme. COLY, Annette	GTZ/Projet d'Appui à l'Exécution de la Déclaration de Paris (PAEDP) Conseillère Technique Principal		√	√	√
6. M. DECLEIRE, Yanek	GTZ/ProPSFE Conseiller MINFOF MINEP Forêts - Environnement		√	√	√
7. M. ENOW, Dickson Enow	Youth and Gender Welfare Association (YOGWA)/Présidente	Oui	√	√	√
8. M. ESSOMBA, Pierre	MINATD/Chef de la Division des Affaires Juridiques		√		

NOM, Prénom	Institution/Fonction	Point Focaux – oui/non? pour?	25.5.	26.5.	27.5.
9. M. FAISOP, Charles	MINFOPRA/CEA		√	√	√
10. M. FOMBE MBAH, Georgewill	ARMP/Contrôleur à la Brigade de Contrôle, des Enquêtes et des Investigations	Pour ARMP		√	√
11. M. ITOUA-AYESSA, Nestor	Conseil des Eglises Protestantes du Cameroun (CEPCA)/Forum Cameroun/Service des Eglises Evangéliques en Allemagne pour le Développement (EED)	Oui	√	√	√
12. M. KAUP, Ludger	DED/PADDL		√	√	√
13. Mme. MANDENG, Corinne	Filles d'Aujourd'hui, Femmes de Demain (FAFED)/Présidente		√	√	√
14. Mme. MANGE MAYER, Magdalene Keja	PNUD	HIV/AIDS groupe programme	√	√	
15. M. MBA MBO, Hyacinthe	La Jeunesse volontaire des nations unies pour la promotion des droits de l'homme (JEVNU.PRODH)/Président Coordinateur Centre International de Formation Appliquée en Démocratie, Développement, Ethique et Gouvernance (CIFADDEG)/Directeur		√	√	

16. M. MBOBDA, Emmanuel	MINFI/Chargé d'Etude, Direction Générale du Budget		√	√	
17. Mme. MOUNLOM, Damaris	Femmes-Santé-Développement (FESADE)/Coordinatrice		√	√	√
18. M. MOUNCHAROU, Georges	MINFOF/Chef de Cellule de Coopération		√	√	
19. M. MZOGANG, Patrick	MINEPAT		√		
20. M. NANA, Leopold	GTZ/PADDL Conseiller Technique		√	√	√
21. Mme. NDJEBET, Helene	Banque Mondiale		√	√	
22. Mme. NDOUMBE, Victorine	MINFOPRA/CS		√	√	√
23. Mme. NGO MBOGLEN, Maxemilienne	Association de Lutte contre les Violences faites aux Femmes (ALVF)		√	√	√
24. M. NGOUNOU, Charlie Martial	Association Internationale des Maires Francophones (AIMF)/Président Exécutif, AfroLeadership	Pour l'AIMF	√	√	√
25. M. NKAMA, Arsène	PNUD		√		
26. M. NKONGHO, Samuel Agbortogo	MINATD		√	√	√
27. M. NJOYA NSANGOU, Soulémane	Association des Jeunes pour la Promotion de la Culture, l'Education et le Développement Economique et Social (AJP CEDES)/Administrateur, Coordonnateur	oui	√	√	√

28. M. NTEP, Rigobert	MINEP/Sous-directeur de la Sensibilisation	Pour PSFE Comp. 1	√	√	√
29. NZEUSSEU, Leopold	Transparency International		√	√	√
30. M. OKOUDA, Barnabe	INS			√	
31. Mme. ONDOUA BIWOLE, Viviane	MINFOPRA/Inspectrice Générale et Coordinatrice du projet PINORAC		√	√	√
32. M. ONDOUA, Serge Hervé	MINEP/Chef de Division des Etudes, des Projets et de la Coopération		√	√	√
33. Mme. RADEKE, Helen	GTZ/ Projet d'Appui à l'Exécution de la Déclaration de Paris (PAEDP) Conseillère Technique		√	√	
34. Mme. ROSEN, Dana	GTZ/Experte Associée au Bureau Régional		√	√	√
35. M. SONG, Jean Emile	ADIL/COSADER/Ingénieur Agronome, Structure des OSC Développement Rural		√	√	√
36. M. VUILLERMET, Matthieu	Ambassade de France au Cameroun /Economiste Chargé de mission gouvernance Service de coopération et d'action culturelle		√		√
37. Mme. YOBO GOUEM, Fidèle	SNV/Advisor - Pastoral Livestock	Pour suivi évaluation MfR (Managing for Results)	√	√	√

Annex 2 Participants' Responses to open questions

Q3: Quels sont les effets du séminaire que vous considérez être importants pour l'augmentation future de l'harmonisation, l'alignement et la gestion axée sur les résultats?
La mise en commun d'acteurs divers offre l'opportunité d'initiative multi-acteurs pour améliorer les approches d'harmonisation et d'alignement.
La participation multi-acteur à l'atelier. La sensibilisation à l'approche GRD et les exemples par pays.
Relation causalité entre intrants-extrants-effet-impact ; les risques; le leadership.
La chaîne des résultats.
La collaboration et l'échange entre les différents groupes d'acteurs (société civile, gouvernement et les PTF).
La prise de conscience vis-à-vis des compétences au niveau des différents groupes, et des idées concrètes ont été développées; lieu entre ministère et secteur.
Sa nature (séminaire conjoint) qui a permis de mettre sur une même table de discussions : les bailleurs, le gouvernement et la société civile.
My risk management and decisions taking skills will increase. This will follow by production of results within a committed time.
Les plans d'actions que les différent groupes ont élaborés sont porteurs d'espoir à condition qu'ils soient effectivement mis en œuvre.
Public mêlant CSO, bailleurs et gouvernement; travail en ateliers.
Partager les informations et les pratiques, capitaliser les expériences et échanger, publication des bonnes pratiques.
Prise de conscience des enjeux, engagement à renforcer les capacités et implementer les techniques et outiles, Intérêt aux stratégies / vision des partenaires, exigence de renforcement organisationnel.
We should principally adapt our cultural environment. With this results-based management will be easily adopted and executed.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Prise de conscience importante (GAR) – Motivation à "championner" la GAR dans nos organisations – Interrogation sérieuse sur les conditions pour avoir la GAR au Cameroun.
Clarté et Précision dans la définition des concepts (base), approche (méthodologique) excellente.
1. L'accord sur l'importance ou la pertinence de l'aspect participatif dans la mise en œuvre des stratégies de développement. 2. Changement de la mentalité.
Sensibilisation
Travail en atelier avec divers acteurs, travaux pratiques, explication des concepts, études de cas.
La communauté de langage entre la société civile, le secteur privé et l'administration

Q6: Quelles sessions étaient les plus importantes pour vous?
Gestion des risques, Indicateurs Clés de Performance, leadership et Cap Scan.
Indicateurs, risques et la prise de décision.
1 ^{ère} session du 2 ^{ème} jour.
Travaux dans le groupe de la société civile; élaboration après identification des faiblesses.
Deuxième et troisième jour.
Chaînes de résultats et Indicateurs Clés de Performance.
Travaux en atelier par secteur, exposés, élaboration des plans d'action.
Chaine de résultats (travail en groupe); statistique, surtout les exercices pratiques – CAP-Scan pour une application concrète.
Gestion du risque /reportage à partir des effets, impacts, prise de décision.
Sessions B, C 1 ^{er} jour. Sessions B, C, D, 2 ^{ème} jour, Sessions B, C, 3 ^{ème} jour.
The first day session B and C. Second day sessions B and C and third day sessions B and C.
La session qui s'est focalisé sur les formulations et la gestion des risques lors de l'exercice de planification.
Présentation des concepts; challenges à affronter.
Chaines de résultats; Prise de décision fondée sur des données factuelles; les statistiques dans la prise de décisions; le leadership; CAPScan
Les sessions qui étaient les plus importantes sont les travaux en groupe et la restitution de ces travaux.
Gestion des risques, expression statistique des résultats, importance du leadership dans la GRD, CAPScan.
The 3rd session
GRD, Statistiques et CAP- scan
3 & 1
Prise de décision fondée sur les données factuelles ; indicateurs de performance.
Leadership, méthode CAP-scan.
Concept de la chaine de résultat ; Situation des données disponibles au Cameroun.
Leadership ; gestion du risque, introduction à la GRD.
1. La gestion des risqués 2. La flexibilité de la GRD 3. Le leadership
CAPScan, leadership.
Gestion des risques; GAR au Cameroun.
Première et dernière sessions (ateliers).
La chaîne des résultats

Q7: Quelles sessions étaient pour vous les moins importantes ?
1 ^{er} jour
Aucune
Présentation INS
l'introduction, échanges les défis (challenges)
Celles qui n'ont pas été citées plus haut
Session A for the first day, Non in the other sessions
Leadership (trop général)
The 1st and 2 nd day sessions, because these contained concepts that I already integrated during my previous RBM or GAR seminars
CAP scan restait un peu "peu applicable" comme méthodologie
Les statistiques pour la prise de décision car durée courte

Q21: Merci de noter vos commentaires sur les sujets précités et de nous faire part de vos suggestions pour améliorer le cours.
Ajouter une séance sur la planification, parce que Chaine de Résultats mérite plus d'analyse.
La majorité des participants mènent leurs activités à Yaoundé, cela a influencé négativement sur la régularité aux sessions, ce qui explique les retards.
Pensez aux supports du séminaire fin doivent être distribués tout au long.
Satisfaction totale.
Un grand merci a l'équipe de consultants / modérateurs. Le séminaire était très intéressant et a facilité l'échange entre les participants en une manière totalement nouvelle.
Prévoir un peu plus de temps pour les interventions des participants (à certains moments, on était un peu 'privé' de parole).
Pour une formation pareille, il serait mieux de sortir de la ville.
Nous tirons un coup de chapeau à la GTZ initiatrice de l'atelier et l'escortons à veiller à la mise en œuvre des recommandations formulées.
Considering the limited time for much work, I will suggest that in future workshops, the organising team should endavour to serve the participants with the working documents about a week before the workshop. This will permit participants to read and appreciate the material and to better participate in the workshop.
Le genre d'atelier doit être organisé hors des lieux de service des participants pour les amener à s'y concentrer exclusivement.
Il serait intéressant de faire des exercices concrets (ex: définition d'une politique publique ou d'un programme) avec les différents acteurs (CSO; bailleurs; gouvernement), au delà des plans d'action. Une formation spécifique GRD, pour les bailleurs, serait très intéressante pour approfondir (voir identifier) des pratiques concrètes GRD en matière de politique et programme de développement.
Multiplier des exemples ; Etudes de cas; Espaces de réflexion/échanges sur les pratiques entre organisations.
Je propose que les séminaires soient organisés au centre ville par ce que l'hôtel paraît très distant par rapport à nos résidences.
Attendre le feedback des participants quand ils utiliseront les apprentissages.
It's important to pay attention to the English audience. A bilingual consultancy will impact more. However I appreiate the bilingualism of Mr.Herman Snelder.
Tous mes encouragements pour la méthodologie: Participation + Exposé + Ateliers + Travaux de groupe + discussions contradictoires. Faire d'autres formations.
Continuez dans la clarté et la précision du cours (explications).
Le séminaire pouvait alter en deux jours!
Le fait d'adjoindre à M. Snelder, des Camerounais ayant une bonne connaissance du sujet et du contexte est réellement appréciable.
Bien vouloir inviter quelques décideurs (leaders); leurs contributions contribueront énormément à enrichir les discussions.
Questions liées au budget et a la compétence restent ouverte; qualité des prestations / qualité des dépenses.
Il serait très intéressant de faire cette même formation spécialement pour les bailleurs en élaborant des ateliers très concrets. De même pour une formation mêlant divers acteurs, il eût été intéressant de faire un atelier consistant par exemple à formuler un programme ou politique de développement selon la GRD, faisant intervenir gvt, OSC et bailleurs, aux différentes étapes de la programmation. Les ateliers sont restés un peu trop théoriques.
Présenter la Déclaration de Paris et l'importance de la GAR comme outil permettant l'opérationnalisation de la Déclaration de Paris ; la préoccupation éthique dans la gestion axée sur les résultats.