MUNICIPAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME

for Eastern & Southern Africa

MID-TERM EVALUATION
FINAL REPORT

Harare, Nairobi, 7 April 1997

Prof. G. C. M. Mutiso
Muticon Limited
P. O. Box 14333
Nairobi, Kenya

Nicholas You
P. O. Box 30030
UNCHS (Habitat)
Nairobi, Kenya

Table of Contents

Annexes and Appendices

A. Executive Summary

The MDP for Eastern and Southern Africa has a critical role to play in the sub-region. The evaluation of the programme revealed that its activities respond to well-identified needs of its client municipalities. It also has a tangible impact in selected focus countries in facilitating decentralisation policies and strategies and in helping change municipal management practices. The Programme is perceived as a neutral entity in the sub-region capable of: (i) undertaking impartial policy analysis; (ii) brokering policy dialogue; and (iii) matching demand with supply of expertise in helping municipalities meet the challenges associated with decentralisation.

The Programme has considerable potential of becoming a value-added knowledge provider in the area of municipal development in the sub-region. To realise its full potential in providing value-added services, several important changes should be introduced to, *inter alia*, its governance structure, its procedures for designing and implementing its activities and its working modalities. These are, in summary, as follows:

1. Incorporating the MDP as an African institution and in the capacity of an executing agency, guided in its policy by an Advisory Board and overseen in its management by an Executive Board of Directors. It is recommended that a single Advisory Board for both the MDP-ESA and the MDP-WA be established to facilitate a set of common policies, strategies and monitoring and evaluation processes, as well as to promote the exchange of lessons learned and joint activities. Each regional programme should, however, have its own Executive Board to guide programme management and implementation. The Terms of Reference of the Director should also be revisited to reflect the strategic role he/she needs to play in forging partnerships, networking and raising funds.

2. Adopting an "activity cycle" comprised of: (i) Policy analysis and dialogue; (ii) Capacity-building; and (iii) Monitoring and Assessment of trends in and impact of decentralisation policies and programmes. This cycle should be implemented in full in each of the focus countries, allowing for more sustained impact of its activities which are largely catalytic in nature. Policy Analysis and Dialogue activities should be carried out in close collaboration with national and regional associations of local authorities. Capacity-building activities should be carried out in close collaboration with and make use of institutions and similar programmes which are active in the region. Monitoring and Assessment activities should seek to promote stakeholder involvement including independent associations representing civic society.

3. Partnering with similar programmes and institutions in the region to leverage its resources and to make effective use of regional expertise and experience.

4. Networking and disseminating tools, instruments and lessons learned from its activities as well as "best practices".

The above changes are proposed in order to allow the Programme to scale up its impact and, more importantly, to link its normative policy objectives of decentralisation with its substantive and operational activities of capacity-building, networking and information dissemination. It is also the opinion of the evaluation team that the above changes could

contribute significantly to transforming a demonstrated capacity to respond to real needs in the region into an organisation which can play a major role in effecting change in municipal development policies and practices in the sub-region.

More specific recommendations regarding improvements to programme delivery, working modalities and other substantive aspects of the programme include:

1. Broadening stakeholder involvement: Whilst it responds to needs of specific municipalities in focus countries, it is recommended that the Programme include, in its scope of work, the involvement and fostering of dialogue between local and central governments, on the one hand, and with civic associations and organisations on the other. This will enable the Programme to broaden its impact on key groups of stakeholders and users of municipal services.

2. Multiple clients per activity: A means by which to enlarge the impact of the Programme's activities and impact is for the programme to demand its clients (municipalities and their associations) to identify other municipalities within the same country which have similar needs and to mobilise their participation in programme-sponsored activities. This would enable the MDP to: (i) scale up the impact of its activities; (ii) reduce its unit costs of delivery; (iii) provide a basis for decentralised city-to-city cooperation; and (iv) to monitor the impact of MDP activities on a larger scale. Where appropriate, national ministries responsible for decentralisation policies should also be involved.

3. Using clients as resource persons: Whilst the programme has a history and track record of using clients as resource persons, their use should be systematised for the implementation of the activity cycle in other countries. This would considerably contribute to and strengthen: (i) the regional dimension of the Programme; (ii) stakeholder involvement in the design and delivery of Programme activities; (iii) networking and sharing of expertise and experience; and (iv) constitute an effective means of implementing decentralised cooperation.

4. Networking and Information dissemination: The Programme should be empowered to devote human and financial resources to networking and information dissemination. The client/stakeholder evaluation clearly revealed that the clients of the MDP are not aware of activities in other countries or municipalities. Networking can ensure that all of MDP's clients and stakeholders, including municipalities, associations of local government, partner institutions and relevant ministries, benefit from the activities, outputs and lessons learned from ongoing activities. It is recommended that all clients, national associations of local government and partner institutions be gradually put on the Internet-based Intranet allowing for all partners and clients of the MDP to share information, management tools and practices.

5. Partnerships: It is recommended that the Programme should enter into formal Memoranda of Understanding with a wide range of institutions, programmes and organisations based on a clear definition of roles and responsibilities as well as serving as a framework for joint financing and implementation of activities.

6. Extracting lessons learned: It is recommended that the MDP-PU formalise activity reviews in-house both as a means of sharing lessons learned and as a means of monitoring the allocation of programme resources as a whole.

7. Needs Assessment: It is recommended that future needs assessments gradually include municipal stakeholder analysis and/or dialogue with, for example, municipal service providers, end-users of municipal services, etc..

8. Use of Information and Communication Technology: It is therefore strongly recommended that the Programme should have access to E-Mail and Internet (World-Wide-Web) to be able to access and disseminate information, expertise and experience and play an active role in promoting the use of ICT by its clients and partners. To this end, the Programme should: (i) recruit a staff member responsible for ICT. Alternatively, donors should consider seconding a staff member for this purpose for an initial start-up period; and (ii) seriously consider using existing information networks, reporting formats and other facilities which already exist in the region with regards to databases, information retrieval systems, home pages, etc..

9. In its monitoring and assessment activities: the Programme should focus on the development of generic management tools and instruments to be applied by local authorities for monitoring and assessing needs, inhibiting factors and opportunities in fulfilling their mandates and in providing essential services. These generic tools and instruments, based partially on the use of performance and policy-sensitive indicators, are critical to the long-term capacity-building goals of the Programme. The MDP has a crucial role in promoting and facilitating information, knowledge and expertise in this area and in the sub-region and should therefore include the development, dissemination and exchange of such tools and instruments as an integral part of its mandate and scope of work.

10. Work Load and programming of activities: The planning of activities for the current phase has been unrealistic given the staff limitations of the programme, bunching of activities and delayed approval of expenditures. It is therefore recommended that: (i) the approved activities be reviewed immediately with the objective of preparing a coherent Phase III; (ii) the Policy Task Manager be hired as soon as possible. Priority should be given thereafter to recruiting an information/networking manager. An alternative would be for a donor to second such a staff for an initial period; (iii) additional increases in staff should await the creation of the new legal framework and the transformation of MDP into an executing agency with both specific short term, medium term and long term plans; (iv) MDP future plans should be formulated, perhaps with the assistance of an external facilitator, by the end of the year.

The evaluation team would like to thank the Director and staff of the MDP for having adopted a participatory approach to the evaluation. The organisation of a client/stakeholder workshop was not only an evaluation exercise - it was also a client/stakeholder analysis and brought to the fore many issues which should enrich the body of knowledge of the MDP in relating to its clients and in responding to their needs. Both the approach and the methodology used were highly appreciated by MDP clients taking part in the evaluation. Their active participation constituted a major input to the evaluation and to the contents of this report.

B. Objectives & Working Modalities

The objectives of the evaluation, as per the terms of reference were:

1. To assess the extent to which Programme activities respond to client needs and are relevant to the concrete process of decentralisation in the focus countries;
2. To assess Programme procedures for relating to clients, responding to their needs, and delivering activities; and
3. To make recommendations on how to improve the Programme's procedures, organisation, and activities; and

to pay particular attention to the following:

4. Clients' view/opinion of MDP services;
5. Impact of MDP's activities on clients' management and performance behaviour;
6. MDP client needs identification mechanisms;
7. MDP's capacity to respond to clients' needs;
8. MDP's activity approval process;
9. Activities planned and implemented under each component; and

to address the following specific issues:

10. The need for a formal client needs identification mechanism
11. The relevance/adequacy of MDP's approach to meeting clients' needs
12. Clients' expectations from MDP
13. The need to streamline activity approval process
14. MDP's capacity to meet clients' needs
15. MDP's management system, procedures, organisation and activities
16. The level of collaboration with similar institutions such as IULA-AS, UMP, etc.
17. Collaboration with donors in the region
18. Overall performance of the programme

Part C of the present report: "Methodological Considerations" contains an explanation of the methods used as well as some important factors which led the evaluation team to adopt, amongst other things, a forward looking bias in its assessment.

Part D of the present report: "Issues, Conclusions and Recommendations" is structured according to the above Terms of Reference. The reader of this report is, however, requested to refer to the annexes to the present report which contain many secondary recommendations as well as the rationale behind those presented in the body of the report.

Part E of the report: "Other Observations" contains recommendations based on discussions with MDP staff as well as casual observations made by the evaluation team in the work environment.

Parts F and G present the findings of: (i) meetings with MDP staff; and (ii) the client/stakeholder evaluation workshop.

C. Methodological Considerations

C.1 A Participatory Approach

The terms of reference proposed a participatory approach in undertaking the evaluation, more particularly in the form of a workshop including MDP staff, selected former participants of MDP activities, Town Clerks of those towns where MDP has undertaken some activities, participating institutions, representatives of associations of local government and consultants who have done some work for MDP. The terms of reference further suggested that this participatory approach include plenary evaluation, group evaluation and individual personal interviews with some of the participants.

C.2 Factors influencing methodology

A number of factors led the evaluation team to adopt the following assessment methods:

a/ *Distinguishing client/stakeholder and MDP staff feedback*: The evaluation team proposed, and the MDP-PU agreed, that MDP staff should participate in plenary evaluation sessions of the workshop but not in the deliberations of its working groups in order not to influence the latter.

b/ *A Forward-looking bias*: Several factors led the evaluation team to propose, and the MDP-PU to concur, that the evaluation should focus, to a large extent, on lessons learned for shaping the future activities of the MDP, including Phase III. These factors include:
- the recent appointment of a new director and the formulation of a new vision for the MDP;
- a Phase II work programme which was marked by considerable delays in disbursements and therefore in activity delivery, during the period January 1995 through to June 1996, for reasons not entirely under the control of MDP-PU;
- the timing of the mid-term evaluation and the limited leeway of MDP-PU, in part caused by the above, to bring about major modifications to remaining activities for 1997;
- ongoing efforts to incorporate the MDP-PU as an African institution.

c/ *Group process*: The workshop was conducted using the following instruments and methods:
- Formation of small working groups each representing, to the extent possible, the diversity of the participants (elected and non-elected local officials, training institutions, central government staff and consultants);
- Use of an anonymous questionnaire administered individually as a basis for group work;
- Use of the results of group work and plenary evaluation as the primary source of data and information for the evaluation;
- Use of a team-building and communication exercise in the form of an "ice-breaker" to enhance the effectiveness of group work and to constitute a group identity.

d/ *Design of the questionnaire*: The following factors determined the design of the questionnaire:
- The use of direct and indirect questions addressing the objectives and specific issues as spelled out in the terms of reference;
- A balance between open and closed questions and questions requiring non-neutral ranking;
- Questions adapted from previously tested evaluation tools developed by UNCHS, EDI, Training Resources Group and other similar programmes;
- Generic questions and questions alluding to the mission of the MDP;
- Questions alluding to common problems and issues faced by African local governments and institutions.

e/ *Interviews and Observation*: Formal and informal interviews were held with MDP staff, clients and stakeholders. Observations were made by the evaluators individually and discussed and processed by the evaluation team.

D. Issues, Conclusions and Recommendations

The following issues, conclusions and recommendations are presented in accordance with the terms of reference.

D.1 The extent to which Programme activities respond to client needs and are relevant to the concrete process of decentralisation in the focus countries

Overall, the Programme responds well to client needs and its activities are highly relevant to the ongoing process of decentralisation in specific countries. The participatory and consultative approach used by the Programme to identify, plan and design activities in response to client needs is well established.

Whilst it responds to needs of specific municipalities in focus countries, *it is recommended that the Programme include, in its scope of work, the fostering of policy dialogue between local and central governments, on the one hand, and with civic associations and organisations on the other.* This will enable the Programme begin to link its normative policy objective of decentralisation with its substantive capacity-building activities. Such activities, which can be undertaken jointly with partners and other programmes in the region, will strengthen the role and capacity of local authorities and civil society to play a more pro-active role in policy change.

D.2 Programme procedures for relating to clients, responding to their needs, and delivering activities

As mentioned above, the Programme has well established procedures for relating to clients, responding to their needs and delivering activities. These procedures include: (i) initial needs identification made by the client; (ii) needs assessment by both the client and the MDP; and (iii) using a consultative and participatory approach to design and delivery. All of these procedures are well appreciated by MDP clients. However, owing to several factors, including the capacity of the MDP proper and donor restrictions on the use of funds, a major client demand for follow-up activities has not been met. This is without a doubt the single most inhibiting factor to MDP's effectiveness as most of its activities are catalytic in nature.

A second area of improvement identified by clients is to improve the user-friendliness of the needs assessment form which is currently used by MDP.

D.3 Improving the Programme's procedures, organisation, and activities

D.3.1 Improving Activities

Three major improvements could be made to the Programme's activities. *First is the adoption of an activity cycle corresponding to the policy development, capacity-building and technical assistance functions of the MDP. The second is to involve more than one municipality in any given activity. The third is to use clients as resource persons.*

9

a/ <u>Activity Cycle</u>: This cycle should enable the MDP to better distinguish between ends (changes in policy and practice) and means (catalytic activities) and should be made up of:

- **Policy analysis and dialogue:** applied and comparative analysis on decentralisation policies and strategies and policy dialogue between clients and stakeholders;

- **Capacity-building**: needs assessment, training, technical assistance, exchange of expertise and experience through information dissemination, networking, decentralised co-operation and peer-to-peer learning, including strengthening of local capacity to undertake monitoring and assessment;

- **Monitoring and Assessing** trends in decentralisation and their implications for institutional (municipal) capacity and performance, documenting policy change and development and disseminating best practices in the delivery of municipal services.

Any of the three functions could constitute an entry point to a country activity and lead to the two others. The recommended time frame for the cycle is two years. By completing the cycle, the Programme will be able to achieve the following:

- Ensure follow-up activities in each focus country;
- Link substantive and operational work with the policy objectives of the programme;
- Leverage its resources by working with other programmes and institutions in the region which are involved in policy advocacy and dialogue, monitoring and assessment of trends and conditions, training and capacity-building, networking and information dissemination.

Each task manager should be responsible for developing activities for the complete cycle.

b/ <u>Multiple clients per activity</u>: The second improvement which could be made to improve the programme's activities and impact is for the programme to demand its clients (municipalities and their associations) to identify other municipalities within the same country which have similar needs and to mobilise their participation in programme-sponsored activities. This would enable the MDP to: (i) scale up the impact of its activities; (ii) reduce its unit costs of delivery; (iii) provide a basis for decentralised city-to-city co-operation; and (iv) to monitor the impact of MDP activities on a larger scale. Where appropriate, national ministries responsible for decentralisation policies should also be involved.

c/ <u>Using clients as resource persons</u>: Whilst the programme has a history and track record of using clients having benefited from MDP activities, the use of clients as resource persons should be systematised for the implementation of the activity cycle in other countries. This would considerably contribute to and strengthen:

(i)   the regional dimension of the Programme;
(ii) stakeholder involvement in the design and delivery of Programme activities;
(iii) networking and sharing of expertise and experience; and
(iv) constitute one of the most effective means of implementing decentralised co-operation.

The latter form of south-south decentralised co-operation is also an area of increasing interest on behalf of regional donors and international co-operation agencies.

D.3.2 Improving Organisational Structure

A major improvement in the organisational structure of the Programme should be to change its status to that of an executing agency. The Steering Committee should be transformed into an advisory board comprising of an equal number of national/regional associations of local authorities and of donors. A single advisory board should be established for both MDP programmes to facilitate the development of a set of common policies and strategies, to promote the exchange of lessons learned as well as to envisage joint activities. The function of the advisory board should be to define policies and strategies.

The management oversight of the Programme should be assumed by an Executive Board of Directors comprised of no less than five members and no more than seven members, two of whom could be appointed/elected by the Advisory Board. The other members should include representatives of government, the private and professional sectors and civil associations or organisations. The Director of MDP would play an important role in the identification of the member of the Executive Board (*See: Annex XI: Management and Structure Issues, page 45*).

The terms of reference of the Director of the programme should also be revisited with a major focus on overall management of the programme, networking and collaboration with similar programmes and institutions within the region and fund-raising.

D.3.3 Improving Procedures

Three major improvements to the procedures, or generic functions of the Programme are proposed, as follows:

- *Networking and Information dissemination*: The Programme should be empowered to devote human and financial resources to networking and information dissemination. The client/stakeholder evaluation clearly revealed that the clients of the MDP are not aware of activities in other countries or municipalities. Networking can ensure that all of MDP's clients and stakeholders, including municipalities, associations of local government, partner institutions and relevant ministries, benefit from the activities, outputs and lessons learned from ongoing activities. *It is recommended that all clients, national associations of local government and partner institutions be gradually put on the Internet-based Intranet allowing for all partners and clients of the MDP to share information, management tools and practices.*

- *Partnering*: The Programme was conceived to do everything from needs assessment, to capacity-building and research. This is not only an outdated concept but one which jeopardises the effectiveness of the entire Programme by stretching its resources and diluting its impact. Furthermore, such a concept negates the capacity of other programmes, organisations and institutions working in the region, including major capacity for training and leadership development in South Africa and UNCHS (Habitat), the dedicated policy advocacy role and mandate of IULA-AS, the policy dialogue capacity of UMP, just to mention a few. *It is recommended that the Programme should enter into*

11

formal Memoranda of Understanding with a wide range of institutions, programmes and organisations based on a clear definition of roles and responsibilities as well as serving as a framework for joint financing and implementation of activities.

- *Internal Management Review*: Currently, and owing to heavy work loads and the bunching of activities, the sharing of information on and the review of activities by the MDP-PU is done on an informal basis. *It is recommended that the MDP-PU formalise activity reviews in-house both as a means of sharing lessons learned and as a means of monitoring the allocation of programme resources as a whole.* This exercise should involve the administrative and financial staff of the MDP-PU as part of the Programmes internal financial management functions.

The terms of reference further called upon the evaluators to pay particular attention to the following:

D.4 Clients' view/opinion of MDP services

The client/stakeholder workshop revealed that MDP clients are generally satisfied with the quality and responsiveness of the Programme to their needs. They particularly appreciate the high degree of professionalism of MDP staff, their methods of work and the accessibility and location of the Programme. *Their un-met demands include systematic networking and two-way flow of information as well as the lack of follow-up activities.*

D.5 Impact of MDP's activities on clients' management and performance behaviour

The assessment mission was able to ascertain considerable impact on client management and performance behaviour in three focus countries, namely Zimbabwe, Uganda and Malawi. MDP activities in these three countries resulted in changes in management practice at the municipal level and in two countries (Zimbabwe and Uganda) in central government policy and practice. *Clients from other countries expressed a strong demand for the systematic dissemination of information on these success stories and suggested that they be documented as "best practices".*

D.6 MDP client needs identification mechanisms

As mentioned above, the MDP appears to have a well-established needs identification procedure. No complaints or suggestions were registered in evaluating this aspect of the Programme, with the minor exception of improving the user-friendliness of the needs assessment questionnaire. *It is strongly recommended, however, that future needs assessments gradually include municipal stakeholder analysis and/or dialogue with, for example, municipal service providers, end-users of municipal services, etc..*

D.7 MDP's capacity to respond to clients' needs

MDP's capacity to respond to clients' needs are clearly limited as witnessed by a strong demand for follow-up activities. These limitations appear to be rooted in three discrete but inter-related aspects:

a/ *Limited staff resources:* there is an objective need for at least one additional Task Manager (Policy), and one person dealing with networking and information dissemination (*see also Annex XII: Staffing Issues, page*);

b/ *Failure to take full advantage of networking and partnering* with other institutions and programmes in the region. Given limited financial and human resources, the Programme should undertake. where ever possible, joint activities in order to leverage its investments, scale up its activities and impact as well as reduce its overhead costs per activity;

c/ *Too many "strings attached"* to donor funding and confusion on behalf of donors between ends (improving policies and practices) and means (activities), leaving MDP with limited leeway to respond to critical issues which arise from and are identified in the course of implementing its activities;

d/ As mentioned previously, Programme activities should involve, where possible and appropriate, more than one client (municipality).

D.8 MDP's activity approval process

With regards to the actual design and implementation of specific activities, both staff and clients had no major comments or suggestions regarding approval processes. *However, the approval process for Programme activities as a whole is too cumbersome with a tendency for the Steering Committee to micro-manage activities.* One of the strengths identified by both clients and MDP staff is flexibility in its overall approach to responding to client needs. A delicate balance needs to be struck between flexible response to clients' needs and the overall budget approval process.

D.9 Activities planned and implemented under each component

An analysis of working documents for Phase II revealed that 115 activities were initially planned over a three year period, translating into 38 activities per year! Table 1 in Annex VIII (*Analysis of Plans and Expected Outputs of Phase II, page 42*) provides an overview of planned and implemented activities up to February 1997. This table shows that of the 123 activities planned up to that date, less than half had been implemented.

This apparently meagre result led the evaluation team to probe further and analyse and compare, amongst other things, planned activities of Phase I, work done during the period July 1996 and February 1997 (Appendix V), and work load sharing for that same period (Appendix VI).

The conclusions and recommendations of the evaluation team are:

(i) The initially planned activities were totally unrealistic given staff resources. Analysis of work load sharing indicates that 146 staff weeks would have been required for the period July 1996 to February 1997, or the equivalent of 5 full-time Task managers!

(ii) Delivery during Phase II was severely constrained by disbursement problems;

(iii) No organisation of a predominantly technical assistance nature could be expected to cope with a four-fold increase in delivery between Phase I and Phase II of operations whilst being subjected to budget constraints at the same time;

13

(iv) The remaining activities of Phase II be reviewed immediately with the objective of preparing a coherent Phase III and, where possible, in accordance with the introduction of an "activity cycle" *(See Annex XI: Staffing Issues, page 45)*.

Analysis of actual delivery during the period July 1996 - February 1997 shows a delivery of approximately 12 activities per Task Manager, a very impressive result indeed!

The terms of reference also asked that the evaluation team addresses the following specific issues:

D.10 The need for a formal client needs identification mechanism

The MDP needs identification procedures are well established and are well perceived by its clients. Areas in which the needs identification could be strengthened include:

a/ *Involvement of central government ministries, municipal service providers, utility firms and end-users of municipal services, including organised forms of civil society*, in sharing the results of needs assessments. Such a mechanism of partner/stakeholder consultations should help the Programme to create awareness of: (i) larger urban issues and issues related to decentralisation, urban management and governance; (ii) institutional capacity-building requirements; and (iii) the need to forge partnerships and new opportunities for decentralised co-operation and peer-to-peer learning at the national level;

b/ *The development of generic management tools and instruments to be applied by local authorities for monitoring and assessing needs, inhibiting factors and opportunities in fulfilling their mandates and in providing essential services*. These generic tools and instruments, based partially on the use of performance and policy-sensitive indicators, are critical to the long-term capacity-building goals of the Programme. The MDP has a crucial role in promoting and facilitating information, knowledge and expertise in this area and in the sub-region and should therefore include the development, dissemination and exchange of such tools and instruments as an integral part of its mandate and scope of work.

D.11 Relevance/adequacy of MDP's approach to meeting clients' needs

MDP's participatory approach to meeting clients' needs is highly appreciated. Regarding adequacy, there is a largely un-met demand for the following:

a/ Follow-up activities to ensure more lasting impact and potential for scaling up;
b/ Information dissemination and feedback.

Both of these un-met demands could be and should be met by the MDP adopting an "activity cycle" and in focusing part of its resources to networking and information dissemination.

D.12 Clients' expectations from MDP

Client expectations fall into three categories:

a/ Incorporation of the MDP as an African institution: Clients, while fully appreciative of the Programme's activities, are clearly concerned with the incorporation of the Programme as an African institution with a clear mandate and status of an executing agency;

b/ Follow-up activities: As mentioned previously, clients have un-met demands which they expect MDP to be responsive to and expect the MDP to make better use of: (i) partnering to leverage resources and capacity to respond to un-met demands; and (ii) networking to increase the pool of available African knowledge, expertise and information;

c/ Facilitating policy dialogue: most notably with representatives of central government and organised forms of civil society to systematise debate on decentralisation policies and their implications for institutional development at the municipal level. Clients perceive the MDP as a critical "neutral" partner amongst others such as IULA-AS, in fulfilling a "brokerage" role.

D.13 Level of collaboration with similar institutions in the region

Collaboration with similar institutions, programmes and organisations in the region has been one of the weaker dimensions of the Programme, more so in light of the fact that all participants of the evaluation workshop indicated that they were involved in and benefiting from other programmes in the region.

The evaluation team noted that efforts are currently under way to establish strong working ties with IULA-AS (cf. joint Regional Information Centre on Local Government), the Urban Management Programme (UMP), as well as with training institutions. *It is recommended that a systematic effort be made to formalise working relations, preferably in the form of formal Memoranda of Understanding with institutions, programmes and organisations active in the region.* These should include the Indicators, Best Practices and Capacity-Building Programmes of UNCHS (Habitat), the University of Pretoria's Faculty of Economic and Management Sciences, umbrella NGOs in each of the focus countries, GTZ's Small Towns Project, amongst others. One key institutional actor which should be involved increasingly in and be systematically informed of MDP activities is the Office of the United Nations Resident Co-ordinator in each of the countries concerned, as these Offices are often capable of involving the UN family of agencies.

D.14 Collaboration with donors in the region

Collaboration with regional donors is a relatively recent undertaking of the MDP and needs to be systematised in order to take advantage of an increasing share of official development assistance (ODA) disbursement being de-centralised to country levels. The members of the Steering Committee also have a major role to play in assisting the MDP-PU in establishing contacts at the country level in their respective countries.

D.15 Overall performance of the programme

The impact and performance of activities actually delivered are, in the opinion of the evaluation team, quite impressive and of a quality and responsiveness to clients needs which

is highly appreciated by the Programme's clients. The apparent meagre performance in delivery of planned activities cannot, in the opinion of the evaluators, be attributable to the quality of staff nor to the present management of the Programme; it is rather due to a combination of factors and events which can only be described as unfortunate, including severe budget constraints.

E. Other Observations

A number of informal and formal interviews were held with selected clients/stakeholders as well as casual observations made. These resulted in the following observations and recommendations:

E.1 Office procedures and internal management

a/ There is a need to introduce office procedures to systematise routine functions. Many routine functions, such as contracts and procurement, letters of appointment, etc., could be systematised and their production delegated to support staff;

b/ There is a need for the empowerment of support staff, especially in lessening the burden on the Director and on Task Managers for routine tasks;

c/ There is a need for regular and periodic staff meetings to share lessons learned and to make collective decisions on the allocation of resources. The accountant should generate periodic financial management tables and charts indicating the overall expenditure pattern of the programme and flag issues on unit costs and operating costs;

d/ There is a need for adopting productivity enhancing tools and methods including time management methods and tools. The heavy work load requires careful management of time and focus of professional staff on priority issues.

E.2 Office Equipment

a/ There is a need to update computer hardware (computers and printers), and to replace office furniture with low maintenance furniture *(see also Annex XII: Analysis of Computing Capacity, Office Equipment, Furniture and Space, page 46)*.

E.3 Information Communication Technology (ICT)

The Programme's use of information technology is largely limited to the production of outputs and reports. Information technology is not being combined with communication technology to facilitate the work of dissemination, information exchange and communication. *It is therefore strongly recommended that:*

a/ *The Programme should have access to E-Mail and Internet connectivity (World-Wide-Web) to be able to access and disseminate information, expertise and experience and should play and active role in promoting the use of ICT by its clients and partners;*

b/ *The Programme should recruit a staff member responsible for ICT. Alternatively, donors should consider seconding a staff member for this purpose for an initial start-up period;*

c/ *The Programme should seriously consider using existing information networks, reporting formats and other facilities which already exist in the region with regards to databases, information retrieval systems, home pages, etc. (see also Annex XI: Staffing Issues, page 45).*

F. Results of Meetings with MDP-PU

F.1 Issues identified by MDP-PU staff through the questionnaire

The analysis of the responses to the MDP-PU staff questionnaire revealed the following:

a/ The *identification and assessment of client needs* are both satisfactory and generally respect well-established procedures. One method which seems to be lacking is the organisation of multi-partner consultations and consultations with end-users of municipal services as well as municipal service providers;

b/ The *approval process* also appears to respect well-established procedures;

c/ The *planning of responses* to client needs is equally well-established with MDP Task Managers or the Director working together with the client (municipality or partner institution);

d/ The *monitoring and impact assessment* of MDP activities, on the other hand, is weak. Other than Activity Completion Reports submitted by the client, and End of Activity Reports prepared by MDP staff, the MDP does not have an established mechanism for monitoring or assessing the impact of its activities over time. This appears to be an important gap as much of MDP's activity is catalytic in nature and designed to facilitate change in policies, institutional capacity and practices.

e/ Regarding factors identified as inhibiting the capacity of MDP to respond to client needs, MDP staff identified the following:

    (i) Limited financial and staff resources;
    (ii) Failure to take advantage of networking;
    (iii) Micro-management by the Steering Committee and overly restrictive conditions on use of donor funding;
    (iv) Non-involvement of African members of the Steering Committee in fund-raising activities;
    (v) Unpredictability of donor support;
    (vi) Incomplete institutionalisation of the MDP including the development of a scheme of service, incorporation, status as an autonomous executing agency, etc.;
    (vii) The need for staff to focus their time and energies more on advisory services versus organisation and implementation of activities; and related to this;

    and, significantly,

    (viii) **The need to have more activities delivered by partner institutions.**

f/ Regarding staff perception of the strengths of MDP in responding to client needs, the following were identified:

    (i) Use by MDP' of a broad-based participatory and demand-driven approach to identifying client needs and designing technical assistance;

(ii)   Flexibility in responding and adapting to client needs;

(iii) Networking with partner institutions and consultants in focus countries;

(iv)   Practical knowledge of countries' problems and of clients which facilitates interaction with clients;

(v)   Goodwill and high regard for MDP from clients;

(vi)   Willingness of donors to support MDP activities, though often erratic and short-lived; and

(vii) Ability to collaborate with other similar institutions in joint activities.

F.2 Diagnosis by the evaluation team

Following is the diagnosis of the evaluation team which was discussed *in extenso* with the staff of the MDP-PU:

a/ Need to bridge the normative policy objectives of the MDP with its substantive and operational work to enhance the impact of Programme activities. For the moment, the policy work of the MDP is detached from its programme activities;

b/ Need to adapt the structure and working modalities of the MDP to ensure its long-term sustainability and its "Africanisation";

c/ Need to forge partnerships and close working relations with other institutions in the region to leverage resources and scale up the impact of programme activities;

d/ Need to focus on value-added information products and services and their dissemination;

e/ Need to assume major role in networking, information dissemination and use of the media;

f/ Need to develop impact assessment, monitoring and assessment tools and methods.

G. Results of the Workshop Evaluation

The following is a narrative summary of the results derived from the evaluation workshop. The processing of these results took into consideration that one group was comprised mainly of trainers, consultants and not municipal officials. The results are presented according to the broad categories of the questionnaire.

G.1 Roles and Responsibilities in Management and Decision-making

It was generally felt by participants that the MDP has a <u>substantial impact</u> on:

1. Developing strategies for applying new knowledge in the work environment;
2. Introducing new and improved management processes and practices;
3. Generating awareness of and knowledge about roles played by elected officials, administrators and chief officers.

Areas which were felt to be <u>less effective</u> include:

1. Improved performance of local authorities in the planning and delivery of municipal services;
2. New and improved decision-making processes;
3. New and improved resource allocation procedures.

G.2 Skills, Methods and Tools Applied Within the Work Environment

The participants felt that the <u>greatest impact</u> of the MDP is on:

1. Strengthening institutional/organisational capacities;
2. Enabling individuals to play a leadership role in their respective institutions/organisations;
3. Facilitating dialogue, consultations and negotiations;
4. Policy and decision-making processes;
5. Communication and sharing information (within the work environment).

The areas in which the MDP <u>was not</u> perceived as making significant contribution include:

6. Mediating conflict and brokering power;
7. Overseeing the work and contribution of others;
8. Enabling and empowering others;

and significantly,

9. Mobilising and leveraging public, private sector and community resources.

G.3 Skills, methods and tools applied outside the work environment

The MDP was perceived as having made <u>significant contributions</u> in the following areas:

1. Partnerships with other municipalities;

20

2. Partnerships with the private sector (?)
3. Working relations with central government.

The areas in which the MDP was not perceived as making significant contribution include:

4. Working relations with sub-contractors and municipal service providers;
5. Working relations with public utilities and line agencies;

and significantly,

6. Working with NGOs/CBOs and other civil society institutions.

G.4 MDP's Impact

Participants felt that MDP had the greatest impact in the following areas in descending order:

1. Strengthening local government capacity to deal with municipal and urban issues;
2. Facilitating networking, sharing and exchange of information and expertise;
3. Improving municipal management practices and methods;
4. Facilitating the adoption of more effective decentralisation policies and strategies;
5. Strengthening the capacity of national and/or regional municipal capacity-building institutions;
6. Strengthening individual capacities;
7. Facilitating public-private partnerships in the planning and delivery of municipal services;
8. Facilitating community participation in the planning and delivery of municipal services;
9. Strengthening central government capacity to deal with municipal and urban issues;
10. Facilitating the adoption of more enabling and empowering legislation for municipal mandates.

G.5 MDP's Future Orientation

Participants were unanimous in defining the future role of MDP as:

1. Facilitating networking, sharing and exchange of information and expertise;
2. Facilitating the adoption of more effective decentralisation policies and strategies, including more enabling and empowering legislation.

There was general agreement that MDP should also focus on:

3. Strengthening local government capacity to deal with municipal and urban issues.

Low priority areas for MDP's future orientation included:

4. Contributing to the improvement of municipal management practice and methods;
5. Strengthening central government capacity to deal with municipal and urban issues;
6. Facilitating community participation in the planning and delivery of municipal services.

Most significantly, participants did not feel that the MDP should deal with:

7. Strengthening the capacity of national and regional capacity-building institutions;
8. Strengthening individual capacities;
9. Facilitating public-private partnerships in the delivery of municipal services.

G.6 Assessment of MDP Products and Services

The most useful products and services of the MDP were judged to be:

1. Policy dialogue including seminars;
2. Support to associations of local authorities;
3. Facilitating decentralised, city-to-city co-operation;
4. Training;
5. Information products and publications.

There was some degree of consensus that the MDP was useful in providing the following products and services:

6. Management tools and methods;
7. Advisory services to local authorities.

No consensus was evident on the usefulness of the following products and services:

8. Research on policy reform;
9. Policy analysis and development;
10. Training tools, methods and materials.

Those products and services which participants indicated a willingness to pay include, in descending order:

1. Training tools, methods and materials;
2. Information products and publications;
3. Training.

Some indication of willingness to pay was given to:

4. Policy analysis and development;
5. Research on policy reform.

There was no indication of willingness to pay for the following:

6. Policy dialogue, including seminars;
7. Advisory services to local authorities;
8. Management tools and methods.

G.7 Institutional Questions

1. Financial Contribution by clients/stakeholders: Participants indicated their willingness to contribute to the costs of the following activities, mostly in-kind:

a/ Participating in policy seminars/workshops/consultations;
b/ Participating in training activities;
c/ In-kind support towards printing and disseminating information products and services.

A limited number of participants indicated their willingness to contribute to the costs of the following:

d/ Hosting decentralised co-operation and peer-to-peer learning.

No participants indicated willingness to contribute financially to the cost of participating in decentralised co-operation and peer-to-peer learning as participants.

2. In response to the question to what extent the MDP has helped participating countries in setting up decentralisation policies and programmes, it was felt that the MDP had played a significant role in Uganda, Malawi and indirectly in Zimbabwe. It was further observed that:

a/ Regarding how this was done, participants indicated the important role played by the MDP in facilitating and organising workshops and seminars.

b/ Regarding with whom, these activities were largely carried out with the participation of local governments, central government and, to a limited extent, with the private sector.

c/ With regard to what effect, in the cases of Uganda, Malawi and Zimbabwe, these activities contributed to changes in policy.

3. Regarding the question on how working relations were initiated with the MDP:

a/ Local authorities played an active role in identifying issues and problems in which MDP could be of assistance;
b/ In most cases, MDP assisted municipalities in clarifying and defining issues and problems;
c/ Correspondence and discussions with task managers were identified as the key methods of communicating client needs;
d/ In all cases the MDP responded positively to the requests of the clients through a combination of financial and technical support;
e/ Negotiation with Task Managers and the use of activity budgets were identified as the key means by which the nature of MDP assistance was determined;
f/ MDP assistance was delivered primarily through review of activity budgets, by task managers involved in facilitating activities and with matching funds covering approximately 80% of the total costs of the activity;
g/ Regarding services provided by the MDP, participants were unanimous in their appreciation of the assistance provided by the MDP. However, several participants noted that there was little or no follow-up and there were delays in disbursement.

G.8 General Comments

a/ <u>General comments</u>: General comments were subject to plenary discussions (see below).

b/ <u>Participation in other regional programmes</u>: All participants had participated in activities of other ongoing programmes in the region, including UMP, UNCHS Training, IULA, Commonwealth Local Government, GTZ Small Towns, ESAMI, as well as JICA sponsored activities.

G.9 Questions for MDP Staff

Participants were invited to respond to questions 6 and 7 of the questionnaire pertaining to constraints and strengths of the MDP in responding to client needs.

4. <u>Constraints</u> affecting the capacity of MDP to respond to client needs: Participants identified the following weaknesses and constraints:

> a/ The primary weaknesses identified by participants was the lack of follow-up to activities at the country level and the absence of information dissemination of MDP activities;
> b/ Owing to disbursement problems, participants were under the impression that the MDP was lacking financial resources;
> c/ Participants also pointed out that the MDP was lacking in human resources;
> d/ The composition and role of the Steering Committee was severely questioned in terms of its representation, "representativity" and competence.

5. <u>Strengths of the MDP</u> in responding to client needs: Participants identified the following strengths in MDP's capacity to respond to client needs:

> a/ The use of regional expertise;
> b/ Focus on training;
> c/ Research on policy issues;
> d/ Proximity and location of the MDP;
> e/ Acceptance by Governments in the region;
> f/ Willingness of donors to support the programme.

In addition to the above, participants felt that MDP was responding to a major opportunity in the region due to ongoing decentralisation processes in all countries. Some of the concerns of the participants included the withdrawal of donor support and the risk of MDP being "swallowed up by other programmes or institutions" [sic].

G.10 Results of Discussions and of General Plenary

Discussions in plenary focused on issues common to and highlighted by the groups in their presentations of their findings. The purpose of these discussions was to distil recommendations for improving the responsiveness of the MDP to client needs and priorities as well as to review some apparent contradictions in group outputs. These discussions focused on the following categories:

a/ Future orientation of the MDP;
b/ Issues pertaining to decentralisation policies in the region;
c/ Local Government management and practices;
d/ Networking and sharing of information and expertise;
e/ Co-operation with programmes, training and research institutions in the region.

1. Future orientation of the MDP

Priority areas in which the MDP should concentrate in the future include:

a/ Decentralisation policies and programmes, including facilitating the adoption of more enabling legislation;

b/ Networking and sharing of information, outputs and lessons learned from MDP and client activities;

c/ Local Government capacity-building including facilitating community participation in the delivery of municipal services;

d/ Improve central government capacity to deal with urban and municipal issues.

e/ Local Government management practices and methods.

2. Decentralisation

There are a wide range of issues and actors involved and therefore a corresponding need to focus on specific aspects of decentralisation, for example, public-private partnerships, community participation, long-range planning, country focus, policy content, structure of advocacy, negotiation skills for associations of local authorities, assistance in transforming policy statements into policy documents and practices.

3. Local Government Management Practices

The areas which clients perceived as important in improving local government management practices include:

a/ Short-term (5 year) strategic planning - the example of MDP work in support of the Municipality of Kwekwe being cited as an exemplary activity;

b/ Performance management systems, tools and methods;

c/ Visioning, including community involvement in priority setting;

d/ Objective(s) setting;

e/ Expertise in long-range planning tools and methods;

f/ Financial management including value for money auditing.

4. Networking

Networking was perceived by the clients as an important means of:

a/ Facilitating the wider sharing of experience and expertise;

b/ In-country networking as building block for regional networking;

c/ Documenting experiences in the form of best practices and lessons learned;

d/ Identifying synergy with other donors/institutions both within and outside the sub-region.

5. Monitoring

Monitoring progress and follow-up to MDP activities was identified as a key means by which the MDP could sustain the impact of its activities, extract lessons learned and provide clients and stakeholders with information to engage in more focused dialogue with central government on urban and municipal issues and issues related to decentralisation.

ANNEXES AND APPENDICES

FIRST DRAFT
TERMS OF REFERENCE
PHASE II MID-TERM EVALUATION

A. BACKGROUND TO MDP PHASE II

The Municipal Development Programme (MDP) is a regional initiative covering all countries in Sub-Saharan Africa (SSA). The program began operations in 1991 with the mission of promoting and supporting the process of decentralisation, and strengthening the capacity of local governments to deliver services and promote development at the local level, as a means towards raising the standard of living of urban populations. The program is organised in two different sections or modules, both of which share the same objectives and methodologies. The Eastern and Southern Section covers 25 countries and is based in Harare, Zimbabwe. The Western Section covers 22 countries and is based in Cotonou, Benin.

The MISSION of MDP

The mission of the MDP is and will continue to be promoting and supporting the process of strengthening local government as a means of development, which should result in raising the standards of living of urban populations. Strengthening local governments refers to developing their capacity to (i) participate in the formulation of appropriate policies, (ii) to mobilise resources, and (iii) to deliver services in a sustainable manner in response to the needs of their populations.

Phase II Working Document (January 1995, December 1997) is the result of a comprehensive consultative process. That process included recommendations and suggestions made by African participating institutions, experts and practitioners involved in decentralisation and local government in Sub-Saharan Africa. The process also included recommendations of the World Bank and of two external evaluations of Phase I (mid Term 1993 and final evaluation 1994). Furthermore, the process included consultation with donors and other development agencies during a meeting held in Ottawa, Canada, on November 24, 1993. However, the final content of Phase II Working Document reflects the decisions of the programme's Steering Committee.

The final outcome of the above process of consultation were a series of recommendations which formed the basis of Phase II Working Document and an endorsement for continuing the programme into Phase II. The main recommendations were the following:
a. The objectives and guiding principles are sound.
b. The second phase should be a three-year period with about the same level of annual expenditures as the first phase.
c. A more precise definition of the program's focus is needed.
d. Municipalities should be the main beneficiaries of the program.
e. The program should be designed and implemented based on the idea that its activities and accomplishments need to be translated into benefits and improvements in living conditions, especially for the poor, the program needs to produce evidence of its effectiveness in these areas.
f. Specific measures should be introduced to promote greater efficiency.
g. Responses to themes such as poverty, gender, governance and environment should be built into the program's activities.
h. A more effective co-ordination process with other programs should be developed.

B. PHASE II OBJECTIVES

Based on the above recommendations the Programme Unit prepared Phase II Working Document for the period January 1995 - December 1997. The programme's general objectives for this phase are to:

1. Support an enabling environment for decentralisation and effective local governance within which local authorities may play a participatory and accountable role; and
2. Improve the capacity of local government to mobilise resources, deliver services and implement actions in support of local development in a sustainable and effective way.

The Specific Objectives are to:

1. Support activities that aim to bring about decentralisation policy reform and define its legislation and implementation;
2. Improve the capacity of local governments to plan and deliver mandated services effectively and pay due regard to resources and environmental sustainability;
3. Support local government in their efforts to become more responsive and accountable to their constitutes;
4. Build the capacity of national and regional institutions whose mandate is to serve and support local governments; and
5. Transform the program into an African institution by the end of Phase II.

C. PROGRAMME COMPONENTS

The above objectives will be achieved by implementing activities at the regional, national and local levels. The activities are group under four programme components.

1. Research and Seminars on policy reform issues;
2. Support to municipalities and their associations;
3. Decentralised co-operation, and
4. Training.

D. OBJECTIVES OF PHASE II MID-TERM EVALUATION

There are three broad objectives to be addressed by the evaluators. These objectives are:

1. Assessing the extent to which Programme activities respond to client needs and are relevant to the concrete process of decentralisation in the focus countries;
2. Assessing Programme procedures for relating to clients, responding to their needs, and delivering activities; and
3. Making recommendations about how to improve the Programme's procedures, organisation, and activities.

In addressing these three broad objectives, the evaluators will part particular attention to the following:

1. Clients views/opinion of MDP services.
2. Impact of MDP's activities on client's management/performance behaviour.
3. MDP client needs identification mechanisms.
4. MDP's capacity to respond to clients needs.
5. MDP's activity approval process.
6. Activities planned and implemented under each component.

E. SOME SPECIFIC ISSUES TO BE ADDRESSED

In undertaking the assignment the evaluators will be expected to address the following specific issues:

1. The need for a formal MDP's client needs identification mechanisms.
2. The relevance/adequacy of MDP's approach to meeting clients needs.
3. Clients expectations from MDP.
4. The need to streamline activity approval process.
5. MDP's capacity to meet client needs.
6. MDP's management system, procedures, organisation and activities.
7. The level of collaboration with similar institutions such as IULA-AS, UMP, etc.
8. Collaboration with donors in the region.
9. Overall performance of the programme.

F. RECOMMENDATIONS TO GUIDE THE REMAINING PART OF PHASE II

Based on the findings the evaluators should make recommendations that would guide the Programme Unit towards accomplishing Phase II objectives. The recommendations should improves its management capacity.

G. PROPOSED EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

The preferred method of evaluation is the participatory approach. This will be in the form of a workshop. Participants for the workshop would include MDP Staff, selected former participants of MDP activities, Town Clerks of those towns where MDP has undertaken some activities, participating institutions, representatives of associations of local government and consultants who have done some work for MDP. The participatory evaluation will be guided by two independent evaluators. The methodology should include plenary evaluation, group evaluation and individual personal interviews with some of the participants.

H. EVALUATORS

The evaluators should be experienced in participatory evaluation. MDP-PU will carry out the identification and selection of the evaluators. The evaluators will be responsible for taking the workshop participants through the participatory evaluation process. They will be responsible for designing the workshop format in line with the terms of reference. They will be responsible for producing Phase II Mid-Term Evaluation Report.

I. TIMETABLE AND DELIVERABLES

The evaluation will begin on March 8, 1997 and will end on March 31, 1997. The evaluators will arrive on March 7, 1997 to prepare for the Workshop and evaluation. Workshop participants will arrive on March 10 and 11, 1997. The Workshop itself will last for two days, i.e., March 12 to 13, 1997.

Within 3 weeks after the Workshop, the evaluators are expected to submit their Phase II Mid-Term Evaluation Report to the MDP Director. The final Report will include an Executive Summary and the necessary recommendations as required by the Terms of Reference.

MUNICIPAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME
EAST & SOUTHERN AFRICA SECTION

MID-TERM EVALUATION - PHASE II

PARTICIPANT'S EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE

This questionnaire is being administered to the participants of the mid-term evaluation workshop of Phase II of the MDP. In keeping with the participatory approach to the evaluation, it is intended to assist both individuals and groups in their reflections and discussions.

I. ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES IN MANAGEMENT AND DECISION-MAKING

1. To what extent has your involvement with MDP increased your knowledge about the various roles played by elected officials, administrators and chief officers?
   Not at all   1   2   3   4   To a great extent   (Please circle one)

2. To what extent has your involvement with MDP helped you identify ways to improve the performance of local authorities in the planning and delivery of municipal services?
   Not at all   1   2   3   4   To a great extent   (Please circle one)

3. To what extent has your involvement with the MDP helped you to introduce:

   a. New and improved decision-making processes
      Not at all   1   2   3   4   To a great extent   (Please circle one)

   b. New and improved resource allocation procedures
      Not at all   1   2   3   4   To a great extent   (Please circle one)

   c. New and improved management processes and practices?
      Not at all   1   2   3   4   To a great extent   (Please circle one)

4. To what extent has your involvement with the MDP helped you develop a strategy for applying the new knowledge you have gained in your work environment?
   Not at all   1   2   3   4   To a great extent   (Please circle one)

II. SKILLS, METHODS/TOOLS APPLIED WITHIN THE WORK ENVIRONMENT

To what extent do you believe your involvement with the MDP has increased your understanding about and skills in municipal management? Answer in the following specific categories:

   a. Policy making and decision-making processes.
      Not at all   1   2   3   4   To a great extent   (Please circle one)

   b. Communication and sharing information.
      Not at all   1   2   3   4   To a great extent   (Please circle one)

   c. Facilitating dialogue , consultations and negotiations.
      Not at all   1   2   3   4   To a great extent   (Please circle one)

   d. Enabling and empowering others.
      Not at all   1   2   3   4   To a great extent   (Please circle one)

e. Mobilising and leveraging public, private sector and community resources.
    Not at all   1   2   3   4   To a great extent   (Please circle one)

f. Overseeing the work and contribution of others.
    Not at all   1   2   3   4   To a great extent   (Please circle one)

g. Mediating conflict and brokering power.
    Not at all   1   2   3   4   To a great extent   (Please circle one)

h. Strengthening your institutional/organisational capacity.
    Not at all   1   2   3   4   To a great extent   (Please circle one)

i. Playing a leadership role in your institution-organisation.
    Not at all   1   2   3   4   To a great extent   (Please circle one)

III. SKILLS, METHODS/TOOLS APPLIED OUTSIDE THE WORK ENVIRONMENT

To what extent do you believe your involvement in MDP has increased your understanding about , and skills in dealing with partners outside the municipality? Please answer specifically in relations to the following:

a. Working relations with central government.
    Not at all   1   2   3   4   To a great extent   (Please circle one)

b. Working relations with public utilities and line agencies.
    Not at all   1   2   3   4   To a great extent   (Please circle one)

c. Working with NGOs/CBOs and other civil society institutions
    Not at all   1   2   3   4   To a great extent   (Please circle one)

d. Partnerships with the private sector.
    Not at all   1   2   3   4   To a great extent   (Please circle one)

e. Working relations with sub-contractors and service providers.
    Not at all   1   2   3   4   To a great extent   (Please circle one)

f. Partnerships with other municipalities.
    Not at all   1   2   3   4   To a great extent   (Please circle one)

g.   Other (please specify)

IV. MDP'S IMPACT

In which areas do you believe the MDP has had the most impact? Please rank in descending order 1 to 10.

[ ] Facilitating the adoption of more effective decentralisation policies and strategies.
[ ] Facilitating the adoption of more enabling and empowering legislation for municipal mandates.
[ ] Contributing to the improvement of municipal management practices and methods.
[ ] Strengthening central government capacity to deal with municipal and urban issues.
[ ] Strengthening local government capacity to deal with municipal and urban issues.
[ ] Strengthening the capacity of national and/or regional municipal capacity-building   institutions.
[ ] Strengthening your individual capacity.
[ ] Facilitating networking , sharing and exchange of information and expertise.
[ ] Facilitating public-private partnerships in the planning and delivery of municipal   services.
[ ] Facilitating community participation in the planning and delivery of municipal services.
[ ] Other (please specify)

V. MDP'S FUTURE ORIENTATION

In your view, of the areas listed below, which three priority areas should MDP concentrate on?
Please circle three.

1. Facilitating the adoption of more effective decentralisation policies and strategies, including more enabling and empowering legislation.
2. Strengthening central government capacity to deal with municipal and urban issues.
3. Contributing to the improvement of municipal management practice and methods.
4. Strengthening local government capacity to deal with municipal and urban issues.
5. Strengthening the capacity of national and regional capacity building institutions.
6. Strengthening your individual capacity .
7. Facilitating networking, sharing and exchange of information and expertise.
8. Facilitating public-private partnerships in the planning and delivery of municipal services.
9. Facilitating community participation in the planning and delivery of municipal services.
10. Other (please specify)

VI. MDP PRODUCTS AND SERVICES

1. Which MDP products or services have you found most/least useful in that you have been able to apply them to your own work environment. Please tick corresponding box

Least useful   Most useful
[ ]   Research on policy reform   [ ]
[ ]   Policy dialogue including seminars   [ ]
[ ]   Policy analysis and development   [ ]
[ ]   Advisory services to local authorities   [ ]

Least useful   Most useful
[ ]   Support to association of local authorities   [ ]
[ ]   Facilitating decentralised (city-to-city) co-operation   [ ]
[ ]   Training   [ ]
[ ]   Training tools, methods and materials   [ ]
[ ]   Management tools and methods   [ ]
[ ]   Information products and publications.   [ ]

2. Which of the above MDP products or services would you be willing to pay for? Please underline above.

VII. INSTITUTIONAL QUESTIONS FOR PARTICIPANTS

1. To what extent is your organisation in a position to contribute financially to some of the MDP activities? Please tick as appropriate.

[ ] Cost of participating in policy seminars/workshops/consultations
[ ] Cost of participating in training activities
[ ] In-kind support (cost of printing and disseminating) information products and services
[ ] Cost of participating in decentralised co-operation and peer-to-peer learning, as hosts
[ ] Cost of participating in decentralised co-operation and peer-to-peer learning, as   participants
[ ] Other (Please specify)

2. To what extent, and how has the MDP helped your country in setting up decentralisation policies and programmes? For example, did the MDP assist you/your organisation in facilitating/brokering discussions or dialogue of these policies and programmes?

How?

With whom?

To what effect?

3. How did your organisation initiate relations with MDP?

c. Did you identify the issues or problems you wanted MDP to assist you with?
d. Did the MDP help you identify the issues or problems?
e. How did you communicate your needs to MDP?
f. How did MDP respond to your request for assistance?
g. How did MDP negotiate with your organisation on the nature of the assistance to be provided?
h. How was the assistance delivered?
i. Was the assistance provided to your satisfaction?

VIII. GENERAL COMMENTS

a. To what extent are MDP products and services responsive to your organisations specific needs?
   Not at all   1   2   3   4   To a great extent   (Please circle one)

b. If you have circled [1] or [2], why?

c. Have you benefited from or participated in other programmes in the region or the sub-region? Please tick as applicable.

   [ ]   Urban Management Programme (UMP)
   [ ]   UNCHS Training and Capacity-building Programme
   [ ]   IULA Africa Section
   [ ]   Commonwealth Local Government
   [ ]   GTZ Small Towns Programme
   [ ]   ESAMI
   [ ]   Other, please specify

IX. QUESTIONS FOR MDP STAFF ONLY: MDP METHODS AND PROCEDURES

1. How does MDP identify clients?

   a. Written requests from clients?
   b. Informal requests from clients?
   c. MDP staff visits?
   d. Through MDP promotional literature?
   e. Other (please specify)

2. After client identification, how are their needs assessed?

   a. Client shopping lists?
   b. Assessment of client needs by:
           the client?
           MDP Task Managers?
           Multi-partner consultations (central government, local authorities, MDP and
      others)
   c. From central government feedback or consultations?
   d. By stakeholder meetings/consultations?
   e. By the executing agency?
   f. By donors or other agencies?
   g. Other (please specify)

3. Once needs have been identified for a client, how are the possible activities approved within MDP?

   a. Chief Executive approval?
   b. Specialist programme personnel approval?
   c. MDP management committee approval?
   d. MDP in discussion with Governments?
   e. MDP in discussion with local authorities and their associations?
   f. Other (please specify).

4. How is the response to identified client needs planned?

a. Together with the client?   By the Task Manager?   By the Director?

b. By the task manager alone? By the Director alone?

c. With client's top management (mayor, town clerk)?   By the Task Manager?
                                                               By the Director?

d. With councillors individually?   By the Task Manager?   By the Director?

e. With councillors collectively?   By the Task Manager?   By the Director?

f. With contractors and service providers (e.g. utility firms, waste management firms, etc.)?
g. With users of municipal services?

h. Other (please specify)

5. Once a client has been identified and a service provided, how does MDP monitor and assess the
   impact of the service?

a. Client assessment, by municipal officers?

b. Client assessment by central government ministries?

c. Client assessment by users of municipal services?

d. MDP field visits?

e. Tracer studies or questionnaires?

f. Other (please specify)

6. What, in your view, are the constraints which inhibit the MDP in improving its capacity to respond to client needs?

7. What, in your view, are MDP strengths in responding to client needs?

Annex III: Additional Issues identified by participants

As per the workshop schedule, participants were requested to respond to the questionnaire on an individual basis prior to engaging in group work. A plenary session was held to identify additional issues for consideration.

1. Substantive Issues:

a/ Clarification of roles and responsibilities between elected and appointed officials (addressed indirectly by the questionnaire)
b/ Communication mechanisms between municipal councils and the community
c/ Need for civic education, particularly to better prepare citizens for local elections
d/ Sharing and exchange of experiences, policies and practices (addressed by the questionnaire)
e/ Need for more methods and training in mediation and conflict resolution (addressed by the questionnaire)
f/ Need to address central-local government relations and to use central government as a means of extending the work of the MDP to a wider number of local governments
g/ Need to promote municipal-NGO/CBO partnerships and partnerships with other actors

2. Process Issues:

a/ Need to differentiate between individual and institutional involvement
b/ Need to incorporate country perspective
c/ Need to systematically incorporate clients' views and client involvement in the design and implementation of MDP activities
d/ Need to focus more on marketing of MDP to its clients
e/ Need for dissemination of information on MDP activities and outputs and information on other relevant and related programmes
f/ Need for follow-up and evaluation of partners' activities and activities at the country level
g/ Need to focus on methods which can be of help to local authorities in mobilising resources
h/ Need to address issues related to the introduction of pluralism.

Annex IV: Schedule of the Workshop

Schedule
Workshop for the Mid-Term Evaluation of Phase II of the MDP
for East & Southern Africa

Wednesday, 12 March 1997

09h00-10h00	**Session 1** Welcoming statement by the Director of the MDP for West & Southern Africa Presentation of the evaluators, objectives and working methods Presentation of the participating Ice-breaker
10h00-10h30	Coffee break
10h30-12h30	**Session 2: Individual responses to questionnaires**
12h30-14h00	Lunch break
14h00-15h00	**Session 3:** Work in small groups
15h30-16h00	Coffee break
16h00-17h30	**Session 4: Work in small groups (cont'd)** First progress report to plenary

Thursday, 13 March 1997

09h00-10h00	**Session 5: Work in small groups (cont'd)**
10h00-10h30	Coffee break
11h00-12h30	**Session 6: Work in small groups (cont'd) Individual responses to questionnaires**
12h30-14h00	Lunch break
14h00-1530	**Session 7: Report of working groups to plenary**
15h30-16h00	Coffee break
16h00-17h30	**Session 8: Plenary session and wrap up**

Annex V: List of participants attending the workshop

Malawi

1. **Mrs. S. Kalimba**
   Town Planning Estate Manager
   City of Blantyre
   P.Bag 67
   Blantyre, Malawi
   Tel/Fax: 265. 670417

Ethiopia

2. **Eng. S. Kassaye**
   General Manager
   NUPI,
   P.O. Box 2405
   Addis Ababa, Ethiopia
   Fax:251.1.510545
   Tel. 251.1.513840

Uganda

3. **Mr. Charles Katarikawe**
   Town Clerk
   Jinja Municipality
   P.O. Box 720
   Jinja, Uganda
   Tel: 256.43.20799
   Fax. 256.43.30002

4. **Mr. J. Rucogoza**
   Director
   Min of Local Government,
   P.O. Box 7037
   Kampala, Uganda
   Tel: 256. 41. 256532
   Fax.256.41.258127

5. **Mr.Patrick N. Wanyeraw**
   Mayor
   Mbale Municipality
   Private Bag
   Mbale, Uganda
   Tel: 256 45 33517
   Fax: 256 45 33518

South Africa

6. **Prof. Chris Thornhill**
   Dean
   Faculty of Eco & Management
   University of South Africa
   Pretoria 0002
   Republic of South Africa
   Fax: 27.12. 3422431

Tanzania

7. **Ms. Mwaiselange**
   IHSBR
   University of Lands and Architectural Studies
   P.O. Box 35124
   Dar es Salaam, Tanzania
   Tel: 255.51.75004/72292
   Fax.251.51.75479
   Email: Mwagnes@udsm.actz

8. **Mr. A. Kyessi**
   Associate Director
   IHSBR- UCLAS
   P.O. Box 35124
   Dar es Salaam, Tanzania
   Tel. 251.51.75004/72292
   Fax. 251.51.75479
   Email IHSBR @UDSM.AC.TZ

Zambia

9. **Mr. A.W. Saka**
   Director
   Management Services Board
   P.O. Box 50995
   Lusaka, Zambia
   Tel & Fax. 260.1.254466

10. **Mr. M. Mbolela**
Executive Secretary
Local Government Association of
Zambia
P.O. Box 20070
Kitwe, Zambia
Tel: 260.2.227135

11. **Mr. D.P. Chaponda**
Local Government Policy Co -ordinator
Local Government Support Project
P.O. Box 34483
Lusaka, Zambia
Tel: 260 1 254733
Fax: 260 1 251760

Zimbabwe

12. **Mr. C.C. Katiza**
IULA
Secretary General
P.O. Box 6852
Harare, Zimbabwe
Tel & Fax. 263.4.726289

13. **Mrs. L. Mkandhla**
Personnel Officer
Kwekwe Municipality
P.O. Box 115
Civic Centre
Kwekwe, Zimbabwe
Tel: 263. 155.2301/2
Fax. 263.4.155.4301

14. **Mr. G. Matovu**
Senior Programme Officer
Municipal Development Programme
7th Floor, Hurudza House
14 - 16 Baker Avenue
Harare, Zimbabwe
Tel: 263.4.774385/6
Fax.263.4.774387

15. **Dr. E.M. Chiviya**
Director
Municipal Development Programme
7th Floor, Hurudza House
14 - 16 Baker Avenue
Harare, Zimbabwe

Namibia

16. **Mr. T.N. Mbaeva**
Former Deputy Director
Regional Government Co-ordination
Private Bag 13211
Windhoek, Namibia
Tel. 264.61.249795
Fax. 264.61.223868

17. **Rev. P. Goagoseb**
President of ALAN
Mayor of Quijo, Namibia
Fax. 264.654 313065

Kenya

18. Mrs. S.M. Kisare
Architect /Planner
Nairobi City Council
Dept of Planning and Architecture
P.O. Box 29877
Nairobi
Tel. 254.2.224281 Ext 2251
Fax. 254.443241

Mozambique

20. Mr.L.S. Renco
Mayor
Beira Municipality
P.O. Box 95
Beira, Mozambique
Tel 258.3.322298
Fax. 258.3.329709

RESOURCE PERSONS

Mr. Nicholas You
UNCHS (Habitat)
P.O.Box 30030
Nairobi, Kenya

Prof. G.C.M.Mutiso
One Isukwni
P.O. Box 14333
Nairobi, Kenya

Annex VI: List of documents consulted

a/ MDP documents

1. The Municipal Development Programme for Sub-Saharan Africa, Working document for Phase II of the Eastern & Southern Africa Section, December 1994
2. First Draft Terms of Reference, Phase II Mid-term Evaluation (undated)
3. Invitation list for Participatory Evaluation Workshop
4. Director's Report, 12th Steering Committee Meeting, Harare, 14-15 November 1996
5. Publication and Information Policy: A proposal for the Steering Committee, 12th Steering Committee Meeting, Nov. 14-15, 1996.
6. MDP Annual Budget, January 1997-December 1997. 12th Steering Committee Meeting, Nov. 14-15,1996.
7. Report to the Steering Committee: Institutionalisation of MDP.
8. Initiating Brief for City Consultations on Urban Poverty and Governance in Eastern & Southern Africa, Harare, Lusaka, Kampala, Addis Ababa, March to December 1997
9. Participation in Some of the Regional Activities (undated)
10. Local Government and Urban Poverty Alleviation in Eastern and Southern Africa: Issues and Policy Options. MDP Working Paper 1.
11. Budget January 1995-December 1995, Strasbourg.
12. Financial Statement July 1993-June 1994, Strasbourg.
13. Financial Statement July 1994-December 1994, Strasbourg.
14. MDP Annual Budget January 1996- December 1996. Revised After the 10th Steering Committee Meeting Nov. 17-18, 1995, The Hague.
15. Initiating Activity Briefs for 1997, Prepared December 1996.
16. Municipality of Kwekwe, Zimbabwe: Integrated Strategic Development Plan 1994/95-1988/99.
17. Activities Implementation and Progress Report, May-December, 1996.

b/ Documents prepared by others for the MDP

1. *R.M. Shambare*, Report on A Regional Workshop on Local Governments and Urban Poverty in Eastern & Southern Africa held in Harare, 11-13 November 1997.
2. *A.J.C. Kawonga and P.R. Lungu*, A Study on Decentralised Co-operation in Malawi; Final Report. September 1994.

c/ Documents compiled by MDP for the evaluation team

1. Financial Flow for Activities in 1995
2. Financial Flow for Activities in 1966
3. Cash Flow January to December 1995.
4. Time Flow for Annual Work Plan Activities 1996.
5. Work Programme July 1996 to February 1997
6. Workload Sharing, July 1996 to February 1997

d/ Other

1. *David Tees, Nicholas You*, Collaborative Organisational Assessment, UNCHS (Habitat) 1994

Annex VII: Activity Report

1. Preparation

February 1997:	First contact with Prof. Mutiso
18 February 1997:	First contact with Mr. N. You
	Receipt of TOR by Prof. Mutiso
24 February 1997:	Receipt of TOR by Mr. N. You
	Preparation of issues/questions by Prof. Mutiso
1 March 1997:	Preparation of issues/questions by N. You
2 March 1997:	First meeting of evaluation team in Nairobi to discuss methodology and prepare draft zero of evaluation questionnaire
3 March 1997:	Fax to Dr. Chiviya on results of the meeting in Nairobi and proposed working methodology
6 March 1997:	Second meeting of evaluation team in Nairobi, second draft of questionnaire and list issues to be discussed by Prof. Mutiso and MDP-PU

2. Evaluation Mission to Harare:

7 March 1997:	Arrival of Prof. Mutiso in Harare:
9 March 1997:	First meeting between Prof. Mutiso with MDP-PU:
10 March 1997:	Arrival of Mr. N. You in Harare
	Second meeting with MDP-PU
11 March 1997 (a.m.):	Finalisation of workshop questionnaire
11 March 1997 (p.m.):	Document Analysis
	Third meeting with MDP-PU
12-13 March 1997:	Client/Stakeholder Workshop
13 March (a.m.):	Fourth meeting with MDP-PU
14 March 1997:	Fifth meeting with MDP-PU
14 March 1997 (a.m.)	Meeting with the Deputy Secretary of the Ministry of Local Government, Mr. Matumbika
15 March 1997 (a.m.):	Table of contents of Draft Evaluation Report
	Processing of participants' evaluation
15 March 1997 (p.m.):	Departure from Harare

3. Document Analysis and Report writing

17-19 March 1997:	Analysis of documents and formulation of draft report

4. Draft report submitted to the Director

21 March 1997:	Draft report submitted to Director of MDP

5. Feedback received from the Director
4 April 1997:

6. Submission of final report
16 April 1997

Annex VIII: Analysis of Plans and Expected Outputs of Phase II

According to the Working Document for Phase II, dated December 1994, Phase II of the MDP was supposed to deliver 115 activities over a three year period, translating to 38 activities a year, in the following areas.

- a. 20 Activities on Policy Research
- b. 24 Activities on Direct Support to Local Authorities
- c. 13 Activities on Decentralised Co-operation
- d. 18 Activities on Training
- e. 40 Complimentary activities.

Phase I, which lasted four years, had delivered 43 activities, or about 11 activities per year. This document also instituted what it called " budget constraint" (see page v. of the Executive summary).

As evaluators, we were not in a position to determine why the organisation was supposed to increase its load fourfold. This is not only illogical but unrealistic, as organisations do not adapt that quickly to a four-fold increase their work load without corresponding changes in production capacity and working methods. It is even more surprising given the notion of budget constraint. Perhaps this is the background to the disbursement and management problems which haunted and thus limited the implementation of activities in Phase II.

In any case the plans did not come to be for practically no work was done during the first six months of the Phase II. Analysis of the work done between July 1996 and February 1997 is shown in Appendix 5: Work Programme July 1966 to February 1997.

The following table compares the planned activities and achievements up to end of February, 1997.

TABLE 1: PLANNED AND ACHIEVED ACTIVITIES

ACTIVITY	TARGET	ACHIEVED
1. POLICY RESEARCH STUDIES		
a. Regional Seminars	5	2
b. National Seminars	15	6
2. DIRECT SUPPORT	24	8
3. DECENTRALISED CO-OPERATION	13	0
4. TRAINING		
a. Regional Workshops	3	2
b. National Workshops	15	0
5. PROGRAMME SUPPORT		
a. Training Materials	7	0
b. Case Studies	9	0
c. Newsletter	12	?
d. Other Publications	9	3
e. Institutional Studies	2	2
f. Evaluations	2	1

Although these activity achievements may be looked at as meagre, one should note that the data presented in Appendix 6: *Work Load Sharing July 1966 to February 1977* shows that a total of 143 staff weeks are required to complete the then envisaged work.

The conclusion is that the planning and approval of activities by the Steering Committee were not realistic. Other reasons why targets are not achieved is presented under the sections on disbursement, management, staffing and office equipment subsequently.

Annex IX: Analysis of Financial flow for activities in 1995 and 1996

It is obvious that there were serious problems in the disbursement of funds during Phase II. Data prepared for the evaluators are shown in Appendix 1: Financial Flow for Activities in 1995, Appendix 2: Financial Flow for Activities in 1996, Appendix 3: Cash Flow January to December 1995, Appendix 4: Time Schedule for Annual Work Plan Activities 1996, Appendix 5: Work Programme July 1996 to February 1997 and Appendix 6: Workload Sharing: July 1996 to February 1997.

First it should be noted that for 1995, the Steering Committee approved a budget of USD 492,676, but only USD 219,171 (44%) was actually remitted to the MDP.

In 1966, of the USD 485,736 approved only USD 153,145 (31.5%) was actually remitted.

The point we wish to make is simply that the MDP spent a lot of time planning activities which could not implemented since donors did not avail the MDP of the necessary funds.

The above had two consequences: (i) it demoralised the staff; and (ii) it demoralised the partners who had discussed the activities with MDP. Perhaps this is the basis of the two comments by participants that "MDP shows up and once and then there is no follow-up".

It should be noted that even when the funds started flowing after May 1996, the organisation could only implement a limited number of the thirty-two planned activities, as the work planned for the first part of the year could not be undertaken or had to be traded off against work for the later period.

It should also be noted that between July 1966 and February 1997 a total of 15 activities have either been completed or are on-going. Their individual status and cost estimates are shown in Appendix 5. Work Programme July 1996 to February 1997. There has been programming creativity in undertaking this work, for example in combining some activities.

Annex X: Management and Structure Issues

It is an open secret that there was serious management conflict between the past MDP Director, the Executing Agency and the Steering Committee for a significant part of Phase II. No doubt the conflicts led to the spastic disbursement system and its attendant consequences. It also led to problems of credibility of the Programme in the region and to the apparent lack of autonomy of the MDP-PU in planning its operations and in implementing its activities.

There is an apparent conflict of interest in the World Bank acting both as an executing agency and as a member of the Steering Committee.

The evaluators were informed that the Steering Committee has made several policy decisions to move MDP from being a mere project to a legal entity. Among these are:

a. That the MDP should become a stand alone African Institution.
b. That the World Bank will no longer be the executing agency but a fund trustee.
c. That the MDP is working out a constitution in preparation for registration to enable it to become a legal entity. This will enable it to be come an executing agency.

Stemming from these decisions, it is clear to the evaluators that the governance structure based on a steering committee as presently constituted will not be sufficient. The MDP, as a legal entity under the laws of the host country, would require, *inter alia*, the establishment of a board of directors.

Consequently we recommend:

a. That an <u>advisory board</u> be created, responsible for policy advice and fund-raising. It should have representatives of key donors, but the majority of the members should be representatives of national municipal associations and representatives of regional local government associations. The reason is simply to make MDP their organisation. It is also expected that these actors will increasingly support the MDP financially. It is also recommended that a single consolidated Advisory Board be established for both MDP programmes to facilitate the adoption of a set of common policies and strategies, to encourage the sharing of lessons learned and to promote joint activities.
b. An <u>executive board</u>, of not less than five and not more than seven high level professionals, should be created. They should represent the private sector, urban development professions, the legal profession, the NGO/CBO sector and associations of local authorities.
c. Not more than two donors should be represented on the executive board, their representatives should reflect specialised sectors and they should be nominated from and elected by the Advisory Board.
d. The responsibilities of the executive board will be to supervise management and to report to the advisory board and the annual general meeting of the representatives of partner organisations.
e. The secretary to the Board will be the Director of the MDP.
f. It is important that the Steering Committee task force charged with investigating the modalities of setting up the legal framework of the future MDP avoid registration under the NGO laws operative in the countries of the region. Most of these laws are framed to limit NGO activity, do not favour employment of personnel outside the host country, do not give tax free status and limit acquisition of diplomatic status and privileges. In most of the countries where MDP is supposed to work there are legal frameworks which can lead to incorporation of an organisation "limited by public guarantee" with shares subscribed by partners in specific development activities. Such a framework would offer a more flexible legal framework for a regional organisation like MDP.
g. All partners undertaking an activity (including funding) with MDP would then qualify for one share. Their <u>annual general meeting</u> would become the framework for selecting the executive board and setting up long term strategies for MDP.

Annex XI: Staffing issues

There is a sense in which the MDP is overloaded with programme activities now. Appendix 6. Work Load Sharing :July 1996 to February 1997 shows that the previously planned 32 activities will require 143 staff weeks. The main explanation of this pile-up is the spastic disbursement of the earlier period of Phase II.

Currently, the MDP staff are comprised of a Director, two Task Managers, an Administrator, an Accountant a Secretary and a Driver. It is our understanding that a Task Manager with specific focus on policy is to be recruited soon for applications have already been received.

Given the work pile-up during the earlier period of this phase and the Director changes during the phase, it is obvious the planned activities will not be completed by the end of the phase, December 1997. This is more so for the Director is relatively new, will as a matter of urgency spent a lot of time working on setting up systemic management system, creating the new legal structures and reactivating the constituency in the region, including negotiations with new partners.

It is therefore recommended that:

1. The approved activities be reviewed immediately with the objective of preparing a coherent Phase III.

2. The Policy Task Manager be hired as soon as possible. Priority should be given thereafter to recruiting an information/networking manager. An alternative would be for a donor to second such a staff for an initial period.

3. The strategy for staff increase should await the creation of the new legal framework and the transformation of MDP into an executing agency with both specific short term, medium term and long term plans.

4. MDP future plans should be formulated, perhaps with the assistance of an external facilitator, by the end of the year.

Annex XII: Analysis of Computing Capacity, Office Equipment, Furniture and Space

1. Computing Capacity

MDP's computing capacity is six networked computers. These were "second hand" donations in 1991. Two portable computers are in the inventory, neither of which are in good operating order.

This equipment is out of date and dysfunctional, although attempts to upgrade it have been made from time to time. The hardware (486s) is not designed to run some of the software installed (Windows 95). The only printer, an HP Laser Printer III, has a defective drum which cannot be replaced locally. The evaluation questionnaire had to be printed outside. The LAN system crashed several times whilst we were working and data was being prepared for us. Whilst it can be argued that one printer and one file server are adequate for the number of staff involved, the present system is far from satisfactory. It is therefore recommended that:

a. The LAN system be debugged and re-installed to ensure that it operates without crashing.
b. Each of the eight work stations be replaced/upgraded with sufficient RAM to run software currently in use and with sufficient hard disc capacity so as not to overload the server.
c. That the laser printer be replaced and a minimum of three personal-use or desktop printers be acquired for the printing of draft documents;
d. That at least three portable computers be availed to the staff for purposes of out of office work.
e. The accounting office be equipped with its own work station with a mirror disc for backing up accounting and financial management documents;
f. That the office be equipped with e-mail and access to the Internet. The present system is a Bank proprietary system which does not allow for the Programme to communicate easily with and to access information from the outside world. For example, three attempts to send the draft of this present report by e-mail were not fruitful.

2. Office Equipment and Furniture

There is a lot of broken office equipment and furniture at MDP. Evaluators were informed that the problem is lack of maintenance resources on one part. It is also clear that past procurement did not address the issue of durability and ease of maintenance. It is therefore recommended that the MDP:
a. Be authorised to dispose of the broken furniture which is occupying useful space. This will include an old photocopiers.
b. Procurement of furniture in the future should focus on ease of maintenance and local availability of spares.

3. Office Space

For the current staff , office space seems to be adequate. It is not expensive for it costs less than USD 2,000 per month. However as the MDP seeks to become a sustainable African institution, it will have to reduce its operating cost. One way of doing this is to negotiate with the Government for land or space in government buildings. Such an approach will enable it to reduce operating costs further if it can hold its meetings in its space rather than paying for them as is the case to date. It would make sense to investigate whether the approach to government can be made in tandem with IULA-A who are also in the same position. It is therefore recommended that: MDP and IULA-AS approach the Government with a view to getting land or space where they can have office and other types of space so as to reduce operating costs.

Annex XIII: Client Needs Identification and Activity Approval Mechanism

From the participants group process and the staff questionnaire and discussions, it is clear that:

a. Clients initiate requests to MDP for stand alone activities;

b. Clients then are either visited by Task Managers or get a form , which participants argued was not user friendly, to fill for the particular activity;

c. Whilst a Task Manager is in a particular country, in an ad hoc way he attempts to generate other activities.

d. When a request is received within MDP, it is distributed to the relevant Task Manager;

e. It appears that decisions to undertake activities are made by the Task Manager without a formal internal review process.

There are problems with this system of client needs identification and approval. First given that the MDP is working in many countries, the portfolio of activities is likely to be extremely diverse. This diversity, combined with the one-shot nature of most activities, implies high unit costs as Task Managers are more than likely to spend most of their time organising activities. This diversity, combined with a heavy work load could also imply that activities are less likely to build upon each other and to contribute to the overall strategic objectives of the Programme. We believe this is one of the main reasons for the Steering Committee to give MDP targets on what percentage of resources are to be spent on specific activities. We do not believe, however, that this is the best approach.

Consequently we recommend the following:

a. First MDP should set up regular meetings internally to discuss requests by all managers.

b. An internal review process should be initiated whereby all requests are circulated to all Task Managers, the Finance Manager (Accountant) and the Director for comments and discussion. Clearly this should be led by the Task Manager responsible for the activity. The MDP Director and Finance Manager (Accountant) should participate as equals, given their oversight responsibilities, and assess the implication of each activity in terms of its overall cost to the Programme, its overall benefits to the specific client in question and its potential for follow-up activities and for benefiting other clients.

c. MDP should request any client identifying a need to find other clients in the same country which could benefit from the same activity.

d. Once a set of clients have negotiated joint needs a Task Manager should travel to the country to: (i) refine the needs assessment; (ii) identify and/or validate similar needs/demands from other clients; and (iii) work out the details of the request form (to be revised to become more user-friendly).

e. Task Managers should be charged with the responsibility of identifying, initiating and implementing, in each country, activities in all areas of MDP responsibility. This is currently done informally. The implication of this recommendation is that Task Managers will increasingly become generalists for programme development rather than specialists in their particular field or sector of expertise.

f. Finally, as the Director puts new structures and working methods into place, it should be part of his responsibility to sell the idea of activities which respond to several clients simultaneously. Perhaps this can be done most efficaciously if the National and regional associations are more involved in identifying common needs. It also opens up opportunities for decentralised, city-to-city co-operation where a municipal client can become the instrument by which the MDP helps another municipal client.

Appendix 1: FINANCIAL FLOW FOR ACTIVITIES IN 1995

COMPONENT	FUNDS IN WORKING DOCUMENT		APPROVED BUDGET	FUNDS RECEIVED	ACTIVITIES	BUDGET BALANCE
	Proposed Budget	Core Budget				
Policy Studies and Advocacy	178,500	149,892	133,977.00	41,105.00	1. Workshop for Human Resources Network	92,871.00
Regional Seminars	84,000	70,446			2. In Collaboration with UMP, A Regional Workshop on Urban Poverty & Governance	
National Seminars	94,500	79,446			3. No money was available	
Direct Support to Municipalities	216,000	181,146	162,124.00	91,000.00	1. Workshop on Institutional and Financial Plan for Mbale Municipal Council	71,124.00
					2. Direct Transfer to IULA-AS US$ 85,000.00	
Decentralised Cooperation	117,000	98,121	87,817.00	39,392.00	1. National Workshop on Decentralised Cooperation in Uganda	48,425.00
					2. National Workshop on Decentralised Cooperation in Namibia	
					3. On-going activity in Mozambique	

Training	144,900	121,519	108,758.00	47,674.00	61,083.71
Regional Seminars	50,400	42,267		1. Collaboration with CLGF, UNCHS, IULA-AS to implement a Regional Workshop Capacity Building in Local Government through Education and Training	
National Seminars	94,400	79,252		2. Support to Chalimbana Local Government Training Institute to develop an Institutional Development Plan	
				3. Support to Zambia Ministry of Local Government to Prepare a National Training Policy and Strategy for the Local Government Sector	
				4. Support to Domboshava Training Centre to Develop an Institutional Devt. Plan	
TOTALS	656,400	550,678	492,676.00	219,171.00 12 Activities were implemented	273,503.00

Appendix 2: FINANCIAL FLOW FOR ACTIVITIES IN 1996

COMPONENT	FUNDS IN WORKING DOCUMENT		APPROVED BUDGET	ACTUAL FUNDS USED	Activities
	Proposed Budget	Core Budget			
Policy Studies and Advocacy	195,308	132,090	132,090	70,417.00	1. Regional Workshop on Local Government and Urban Poverty Reduction in Eastern and Southern Africa
Regional Seminars	91,910	62,160	62,160		2. National study and seminar on Local Government and accessibility to Land for Low-Income Housing in Malawi: The Case of Zomba Municipality;
National Seminars	103,398	69,930	69,930		3. National study and seminar on Factors Affecting Effective Delivery of Services and Infrastructure by Local Governments in Zambia: The Case of Kabwe Municipality; 4. National study and seminar on Local Partnerships for Poverty Alleviation through the Informal Sector: The Case of Jinja Municipality in Uganda
Direct Support to Municipalities	236,339	159,840	159,840	10,962.00	Study and Seminar on Urban Planning as it relates to Land Use, Land Tenure, Regularisation and Upgrading of Unplanned Settlements in Tanzania (Studies are completed, and the Workshop is scheduled for May 1997
Decentralised Cooperation	128,017	86,580	86,580	45,870.00	1. Development of Project Proposals in the Municipalities of Mekkele and Dessie in Ethiopia, and Maputo and Beira in Mozambique under the Italian Decentralised Cooperation Programme

Training					
Regional Seminars	158,544	107,226	107,226	25,896.00	
	55,146	37,296	37,296		1. Research and Seminar on Intergovernmental Fiscal Relationships in Eastern and Southern Africa: Opportunities and Obstacles for Improving Transfers and Revenue Sharing Systems. (Studies completed and the Workshop is Scheduled for April/ May 97
National Seminars	103,398	69,930	69,930		2. Training Seminars for Zimbabwe Executive Mayors, Executive Councillors, Councillors, and Chief Officers of Bulawayo, Gweru, Harare, Chegutu, Chinhoyi, Chitungwiza, Kadoma, Kwekwe, Marondera, Masvingo, Red Cliff, Norton, Kariba, Karoi, Rusape, Shurugwi, Victoria Falls , Gwanda, Bindura, Hwange, Chirundu, Epworth, and Ruwa.
					3. National Training Workshop in Namibia on Management of Local Government Finances (Started in 1996 and completed in 1997)
TOTAL	718,208	485,736	485,736	153,145.00	

Appendix 3: CASH FLOW JANUARY TO DECEMBER 1995

CODE	ACTIVITY	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	TOTAL
	POLICY RESEARCH AND DEBATE					
PS-2-R	Decentralised Policy Research and Ministerial Workshop	2,000	40,530			42,530
PS-1-NT	Tanzania Study and Seminar on urban planning as it relates to land use, land tenure, regularization and upgrading of unplanned settlements					(21,000*)
PS-1-NZW	Zimbabwe - Study and Seminar on Economic Structural Adjustment Programme with emphasis on the institutional and legal framework and by-laws of local government which impact on economic and social activities of urban communities		1,000	19,079		20,079
PS-3-R	A study and consultation on the UMP developed.Urban Poverty Guidelines to be undertaken in either Jinja,Kwekwe,Zomba, Mwanza,	10,000	10,000	1,000		21,000
	TRAINING					
TW-2-NZ	Zimbabwe - Support to train (induct) newly elected executive mayors and councillors	1,946	10,946			12,893
T-2-NNB	Namibia - Support to MRLG&H to strengthen the Training Unit	2,240	12,446	12,446		14,686
T-1-UG	Support to train urban managers and councillors in Uganda	2,000	10,000	10,000		
TW-1-R	A Training of Trainers for women in the informal sector	5,000	35,000	2,267		(42,267*)
T-1-TZ	A TOT in Consultancy skills on municipal finances in Tanzania	500	12,000	1,000		
TW-1-R	A Seminar on Property Tax in Anglophone Africa	21,000				21,000

Code						
T-4-Z	Support for the executive development programme for town clerks in Zambia					(21,000*
	DECENTRALISED COOPERATION					
DC-2-U1	Uganda - National Decentralised Workshop	17,102	1,540			18,642
DC-2-T2	Tanzania - National Decentralised Workshop	1,058	17,584			18,642
DC-2-N3	Namibia - National Decentralised Workshop		18,642			18,642
DC-2-Mo	Mozambique - National Decentralised Workshop		17,605	1,037		18,642
	DIRECT SUPPORT TO MUNICIPALITIES AND THEIR ASSOCIATIONS					
DS-2-NU	Uganda - Support to Mbale Municipality to prepare an Institutional and Finance Plan		1,700	20,238	1,000	22,938
DS-1-NT	Tanzania - Support to Dar es Salaam City Council to prepare an Integrated Development Plan		1,700	9,600	11,638	22,938
DS-1-NE	Ethiopia - Support to Addis Ababa City Council to prepare an Integrated Development Plan		1,700	20,238	1,000	22,938
DS-1-NBo	Botswana - Support to Gaborone City Council to prepare an Integrated Development Plan		1,700	20,238	1,000	22,938
S-1-NZ	Namibia - Support to Kabwe Municipality to prepare an Integrated Development Plan			1,700	21,238	22,938
DS-1-NZW	Zimbabwe - Support to Marondera Municipality to prepare an Integrated Development Plan			1,700	21,238	22,938
	TOTAL	41,185	128,963	120,222	59,114	349,484

Appendix 4: TIME SCHEDULE FOR ANNUAL WORK PLAN ACTIVITIES 1996

ACTIVITY		1996											
CODE	TITLE	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D
PS-2-R	Decentralisation Policy Research and Ministerial Workshop												
PS-1-NT	Tanzania study on land use, tenure and their impact on unplanned urban settlements												
PS-1-NZW	Zimbabwe - Study and Seminar on Economic Structural Adjustment with emphasis on the institutional and legal framework and by-laws of local government which impact on economic activities of the urban communities												
PS-3-N	A study and consultations on Urban Poverty the Municipalities of Jinja, Kwekwe, Bulawayo, Lusaka, Zomba												
T-1-ZW	Zimbabwe - Support to train (induct) newly elected executive mayors and councillors in the Municipalities of Bulawayo, Harare, Kwekwe, Chnhoyi, Chegutu, Chitungwiza, Kadoma, Marondera, Masvingo, and Red Cliff,												
T-2-NNB	Namibia - Support to MRLG&H to develop an Institutional Strengthening Plan for the Training Unit in the Ministry												
T-1-UG	Uganda - Support Training Urban Managers and Councillors												
T-1-R	A TOT Course for Women in the Informal Sector												
T-1-T	A TOT in Consultancy skills on municipal finances in Tanzania												
TS-1-R	A Seminar of Property Tax in Anglophone Africa												
T-4-Z	Support for the executive development programme for Town Clerks in Zambia												

CODE	TITLE	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D
DC-2-NT2	Tanzania - National Workshop on Decentralised Cooperation												
DC-2-NMo4	Mozambique - National Workshop on Decentralised Cooperation												
DS-2-NU	Uganda - Support to prepare Integrated Development Plans for Entebbe, Iganga, and Kabale Municipalities												
DS-1-NT	Tanzania - Integrated Development Plan for the City of Dar es Salaam												
DS-1-NE	Ethiopia - Integrated Development Plan for the City of Addis Ababa												
DS-1-NBo	Botswana - Integrated Development Plan for the City of Gaborone												
DS-1-NZ	Zambia - Integrated Development Plan for Kabwe Municipality												
DS-1-NZW	Zimbabwe - Integrated Development Plan for Marondera Municipality												

Appendix 5: WORK PROGRAMME JULY 1996 TO FEBRUARY 1997

CODE	ACTIVITY DESCRIPTION	STATUS	ESTD COST
PS-4-NM	Activity No. 1 National Policy Workshop on "Local Governments and Accessibility to Land for Low-Income Housing in Malawi". September 23-27.	Completed	$15,000.00
PS-4-NZa	Activity No. 2 National Policy Workshop in Zambia. "Effective Provision of Services and Infrastructure by Local governments". September 23-27.	Completed	$15,000.00
PS-4-NUG	Activity No. 3 National Policy Seminar in Uganda. "Local Partnerships for Poverty Alleviation: Local Governments and the Informal Sector" September 23-27.	Completed	$15,000.00
PS-4-NZim	Activity No 4 - Study and Seminar on Partnership in Housing Provision - A Case Study of Cooperative Housing Initiative in Bulawayo, Kwekwe, and Harare	Completed	$15,000.00
PS-4-R	Activity No. 5 Regional Policy Seminar. "The Role of Local Governments in Urban Poverty Alleviation". November 10-13, 1996, Harare, Zimbabwe.	Completed	$45,000.00
PS-3-R	Activity No. 6 and 7 Regional Research Seminar on "Intergovernmental Fiscal Relationship in Eastern and Southern Africa: Opportunities and Obstacles for Improving Transfers and Revenue Sharing Systems" October 30, 1996. Upon conclusion of the research, a Regional Policy Seminar is planned in Malawi for January 13-19.	Studies Completed Workshop scheduled for May 97	$56,000.00
PS-2-UG	Activity No. 8 Direct Support to the Ministry of Local Governments in Uganda for "Development of a National Policy for Capacity Building of Urban Local Authorities" October 14-19	On-going	$25,000.00
T-2-NNB	Activity No. 9 National Training Workshop in Namibia. "Management of Local Governments Finances." October 21-25.	Completed	$21,000.00
PS-2-ZA	Activity No. 10 National Policy Seminar "Local Government Reform in Zambia: Assessing Opportunities and Needs". October 31-November 2	Studies completed, Workshop Scheduled for March 25-26, 97	$ 6,000.00
T-1-NZW	Activity No. 11 Direct Support to the Municipalities of Chinhoyi, Chitungwiza, and Mashvingo in Zimbabwe. July 29-31	Completed	$ 21,000.00
C-1-R	Activity No. 12, 13, 14 and 15 Direct Support to the Municipalities of Beira and Maputo in Mozambique; and Mekkele and Desai in Ethiopia, for the preparation of project proposals to be presented to Italian Municipalities as part of decentralized cooperation component. October 7-November 30, 1996	Completed	$56,000.00

PS-1-NT	<u>Activity No. 16</u> Tanzania Study and seminar on urban planning as it relates to land use, land tenure, regularisation and upgrading of unplanned settlements	Studies completed Workshop scheduled for May 97	$21,000.00
TW-1-R	<u>Activity No. 17</u> Publication of selected papers presented to the Regional Seminar in Property Taxation		$ 5,000.00
	<u>Activity No. 18</u> Publication of selected papers presented to the Regional Seminar on Urban Poverty	Completed	$ 5,000.00
	<u>Activity No. 19</u> Publication of selected papers presented to the Workshop on Methodologies on Urban Planning	Publication is expected in April	$ 5,000,00
	Total		$326,000.00

Note: 32 Activities will require 142.55 Staff Weeks (5702 staff hours), averaging 4.5 Staff Weeks per activity.

Key code

PS	Policy Research
TW	Training Workshop
T	Training
TW	Training Workshop
DS	Direct Support to Municipalities
DC	Decentralized Cooperation
R	Regional
N	National
I	International
Bo	Botswana
E	Ethiopia
Mo	Mozambique
NB	Namibia
T	Tanzania
U	Uganda
Z	Zambia
ZW	Zimbabwe
Q	Quarter = 3 months

Code structure

Activity Group:: Order:: Location:: Country Code if National.

Appendix 6. WORKLOAD JULY 1996 TO FEBRUARY

	CODE	ACTIVITY DESCRIPTION	DATES	T.M
1.	PS-4-NM	Activity No. 1 National Policy Workshop on "Local Governments and Accessibility to Land for Low-Income Housing in Malawi".	Oct. 7-11, 96	GM
2.	PS-4-NZa	Activity No. 2 National Policy Workshop in Zambia. "Effective Provision of Services and Infrastructure by Local governments".	Oct. 7-11, 96	GM
3.	PS-4-NUG	Activity No. 3 National Policy Seminar in Uganda. "Local Partnerships for Poverty Alleviation: Local Governments and the Informal Sector".	Oct. 14-18, 96	GM
4.	PS-4-NZim	Activity No 4 - Activity No 4 - Study and Seminar on Partnership in Housing Provision - A Case Study of Cooperative Housing Initiative in Bulawayo, Kwekwe, and Harare	Oct. 14-18, 96	GM
5.	PS-4-R	Activity No. 5 Regional Policy Seminar. "The Role of Local Governments in Urban Poverty Alleviation". Harare, Zimbabwe.	Nov 10-13, 96	GM
6-7.	PS-3-R	Activity No. 6 and 7 Regional Research Seminar on "Intergovernmental Fiscal Relationship in Eastern and Southern Africa: Opportunities and Obstacles for Improving Transfers and Revenue Sharing Systems" October 30, 1996. Upon conclusion of the research, a Regional Policy Seminar is planned in Malawi for January 1997.	Oct 28-31, 96 (papers) Jan 20-24, 97 (workshop)	EM
8	PS-2-UG	Activity No. 8 Direct Support to the Ministry of Local Governments in Uganda for "Development of a National Policy for Capacity Building of Urban Local Authorities" October 14-19	Oct 14-19, 96	GM
9.	T-2-NNB	Activity No. 9 National Training Workshop in Namibia. "Management of Local Governments Finances."	Oct 21-25, 96	EM
10.	PS-2-ZA	Activity No. 10 National Policy Seminar "Local Government Reform in Zambia: Assessing Opportunities and Needs".	Oct 31 to Nov 2, .96	MS
11.	T-1-NZW	Activity No. 11 Direct Support to the Municipalities of Chinhoyi, Chitungwiza, and Mashvingo in Zimbabwe.	Jul 26-29, 96	GM
12-15.	DC-1-R	Activity No. 12, 13, 14 and 15 Direct Support to the Municipalities of Beira and Maputo in Mozambique; and Mekkele and Desai in Ethiopia, for the preparation of project proposals to be presented to Italian Municipalities as part of decentralized cooperation component. October 7-November 30, 1996	Oct 7-11, 96(visits by Italian Mun)Oct 14-25, 96(Pjt Pro Prep)Nov 30, 96 (Approval)	JM

No.	Code	Activity	Dates	
16.	PS-1-NT	Activity No. 16 Tanzania Study and seminar on urban planning as it relates to land use, land tenure, regularisation and upgrading of unplanned settlements	Nov 11-15, 96 (Papers in Workshop) Jan 27-31, 97(Workshop)	JM
17.	PS-2-T	Activity No.17 Tanzania study and Workshop urban Development Policy in Tanzania		JM
18.	DS-1-Bo	Activity No 18 Integrated Strategic Development Plan for Kazungula in Botswana		JM
19.	TW-1-R	Activity No. 19 Publication of selected papers presented to the Regional Seminar in Property Taxation	Aug 5-9, 96(Selection) Aug 15 Sept 15, 96 (Edit) Sep 23-Oct 7(SC edit) Oct 14 to Nov 15 (Publ)	GM
20.		Activity No. 20 Publication of selected papers presented to the Regional Seminar on Urban Poverty	Aug 26-30, 96 (Selection) Sept 15-Oct 15, 96 (Edit) Oct 21- Nov 4 (SC edit) Nov 15to Dec 15 (Publ)	GM
21.		Activity No. 21 Publication of selected papers presented to the Workshop on Methodologies on Urban Planning	Sept.2-13, 96(Selection) Oct 15-Nov 15 (Edit) Nov 25 toDec 9, 96 (SC edit) Dec 15, 96 to Jan 15, 97(Publ)	JM
22.		Activity No. 22 Publication of selected papers prepared for Decentralised Cooperation national workshops	Sept.16-26, 96 (Selection) Oct 28-Nov 28 (Edit) Dec 12 to Dec 19, 96 (SC edit) Jan 10-Feb 10, 97 (Publ)	JM

Note: 32 Activities will require 142.55 Staff Weeks (5702 staff hours), averaging 4.5 Staff Weeks per activity.