

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

Course Documentation
Lilongwe, Malawi
14 – 16 April 2010

Introduction

The Train4DevJointDonors’Competence Development Network (Train4Dev) has commissioned MDF Training & Consultancy to develop this programme of Joint Learning Events on Managing for Development Results (JLE on MfDR). The programme will deliver a series of 10 JLEs in developing countries during 2009 and 2010. These will be targeted on donor staff and their partners in government and civil society/third sector.

From 14 to 16 of April the Joint Learning Event on Managing for Development Results (JLE-MfDR) took place in Lilongwe, Malawi. A total of 37 representatives (29 m, 8 f) from Government (26), Civil Society Organisations (3) as well as Development Partners (8) participated in the event (see also the list of participants in Annex 1). For more general event information see section 1.

The in-county team had specifically requested to tailor the event to the Malawian context. Important in this regard was the timing of the event. Malawi is in the initial stages of formulating a new Malawi Growth and Development Strategy (MGDS), an excellent moment to work on result chains, key performance indicators, etc. Moreover, the Government specifically invited most of the key authors of the upcoming MGDS. Although the JLE-MfDR course flow was in general maintained, discussions, exercises and the case study were all Malawi-specific. For more detailed information on the event itself and some of the main products of group work, see section 2.

With an overall average score of 3.5 (3 being good, 4 being very good), this JLE-MfDR was the best appreciated JLE-MfDR till date. The highest scores were for:

Group exercises:	3.7
Relevance of content for work:	3.6
Value added of joint event:	3.6
Trainer average scores:	3.6
Achievement of objectives:	3.5
Venue:	3.5

These scores are very encouraging since they clearly indicate that applying the MfDR thinking to the Malawi context and daily work of the participants worked out quite well. For the complete results of the course evaluation see section 3. This section also includes some recommendations for future events.

This report is meant to serve as an “aide memoire” for participants and trainers and as a source of information for future learning events. The report consists of 3 different sections:

	Page
I. GENERAL INFORMATION: JLE-MFDR MALAWI	3
II. THE JOINT LEARNING EVENT ON MFDR.....	5
III. EVALUATION OF THE WORKSHOP.....	15
ANNEX 1 LIST OF PARTICIPANTS.....	18
ANNEX 2 ANSWERS TO OPEN ENDED EVALUATION QUESTIONS	21
ANNEX 3 GROUP WORK ON RESULT CHAINS AND INDICATORS.....	24

I. General Information: JLE-MfDR Malawi

1. Key data:

Title of the Training course:	Joint Learning Event on Managing for Development Results (JLE-MfDR)
Country and City:	Malawi, Lilongwe
Sectors:	7 priority areas to work on, chosen by the participants
Dates of the event:	14 – 16 April 2010
Resident/ Non-resident:	Non-residential

The day before the event, a meeting was held at the Ministry of Development Planning and Cooperation with all the key actors involved in the preparation. Preparations were checked and final arrangements were made.

The venue, the Malawi Institute of Management (MIM), was visited by the trainer team. In close consultation with MIM, the scheduled conference room was changed and sitting arrangements were made informal, to enable intensive group interactions and debate. For these changes, we received full support from the in-country team.

2. Participants

A total of 37 participants (29 m, 8 f) were present:

Government:	(20 m, 6 f)
Donor:	(6 m, 2 f)
CSO's:	(3 m, - f)
Private Sector:	(- m, - f)
Total	(29 m, 8 f)

The JLE Malawi did achieve the targeted number of 35 participants. Although a JLE-SWAp follow-up workshop and several other large events were taking place in the same week, participation as well as permanent attendance was very encouraging.

The in-country team deliberately chose not to apply the equal participation principle (1/3 Government, 1/3 CSO representatives and 1/3 Development Partners). Considering the present process towards a new Malawi Growth and Development Strategy (MGDS), the relative weak civil society and a number of other reasons, preference was given to key government staff.

3. Names of trainers and implementing agencies

Close coordination took place between the Ministry of Development Planning and Co-operation and the lead development partners, The Deutsche Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit (GTZ) GmbH and Irish Aid. They all joined hands to make the necessary in-country arrangements. The Government of Malawi's Ministry of Development Planning and Cooperation sent out the targeted invitation letters.

The implementation team consisted of 2 trainers and 1 resource person. Short profiles are provided below.

Ronald Mangani

Ronald Mangani has a PhD in Economics from the University of Cape Town. He has over 15 years of experience in university teaching, professional training, research and consultancy, and is currently a Senior Lecturer in Economics at Chancellor College, University of Malawi. He has carried out many consultancy assignments for the Government of Malawi and a wide range of international organisations. He has also been adjunct faculty of the Malawi Institute of Management, and currently resources at the Eastern and Southern Africa Management Institute (ESAMI). Ronald Mangani acted as the resource person during the event.

Kitakaya Loisa

Kitakaya Loisa has over 13 years working experience in the development sector in the Eastern and Southern Africa region. His experience includes research, planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation. His countries of experience include Kenya, Uganda, Tanzania, Sudan, Somalia, and South Africa. This has culminated in among others, key skills and capacities in design of result-oriented programs, design and delivery of training programs and organizational development.

Kitakaya Loisa is working as a Trainer/Consultant, collaborating intensively with MDF East and South Africa. He acted as a trainer/facilitator during the event.

Dick van Blitterswijk

Mr. van Blitterswijk is working as a senior trainer/consultant for MDF, Training&Consultancy, Ede, the Netherlands. He has a Masters in Agriculture and a Masters in Public Management and 25 years of experience in development co-operation. He is involved in the design and implementation of (tailor-made) training programmes and facilitation of workshops, as well as in consultancies. Clients include governments, institutions (like European Commission and World Bank), federations of unions and a number of large non-governmental organisations.

Mr van Blitterswijk carried out long-term assignments in Burkina Faso, Peru, Cameroon and Nepal. He facilitates the francophone debate for the African Community of Practice on MfDR. Within the Joint Learning Programme on MfDR, Dick van Blitterswijk is key expert on MfDR.

II. The Joint Learning Event on MfDR

Introduction

There was a clearly expressed wish to develop the whole event on MfDR in the context of the Malawi Growth and Development Strategy (MGDS). Considering the upcoming preparatory process of the new MGDS the JLE-MfDR was very timely.

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

Day 1

Mr. Kelvin Colgan, senior development specialist of Irish Aid and Ms. Uta Borges, Country Director GTZ welcomed participants on behalf of Train4Dev and the in-country team in Malawi. Both stressed the importance of being as practical as possible during the event and putting lessons learned into practice after the event.

The Director of Monitoring and Evaluation, Ministry of Development Planning and Cooperation, Mr. Chancy Simwaka welcomed participants and officially opened the Joint Learning Event. He stressed the importance of this event, highlighting the link with the MGDS-consultation and formulation process. He also emphasized the necessary shift in general from a more resource-based type of management within the public sector towards Managing for Development Results.

Day 1 was implemented in line with the following programme:

Day 1	
	Introduction <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Welcome, objectives and programme
Session A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Development effectiveness and overview MfDR concepts, principles, pillars, features,...
	MfDR in practice <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Exchange in small peer groups on implementation challenges ➤ Short introduction MfDR case, relevant for Malawi
	Shared goals and strategies (Align Planning with Results) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Short introduction + demonstration MfDR case - results chain ➤ Brief plenary inventory about (challenges in) results chains ➤ Explanation group work (Strategy formulation- Malawi Growth and Development Strategy)
Session C	
	Shared goals and strategies <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Groups develop/discuss result chains for a priority area/sector ➤ Trainers and resource person facilitate and provide feedback
Session D	

During the first introductory session the objectives, programme as well as working schedule of the event were briefly explained. The trainer explained the participant's file containing presentations as well as background reading material (so-called "briefing notes" on the main subjects of the event). The trainer also referred to the Train4Dev website, www.train4dev.net, where all course materials can be found and downloaded. The trainer emphasized that the event would be highly interactive and with hands-on exercises. This intention to make it as dynamic and active as possible also explained the sitting arrangements ("café set-up"), to facilitate group exercises and dynamic interactions.

After these introductory remarks, the subject “Managing for Development Results” was introduced with a power point presentation (supported by a briefing note with the same name).

Afterwards, in the second session, the first group exercise was introduced:

- Discuss in your working group the challenges related to putting MfDR into practice. Write these on cards.

The working groups were composed around 7 MGDS-priority areas:

1. Green Belt Irrigation and Water Development
2. Climate Change, Natural Resources and Environmental Management
3. Public Health, Sanitation and HIV/AIDS
4. Agriculture and Food Security
5. Energy, mining and industrial development
6. Integrated Rural Development
7. Education, Science and Technology

Groups were “mixed” groups, with the different actors involved represented in the different groups. Most participants made their own choice in terms of the priority area they wanted to work on, some accommodated to finally compose 7 groups of similar size.

After the working groups had finalized the assignment, an inventory was made in plenary and cards were clustered under different headings, resulting in the following overview.

MfDR Challenges

1. Inadequate capacity
 - a. Limited number of qualified personnel
 - b. Inadequate access to education opportunities
2. Weak leadership
 - a. Political interference
 - b. Low profile of climate change as an issue
3. Limited resources
 - a. Funding delays
 - b. Obsolete equipment
4. Poor coordination
 - a. Archaic legislation
 - b. Wanting policy coordination and harmonisation
 - c. Weak stakeholder coordination
5. Monitoring & Evaluation
 - a. Poor MIS
 - b. Uncoordinated data
 - c. Lack of functional M&E system
 - d. Non availability of data
 - e. Poor quality data and information
6. Planning challenges

After this inventory, the real life case (Common Approach to Budget Support=CABS) was introduced by the resource person, Ronald Mangani. He provided an overview of the importance of budget support in Malawi and explained the framework behind this CABS.

Questions were raised about the level of alignment with the MGDS, and the following debate touched upon a number of key concepts behind aid effectiveness (ownership, alignment, harmonisation, dialogue on results between key actors, etc. etc.). It was explained that the case was not chosen to provide a best practice, but to show a real life Malawi example (covering a considerable part of Malawi external resources) and debate together if and how different concepts were sufficiently taken into account.

After lunch, result chains were introduced with a power point presentation as a particular MfDR tool. Result chains were presented as logical diagrams linking different result levels (output, outcome and impact).

As such, result chains support the following MfDR principles:

- Dialogue on results
- Align PM&E with results
- Planning and budgeting
- Or in short, result chains support “shared goals and strategies” (see also the AAA, the Accra Agenda for Action).

The trainer linked the result chains to the practical definition of MfDR as provided in the morning.

The resource person subsequently presented results taken from the CAPS framework and debated those (which level, output, outcome, impact?) with the participants. Once consensus was reached about the level, the other levels were added as a first hands-on exercise. These chains are presented below:

Result Chains from the CABS after debate in plenary:

Example 1 from resource person developed in plenary	Outputs	Outcome	Impact
	Government policy and legislation on affirmative action	Increased number of women decision makers	Increased divorce rates (unintended)
	Political will		More equal society
	50/50 campaign		Better understanding of gender
	Education of women		Reduced domestic violence

Example 2 from resource person developed in plenary

Outputs	Outcome	Impact
Reduced training fees	Increased number of nurses per population	Reduced maternal mortality rate
Increased number of trained nurses		Improved delivery of health services
Better conditions of services		Increased life expectancy
		Increased productivity

Example 3 from resource person developed in plenary

Outputs	Outcome	Impact
Increased school feeding programme	Boys' survival rate beyond class 5 increased	Increased literacy levels
Increased number of trained teachers		Reduced underage crime rates
Increased school building blocks		Increased productivity
Increased number of literate parents		Increased incomes

After this practising with result levels, the working groups were requested to prepare their result chains for their respective priority areas. These chains are all presented in annex 3. These chains already include the indicators which were identified during day 2.

This group exercise was scheduled until shortly before the end of the day. The day was closed with the parable of the "Happy Horse", to once again clearly explain the different levels in the result chains:

- *Sphere of Control* (Output level-horse has access to the water/service delivered)
- *Sphere of Influence* (Outcome level-horse thirst quenched/and service used)
- *Sphere of Concern* (Impact level-happy horse/contribution to a wider interest)

Day 2

Day 2 also developed very much in line with the programme as presented.

Day 2

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ <i>Short recap. + personal logbook - reflect on own learning</i>
Session A	<p>Shared goals and strategies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Groups receive feedback from other groups on their result chains ➤ Consultation to achieve shared goals and strategies; how to?
Session B	<p>Evidence-based decision making - key performance indicators</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Key Performance Indicators (presentation of examples), discuss difficulties in practice ➤ Groups add key performance sector indicators to results chains
Session C	<p>Evidence-based decision making – key performance indicators</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Plenary presentations ➤ Discussion measurement of and reporting on those KPI's?
Session D	<p>Evidence-based decision making – information management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Available information in Malawi-sharing of experiences/initiatives ➤ Draw conclusions on how to improve

The day started with a personal reflection (with the help of the personal logbook) on own lessons during day 1; a day which focused on “MfDR, state of the art”, as well as “Shared Goals and Strategies”.

Afterwards, working groups were requested to walk around and look at result chains of their colleagues, providing feedback in plenary. Colleagues seriously questioned the different levels chosen in an attempt to create joint understanding on result chains .

Colleagues also identified several strategies, where areas of intervention are clearly interlinked. Sometimes areas specifically depend on each other (identification of appropriate irrigation technologies for extension work in another area). Sometimes particular strategy development can reinforce achievement of other objectives (use of the right agricultural inputs can reinforce environmental results as well as agricultural ones at the same time). *Important conclusion: dialogue on results not only with different development partners, but also with different government entities.*

After the result chains (a tool clearly supporting “Shared Goals and Strategies”), the programme started to look more at evidence-based decision making (and learning).

Immediately after the break, the session consisted of a closer look at key performance indicators. In a short power point presentation, key performance indicators were defined, including some key characteristics of good indicators. The Kenya National Integrated Monitoring and Evaluation System (NIMES) was explained as an example of working with key performance indicators per sector.

After this example, different CABS indicators were presented and discussed. Participants were asked to comment on these different indicators. In addition, the resource person provided different elements to (re)consider.

After the lunch break, the working groups were asked to prepare indicators for their own areas/result chains. Those can be found in annex 3.

The indicators were briefly presented and discussed in plenary after the exercise.

The last exercise of the day focused on the analysis and use of information.

- For this exercise, data from the 2009 MGDS review for most of the 7 key areas, touched upon during the event, were displayed. The participants were asked to indicate how they would use this type of information for learning and decision making.

The findings were discussed in plenary.

DAY 3

In general terms, day 3 also went in line with the presented programme, although sessions were a bit shortened and lunch break delayed to accommodate and finalise the programme before (a late) lunch.

This adjustment of the schedule was in line with participants requests and normal in-country course-practise on Friday. An earlier start every day as well as a shorter lunch break, helped to cover nevertheless all the programmed subjects. By doing so, we still had 29 active participants until the closure of the course, which was said to be a very encouraging attendance after an almost 3-day event.

Day 3

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ <i>Recap. Personal logbook - reflect on own learning</i>
Session A	<p>Scanning of capacities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Explanation of Capacity scan (example Malawi; Energy Sector) ➤ Participants review MfDR capacity and assess the actual situation
Session B	<p>Leadership and evidence based decision making</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Short introduction ➤ Presentation of specific case experience ➤ Plenary identifies key elements for leadership and decision making
Session C	<p>Change towards MfDR: how to operationalise and what are the conditions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Participants assess own situation and present key elements of change in their situation including conditions ➤ Summary in plenary of findings
Session D	<p>Follow-up actions and wrap-up</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Identification of own actions (use of personal logbook) ➤ Plenary round of individual actions and short feedback ➤ Wrap-up, evaluation and closure

After the participants had finalised their logbook, a short presentation on the CAPScan was made to familiarise participants with the existence of this tool as well as with additional background documentation. The experience in Malawi within the Power sector (the first CAPScan experience focusing on one single sector) was used to illustrate what type of information the CAPScan may well provide to the government. The results of this CAPScan were displayed and briefly discussed with the participants.

Afterwards, a presentation on leadership was followed by quite an interesting debate applying the general leadership concepts on a specific experience in Malawi. The resource person analysed together with the participants the efforts to achieve food security over the last few years in Malawi (a key objective, which clearly was achieved!).

Interestingly enough, it appeared not to be difficult to identify and illustrate the different MfDR leadership qualities (vision, competence and integrity) as presented before. Determination was also clearly emphasized in the plenary discussion as one of the decisive qualities during this process. Similarly, important aspects as:

- ❖ Inclusion of Stakeholders in the process
- ❖ Accountability to people and parliament
- ❖ Relations between politicians and government officials

were also illustrated by jointly analyzing this particular case of Managing for Development Results.

Action planning

After the presentation on leadership, including a short plenary debate on the subject, the last group assignment (action planning in specific actor groups) was explained, resulting in:

Climate change

What do we want to improve on?	How are we going to do that?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improve delivery of forest extension services • Improve data collection methodologies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify capacity gaps • Provide necessary equipment and guidelines on collecting information • Employ and train more extension workers • Motivate staff

Agriculture and Food Security

What do we want to improve on?	How are we going to do that?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service delivery (agricultural extension) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enhance the extension policy i.e. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ undertake coordinated interventions at all levels ○ recruits and train agricultural extension development officers (AEDOs) ○ provide incentives – housing, transportation, etc ○ improve quality of training – revise current curriculum ○ increase training institutions (rehabilitate RTCs, construct new ones) ○ design an effective M&E system to improve data collection, recording, processing and dissemination

Integrated Rural Development

What do we want to improve on?	How are we going to do that?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attitudes • Planning/budgeting for outcomes • Coordination in planning/implementation • Change focusing on M&E from activities & outputs to outcomes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrating leadership, training, guiding our teams • Introducing systems compatible with planning/budgeting for outcomes • SWAp

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data capturing, analysis – to be done more accurately and in a better coordinated way 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developing result chains focusing on outcomes • Statistics – CAP-Scan
---	--

Green-Belt, Irrigation and Water Development

What do we want to improve on?	How are we going to do that?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expansion of area under agriculture • Increase sanitation and hygiene services • Increase access to portable water • Improve data collection and coordination • Reduce vandalism of water structures 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction of dams • Construction of irrigation schemes • Enhance capacity of small irrigation farmers (extension workers deployed) • Intensifying sanitation and hygiene awareness campaigns • Build capacity in hygiene and sanitation department • Promote adoption of VIP latrines • Rehabilitate water schemes • Construct new water supply schemes • Drill new boreholes • Construct new dams for water supply • Build capacity in water development • Establish MIS in water sector • Build capacity of M&E officers • Awareness campaign • Involvement of stakeholders

Education and Youth Development

What do we want to improve on?	How are we going to do that?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear outcomes that are achievable • Prioritization and sequencing of core outputs • Better linkage of strategies with budget • Better realignment of strategies to what need to be achieved • Improve on skills of personnel to implement programmes and policies better • Staff motivation for continuity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stakeholder consultation • Training, peer reviews • Incentives • Conduct joint sector reviews • Set up of functional M&E systems

Health

What do we want to improve on?	How are we going to do that?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quality healthcare services • Cost effectiveness of the delivery system • Access to healthcare services 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enhance capacity through: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Training even at management level including M&E ○ Improved allocation of staff ○ Incentives to reduce staff turnover ○ Provision of necessary equipment ○ Provision of adequate and timely financial resources (allocation to core areas) • Improve MIS using country systems <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Quality data ○ Timely data ○ Completeness • Improve coordination <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ MoH, National Statistics Office (NSO), donors and other stakeholders

III. Evaluation of the workshop

Number of participants completing the evaluation form: 29

Donor: HQ		Donor: field		Ministry		CSO		Private sector		Total	
M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
2	--	2	1	16	6	2	--	--	--	22	7

Summary of Seminar Evaluation:

	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	3.0	3.7	3.5	3.0		3.5
2. Value added by being a joint programme	3.5	3.7	3.6	3.5		3.6
3. Meeting expectations	2.5	3.3	3.3	3.0		3.2
4. Relevance for content of work	3.5	3.7	3.6	4.0		3.6
5. Adequate balance theory and practise	3.5	3.7	3.3	4.0		3.4
6. Adequate mix of methods	3.5	3.3	3.4	3.5		3.4
7. Relevance of materials provided	3.0	3.5	3.4	4.0		3.4
8. Relevance of group exercises	3.0	3.7	3.8	3.5		3.7
9. Average rating of trainer's performance						
<i>Ronald Mangani</i>	3.2	3.6	3.7	3.8		3.7
<i>Kitakaya Loisa</i>	3.0	3.1	3.5	3.5		3.5
<i>Dick van Blitterswijk</i>	3.3	3.7	3.6	3.7		3.6
10. Relevance of pre-course information	2.5	2.5	3.1	1.0		2.9
11. Appropriate venue	4.0	3.0	3.5	3.5		3.5
12. Quality of accommodation	4.0	3.0	3.5	1.0		3.1
13. Quality of food and refreshment	3.5	3.0	3.0	3.5		3.1
Overall Average:						3.5

Analysis and recommendations

Some general conclusions

In general, the seminar is very well-appreciated (overall average score of 3.5; the highest score of a JLE-MfDR so far). The number of participants, 37, was slightly above the target of 35. More important even than these numbers is the fact that key staff involved in the formulation of the next Malawi Growth and Development Strategy was present. Moreover, the timing of the event coincided well with the road map towards this new MGDS. Insistence during preparation of the event by the in-country team on tailoring the event towards the MGDS process should also be seen in this context. The trainer team strongly believes that these factors have contributed significantly to the success of this JLE as well as to the chances that knowledge and skills will be put into practical use.

Particularly high scoresd:

Group exercises:	3.7
Relevance of content for work:	3.6
Value added of joint event:	3.6
Trainers, average score:	3.6
Achievement of objectives:	3.5
Venue:	3.5

These scores, among other things, also clearly indicate that bringing the MfDR thinking as close as possible to the Malawi reality/context did work out well (relevance for work, and group exercises respectively: 3.6 and 3.7!).

The lowest scores are for pre-course information (2.9) and for accommodation (3.1; only scored 7 times out of 29 evaluation forms) and food and refreshments (3.1). Accommodation was neither needed nor provided (except for one participant). Pre course information also scored low during the previous JLEs-MfDR. Trainers experience that this item is frequently scored low (also in other settings and for other events). However, timely information to participants remains of crucial importance and can be improved.

Trainer's final remarks and recommendations

This section is divided into two parts. First of all final remarks and recommendations for future JLEs on MfDR. Secondly, a few remarks and recommendations, which could be useful in the broader context of Train4Dev.

Related to the Joint Learning Event in Malawi

- 🚩 Overall, the course is very well appreciated. The design works (can also easily be adjusted) and the selection of different subjects was clearly valued. The tailoring to the Malawi MGDS setting worked out well and the trainer team was clearly appreciated by the participants.
- 🚩 The Government of Malawi preferred a broad representation of Government staff and did not want to limit the participants to a small number of priority sectors. Therefore, working groups could not be based on priority sectors. The plenary selected 7 out of the new 9 MGDS-priority areas, and working groups were composed based on this selection. All group exercises were carried out within this broad MGDS setting and this worked out very well. This is an interesting lesson, particularly since the trainer team was initially not convinced (based on earlier JLE-MfDR experiences with a limited number of sectors) that this broad approach could be handled well.

- ✚ The case study (Common Approach to Budget Support=CABS framework) as well as the example of Leadership and Food Security were certainly instrumental in explaining the different concepts (aid effectiveness/alignment etc.), tools (result chains, indicators) and MfDR leadership characteristics. Although, this CABS framework is not fully in line with the MGDS, it brought in different views and ideas and as such prepared the working groups very well for their group assignments, all in the context of the upcoming MGDS process. This appeared to be a very effective formula.
 - ✚ A very important lesson to take into account for future Joint Learning Events is the following. The trainer team strongly believes that a few factors have contributed significantly to the success of this JLE and, maybe even more important, to the chances that knowledge and skills will be put into practical use:
 - Key staff involved in the formulation of the next Malawi Growth and Development Strategy was present. Targeted invitations sent by sufficiently senior Government officials is therefore strongly recommended.
 - Timing of the event coincided well with the road map towards the new MGDS. Linking learning events with national road maps for national Plans, considerable Monitoring and Evaluation system efforts, specific (MfDR-relevant) reforms, etc. is therefore also recommended.
 - Insistence during preparation of the event by the in-country team on tailoring the event towards the MGDS process should also be seen in this context.
- The in country teams will be informed by MDF Training&Consultancy about these experiences and will be invited to consider those while preparing a JLE on MfDR.
- ✚ And last but not least, we sincerely thank the in-country team for their efforts and kind and effective support!

Remarks and recommendations related to more general Train4Dev efforts

- ✚ Parallel to the JLE-MfDR, another Joint Learning Event was taking place at Lake Malawi (SWAp follow-up event) as well as several other large events, potentially “competing” for the same type of participants and increasing the burden on Government. Although it may not always be possible to avoid this situation for Train4Dev groups, no need to elaborate that this is not in line with the efforts to increase aid effectiveness. A joint calendar (with a clear link on the Train4Dev home page), where groups could announce events might help to avoid these problems.
- ✚ We discussed in a separate evening session how to increase the effectiveness of the JLEs on MfDR. Recognising that, in the end, ambition levels should not become unrealistically high for a 3-day event, we strongly did agree on the importance of “embedding” the event well in the country agenda’s. Or, in other words, in stead of insisting on “putting things into practise” at the end of the event, the event itself should, as much as possible, be planned in line with an already existing Government roadmap towards a new national plan, revisions of M&E systems, changes in budgeting practices, a specific (decentralisation?) reform agenda. Commitment was, among other reasons, high because participants were already in the process of preparing their new Malawi Growth and Development Strategy. This link seems to be instrumental to a post-event use of new knowledge and skills.
- ✚ This “embedding” should also be seen in the context of strengthening national systems and the need, in this case, to strengthen national institutions to develop MfDR training in a systematic way in Malawi. Although, the event succeeded in linking general MfDR concepts and tools with the Malawi context, a 3-day course cannot fully consolidate MfDR into the way programmes and strategies are designed and planned. It is therefore recommended that a more systematic programme of training and support to Malawi training institutions be adopted to strengthen MfDR across Government, local authorities and non-state actors. In this way future T4D activities could progressively strengthen national institutions.

Annex 1 List of Participants

Joint Learning Event: Managing for Development Results (Lilongwe, 14-16 April 2010)

Name	Function	Type organization	Gender	Contact
1. B. Hamella	Economist, Ministry of Finance	Government of Malawi	M	boydhamela@yahoo.com
2. T. Mkandawire	Deputy Director, Ministry of Irrigation & Water Development	Government of Malawi	M	tswmkandawire@yahoo.com
3. G. Ngwira	Economist, Ministry of Irrigation & Water Development	Government of Malawi	M	goezgan@yahoo.co.uk
4. O. K. Mwamsamali	Principal Water Resources Development Officer, Ministry of Irrigation and Water Development	Government of Malawi	M	omsamali@yahoo.com
5. W. Mughaudira	Economist, Ministry of Education, Science and Technology	Government of Malawi	M	wathando94@yahoo.com
6. Changadeya	Planning/Budget, Ministry of Education, Science and Technology	Government of Malawi	M	jameschangadeya@yahoo.com
7. V. Geresomo	Chief Economist, Ministry of Development Planning and Cooperation	Government of Malawi	F	vcgeresomo@yahoo.com
8. Sooki Dofel	GTZ Technical Advisor, Ministry of Development Planning and Cooperation	Donor	F	sook-jung.dofel@gtz.de
9. M. Zuze	Economist, Ministry of Youth Development and Sports	Government of Malawi	M	zuzeaaroon@yahoo.com
10. I. Nedi	Economist, Ministry of Development Planning and Cooperation	Government of Malawi	M	imrannedi@yahoo.co.uk
11. E. Fasika	Country Programme Officer, African Development Bank	Donor	F	e.fasika@afdb.org
12. G. Chapotera	Principal M&E Officer, Ministry of Health	Government of Malawi	M	gchapotera@yahoo.com

13. M. Chisambo	Assistant Director, Office of the President and Cabinet	Government of Malawi	F	mchisambo@yahoo.co.uk
14. J. Hara	Principal Economist, Ministry of Industry and Trade	Government of Malawi	M	joyharah@yahoo.com
15. W. S. Kamala	Principal Economist, Ministry of Transport and Public Works	Government of Malawi	M	wysonkmala@yahoo.co.uk
16. H. Chipongwe	Senior Economist, Ministry of Energy and Mining	Government of Malawi	M	hchipongwe@yahoo.com
17. R. Chiputula	Programme manager, Malawi Economic Justice Network	Civil Society	M	mcheputula@mejn.mw
18. William Mitembe	Principal Forestry Officer, Department of Forestry	Government of Malawi	M	william.mitembe@gmail.com
19. Alex Namaona	Deputy Director, Ministry of Development Planning and Cooperation	Government of Malawi	M	alexnamaona@yahoo.com
20. Mbilire Chilimampungwa	Parks and Wildlife Officer, Ministry of Tourism, Parks and Wildlife	Government of Malawi	F	rp@wildlifemw.net
21. Kevin Colgan	Senior Development Specialist, Irish Aid, Dublin	Donor	M	kevin.colgan@dfa.ie
22. Peter Kulemeka	Trust Fund Manager, United Nations Development Programme	Donor	M	peter.kulemeka@undp.org
23. Fiskani Nkana	Principal Economist, Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security	Government of Malawi	F	fiesthernkana@yahoo.co.uk
24. Mbilire Sanguni	Economist, Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security	Government of Malawi	F	mbilire_sanguni@yahoo.com
25. Prisca Kanjere	Economist, Ministry of Development Planning and Cooperation	Government of Malawi	F	pkanjere@gmail.com
26. Julius Munthali	Senior Investigation Officer, Anti-Corruption Burreau	Government of Malawi	M	juliusmunthali@yahoo.com
27. Wilson Mumweda	Advisor, Irish Aid	Donor	M	

28. Ronald Mtonga	Programme Manager, Council for Non-Governmental Organisations in Malawi	Civil Society	M	ronalmtonga@yahoo.co.uk
29. Misheck Chisi	Tourism officer, Ministry of Tourism, Parks and Wildlife	Government of Malawi	M	mcchisi2002@yahoo.co.uk
30. Adrian Fitzgerald	Deputy Director, Irish Aid	Donor	M	adrian.fitzgerald@dfa.ie
31. Samson Hailu	Country Director, Concern Universal	Civil Society	M	samson.hailu@concern-universal.org
32. Viwemi Chavula	Senior Advisor, German Technical Cooperation	Donor	M	
33. Florian Lang	Economic Advisor, German Technical Cooperation	Donor	M	florian.lang@gtz.de
34. Dyce Nkhoma	Principal Relief Officer, Department of Disaster Management Affairs	Government of Malawi	M	dycenkhome@yahoo.co.uk
35. Macleod Muyepa	Deputy Director, Ministry of Development Planning and Cooperation	Government of Malawi	M	mmuyepa@yahoo.co.uk
36. William Simwanza	Economist, Ministry of Development Planning and Cooperation	Government of Malawi	M	williamsimwanza@yahoo.com
37. Walusungu Kayira	Principal economist, Ministry of Local Government and Rural Development	Government of Malawi	M	wvkayira@yahoo.co.uk

Annex 2 Answers to open ended evaluation questions

Q3: Most important outcomes for increased harmonisation, alignment and results based management:
Answers:
1. There was some unanimity and consensus in what should be done regarding the successor of MGDS so it is compliant with MfDR.
2. Awareness of the role of leadership.
3. It will be very helpful in the future.
4. If adopted in practice by all parties, it could be a useful tool for harmonisation and alignment.
6. Time-for understanding of all issues, you need a 4-5 day training.
7. Involving key Ministries/Agencies will be important. For ex. the statistical office, which is an important player in implementing the M4DR, but missing at the seminar.
8. Common understanding of Approach in Management, i.e. result chains in MfDR.
10. Result chain.
11. Understanding of MfDR. It will help us to plan in a coordinated way.
12. The emphasis on the need for proper coordination of different actors.
13. Need to take MfDR seriously, contextualise it to the Malawi situation; take advantage of the current MGDS being developed.
14. Inclusion of more case studies.
15. The seminar outlined important aspects for Managing for Development Results such as identification of outcomes, outputs, impacts, activities, leadership, monitoring&evaluation, coordination, which are key to use.
16. Setting of outputs, outcomes and development of achievable indicators.
17. The knowledge on planning for better strategies and monitoring of the same to assess performance/
18. Not sure if this seminar will change in a significant way life, because my observation is that most participants are junior officers with no or little influence. Others attended half-way.
19. Result chain, being able to differentiate outputs, outcomes, impacts-importance of coordination + reliable data.
20. The seminar could help in the formulation of the successor MGDS
21. Putting in place a system for measuring development results.
22. An excellent MGDS II: if all the participants will participate in the formulation.
23. Timing just ahead of the next MGDS development process. Joint learning (GoM, donors and CSOs)
24. Improvement on linkages between deliverables and outcomes which help ensure that outcomes are achieved.
25. Is a good value addition at a opportune time as input within the MGDS.
26. Preparatory inputs to the MGDS review process-people better informed on tools and approaches.
27. Provision of tools/approaches for achieving result-based planning.
28. A shared understanding of MfDR, and why Results are important and common understanding of tools.

Q6: Most valuable sessions:	
Categories of answers:	Mentioned:
Result chains	9
KPI's	7
Evidence based decision making	6
Leadership	3
MfDR introduction	3
CAPScan	2
1. Session in the clarification on the outputs, outcome and impacts (result chains)	
4. Result chain session and then development outcomes, outputs, indicators, etc.	
6. Exercises after each presentation; in which most of the issues were coming out	
7. The second and third day sessions	
9. The case studies, since they were bringing in our country specific issues to Malawi.	
11. Development of indicators at a specific level of the result chain.	
12. CABS objectives, principles, etc.	
13. All	
15. All, including group work discussions and presentations	
16. Development of KPIs and indicator targets.	
17. The result chains eg how to develop outputs, outcomes and impact and their respective targets. I wish more time was allocated on this topic.	
18. Plenary and group work	
19. Outputs, outcomes, linking to real life stories (practical)	
20. Days 1 and 3.	
24. Result chains analysis, because we are currently developing sectoral M&E frameworks and with the training was provided an opportunity for me and participants from sectors to know what we should be doing.	
25. Everything.	
26. All	
27. Result chains, because I have learnt how one can influence an achievement of an outcome, though one cannot have control over them.	
28. The first introduction and on evidence-based and KPIs. Need to get a hand-out on KPIs.	

Q7: Least valuable sessions:	
Categories of answers:	
None (mentioned 8x)	
5. Non were of least value	
6. Non, all of the themes were valuable, since they were interlinked	
8. Action Plans	
13. n/a	
14. CAPScan. This was not valuable. Not because it is not important, but because it was not handled for a lay person to grasp the concepts involved.	
17. The CAPScan. It is valuable to our organisation, but not to me as an individual. I do not have control neither influence over this.	
19. One quiz	
21. Shared goals and strategies.	
23. Day 2.	
27. N/a	
28. Final session. It would have been good to make more locally based "donors" (??reading difficulty)	

Q21: Suggestions for improvements (not summarised, since quite diverse):

2. Group engagement in terms of different personalities to be worked on.
3. Sessions could be done by Malawians who understand the local situation.
4. Generally the training is a good refresher, but could be done within 2 days if well planned.
6. Logistics.
8. It could have been well if the action plans were based on strategies that are currently being delivered on and already developed, so that they could be used for learning and practising.
9. More country specific issues have to be brought in than just discussing issues in general.
11. Good material. We needed more time to debate on critical issues.
12. The training was very relevant and I would like to propose that next time more actors be involved.
13. Need to focus as much as possible at MfDR at national level as much as we focused at sectoral level.
14. The time was short; this required more time than the allocated time.
15. Everything was perfect. If resources available consider holding it outside Lilongwe to have full participation considering its importance.
16. Presentation: try to be more elaborate because not all of us have been trained in monitoring&evaluation.
17. More time for training, 3 days is not enough. Venue outside town to make sure there is 100% participation.
18. Logistics should be clear and in advance of arrival date.
19. Need more time- some sessions were rushed through when people needed to make more contributions.
20. Period of training: the training could have covered a lot of materials if it was for at least 5 days.
21. Tying up comments/issues to achieve consensus. It took a long time to agree on points/ability to control the dominating participants needs to be strengthened.
22. The period of 3 days was very little for the training. 7 working days could be best.
23. The seminar could have been effectively done in 2 days with a bit of pace injected into the process.
24. Time allowing, I think the sessions on CAPScan and a number of case studies where it was been done would help.
25. Need adequate prior discussion on the key elements of the seminar before being to isolate key issues. Constant need to quickly adapt to regional changes and expectations.
26. I think documents for the seminar should be improved upon, especially presentations.
27. The case study could have been focused on the MGDS, the CABS was good and excellently presented, but a bit too donor+gov focused. Could have used MGDS as this is really where government performance is measured by Malawians.

Annex 3 Group work on result chains and indicators

Group:	Outputs	Indicator	Outcome	Indicator	Impact
Integrated Rural Development	Services charter developed and functional	3 districts in Malawi having service charters in place by December 2010	Improved district level service delivery	30% of the communities in the 3 districts are satisfied with services by 2011	Rural communities are food and nutrition secure
	District capacities and structures strengthened	All local authorities have updated DDP in place by 2012			
	Traditional leaders trained to drive development agenda				
	Improved district capacity to mobilise and manage resource	80% of budget in the DDP raised	Improved accountability at district level in the management of resources	Approval of performance report for accessing next tranche	

Group	Output	Indicator	Outcome	Indicator	Impact
Public Health, HIV&Aids	Children under 1 vaccinated	% of children under 5 vaccinated against measles	Preventable diseases reduced	Number of measles cases reported	Reduced infant mortality rates
	Malaria nets used	% of children under 5 and pregnant mothers sleeping under mosquito nets	Reduced rate of malaria cases	Malaria fatality rate	Reduced infant and pregnant mothers mortality rates

Group:	Output	Indicator	Outcome	Indicator	Impact
Education and Youth	Trained teachers increased	Number of teachers trained	Reduced number of pupils per qualified teacher ratio	Pupils per qualified teacher ratio (PqTR)	Improved quality rates
	Youth trained in business management	Number of youths trained in business management, technical and vocational skills	Increased youth participation in economic activities	Number of youths participating in economic activities	Improved livelihoods of youth
	Youth trained in technical and vocational skills				
	Take-home rations for girls introduced in all public primary schools	School drop-out rate among girls in primary school	Increased primary school completion rates among girls		Improved literacy rates among women

Group:	Output	Indicator	Outcome	Indicator	Impact
Energy	New electricity generation plants installed	Number of new plants for electricity generation	Increased electricity generation capacity	Number of megawatts added	Increased investments
	Old plants rehabilitated		Increased households access to electricity	% of households accessing electricity	Reduced deforestation
	Malawi rural electrification programme promoted	Number of rural centres electrified			Improved health services delivery

Group: Agriculture & Food security	Output	Indicator	Outcome	Indicator	Impact
	Increased number of agricultural frontline staff	Number of agricultural staff trained	Increased agricultural productivity	% increased in yields	Food secure population
	Conservation farming promoted	Area under conservation farming (hectares)			

Group: Climate Change	Output	Indicator	Outcome	Indicator	Impact
	Strengthened capacity of forestry department	Numer of families accessing forest extension services	Increased forest coverage	% of land cover under trees	Reduced soil erosion
	Trees replanted on selected government plantations	Number of hectares annually planted with trees			Increased water retention in catchment areas

Group: Green-Belt Irrigation & Water Development	Output	Indicator	Outcome	Indicator	Impact
	New boreholes drilled	Number of boreholes drilled	Increased access to portable water	% of population with access to portable water supply within 500m radius	Improved productivity
	Old water pipes rehabilitated	number of pipes rehabilitated	More land under irrigation	% of total arable farming land under agriculture in hectares	
	Irrigation schemes constructed	Number of irrigation schemes constructed		Number of households engaged in all year round agriculture	
	Mechanised irrigation pumps supplied to farmers	Number of mechanised irrigation pumps supplied to farmers	Increased number of households engaged in all-year round farming		