Strengthening Training Institutions – Expert Group Meeting Report

Nairobi, 28-30 March 2011

Danida Fellowship Centre
Sustaining development
through training

UN@HABITAT
FOR A BETTER URBAN FUTURE

IHS
Making cities work

Contents

Executive Summary: Training institutions are key actor in supporting the capacity development of government authorities – both at national and local level alike. Interestingly though, within the broad development community, comparatively little attention has been paid to developing their capacities and understanding the unique opportunities and challenges related to them. UN Habitat in cooperation with in cooperation with the Danida Fellowship Centre and the Institute of Housing and Urban Development Studies convened a three day expert group meeting at the UN Habitat Headquarters in Nairobi, Kenya. 34 participants representing training institutions and other related organizations from 26 countries participated in the meeting to begin exploring elements such as what constitutes an enabling environment for training institutions, the pros and cons of different business models, collaborative arrangements they utilize, and how some training institutions have begun to shift towards becoming learning institutions. After three days of debate, dialogue, and discussion the meeting participants developed broad regional action plans that will be implemented through a UN Habitat initiative and partnerships. Key elements of the action plans included providing an online platform for south-south exchange of knowledge and experience on the aforementioned topics, developing methodologies to support key functions of training institutions (such as needs assessment, impact evaluation and learning results), assisting in the development of business plans and marketing strategies, providing learning opportunities on emerging and high demand areas as requested by local authorities, and ensuring a high level of visibility and political support within national governments for strengthening training institutions. The meeting was a dynamic and well received start to a longer term process of understanding the unique capacity strength and challenges of training institutions.

1. Background and Purpose of the Meeting

Training institutions are key actor in supporting the capacity development of government authorities – both at national and local level alike. Interestingly though, comparatively little attention has been paid to strengthening them and understanding the unique opportunities and challenges related to them. But herein lays the first problem: the very term 'training institutions' is actually misleading as such institutions are not a homogenous group. Indeed their mandate, scope and status vary widely. They can work at the national or regional levels, address different issues or have different specialties, be private or public institutions, have different business models (private funding, public funding, mixed, fixed budget, fee-for-service arrangements), and vary greatly in size. What is linking them all though is the aim to build the capacity of national and local government actors and civil society. By having the "capacity to build capacity" training institutions thus play a key role in promoting and fostering sustainable capacity development, and strengthening key actors who contribute to the achievement of the MDGs. Additionally, for many bilateral and multilateral agencies, training institutions are essential in taking normative or pilot capacity development initiatives to scale. Yet the training institutions themselves are not well understood – some endure and have significant impact, some collapse, others are bypassed completely. In short, the potential of training institutions is large, the successes exist, but a more detailed understanding and common platform of action to support training institutions is lacking.

Against this background the UN Habitat Training and Capacity Building Branch - under the auspices of the UN DESA Development Account funded project titled "Enhancing the Contribution of Local Authorities and their Partners towards achieving the MDGs through Capacity Building of Local Government Training Institutes" – in cooperation with the Danida Fellowship Centre and the Institute of Housing and Urban Development Studies convened a 3 day expert group meeting at the UN Habitat Headquarters in Nairobi, Kenya. 34 participants from 26 countries participated in the meeting (please see Annex 1); the participants were representatives of training institutions from Africa, Asia, East Europe and Brazil, independent experts, the Mayor of Kisumu Municipality in Kenya, and the Colombian Ambassador to Kenya representing the Escuela Superior de Administracion Publica of Colombia.

The purpose of the expert group meeting was to convene for the first time a diverse group of training institutions to discuss the challenges and opportunities they faced in strengthening the capacity of their government counterparts. The meeting was designed as a starting point for a longer term process of understanding the factors that constrain or promote the sustainable and effective functioning of training institutions and subsequently addressing such constraints through a coordinated, multi-actor plan of support. From the outset it was stressed that a phased approach is required and that one meeting cannot possibly unpack all the issues surrounding training institutions; thus this event was a modest attempt to convene a group of like minded organizations to begin discussions and set an agenda for further investigation and – ultimately – support (please see annex 2 for the Agenda of the meeting). The expert group meeting aimed to examine issues from a global perspective with an understanding that future work will proceed along more specific lines of inquiry (geographical, thematic, etc) as determined by the event participants. This report provides a summary of the event proceedings and conclusions, as well as the action plans that were developed as part of the planning of the next steps of the initiative. For further information on this meeting and the initiative to strengthen training institutions please contact Joe.Hooper@UNHabitat.org The presentations made during the expert group meeting can be found at: http://www.unhabitat.org/categories.asp?catid=533

2. Day 1: SWOT Analysis and the Enabling Environment

The event began with opening remarks from the Director of UN Habitat's Global Division, Mrs. Axumite Gebre-Egziabher. In her remarks the Director stressed that UN Habitat has long viewed training institutions as critical actors for sustainable urban development. UN Habitat's approach has been 'building capacity to build capacity,' strengthening training institutions so that they can further develop the capacities of national and local government authorities to achieve sustainable urban development. The UN DESA Development Account funded project provides a unique opportunity to build on this previous work and begin to explore the complexities surrounding the organizational development of the training institutions themselves. Significant new ground could be broken over the course of the 3 year project provided that smart partnerships were pursued and that an open approach to learning and reflection we taken.

The second opening statement was provided by Mr. Hans Teerlink, of the Institute for Housing and Urban development Studies (IHS Rotterdam, Erasmus University). Mr Teerlink noted that IHS was founded in 1958 and is an international educational and training institute for housing and urban development management, with a special focus on research and mid-career training in the field of Housing. In the early 1990s IHS started to offer one year Urban Development Management master courses. Over those years IHS was engaged in numerous development cooperation programs in various countries in Africa, the Arab region, Asia and former Eastern European countries, where local research and training institutes were either founded or strengthened. Mr. Teerlink expressed his happiness to meet again several of the institutes with whom IHS has cooperated in the past, including some from the LOGOTRI (Local Government Training Institutes) network, of which IHS was a founding member.

The final opening remark was provided by Mr. Lars Pedersen of the Danida Fellowship Centre. Mr Pedersen noted that during the past two to three years DFC has been working on establishing partnerships in developing countries with training institutions of the south. DFC has been doing so with the twofold purpose of supporting capacity development of counterpart staff to Danish supported development projects and programmes at national and regional level, as well as strengthening training institutions in general. He further remarked that it is therefore only natural that DFC accepted the invitation from UN Habitat to join in and commit to this very interesting and highly relevant process and contribute with the experiences already made and act as a driver where needed in the lifespan of this project and beyond.

2.1 Participants' expectations

Before beginning the first session the participants' expectations for the event were documented and collected. The main expectation among the participants was to share experiences and learn from each other about new approaches, tools and what works well and not. Other topics of interest were how to improve the sustainability of training institutions, how to move towards becoming learning organizations and how to mobilize funding for capacity development activities. Another recurrent expectation was to find new partners and extend institutional networks. A more detailed description of the expectations can be found in Annex 3.

2.2 SWOT Analysis

As a start to exploring what makes an enabling environment for training institutions Dr. Ranjit Perera of the Asian Institute for Technology introduced the SWOT analysis as a tool to single out what internal and

external factors affect the training institutes. Strengths and weaknesses constitute the internal factors and opportunities and threats the external. The statement "training institutions are key actors for capacity development" was given to guide the following group discussions. The participants broke into groups to discuss first the strengths and opportunities and later weaknesses and threats. The results were compiled into a SWOT matrix as detailed below

Internal factors	
Strengths	**Weaknesses**
Capacity to create partnerships and networks	Mobility and volatility of staff and lack of practical trainers as well as inability to attract and retain best staff and talent
The institutions' ability to link knowledge and practice	The difficulty in mobilizing resources to finances training courses
Existing flexibility and innovation	Insufficient capacity to operate in a free market
Capacity to develop demand driven courses	Poor management and weak internal structures
The political independence	Limited funding sources
Relevance to enhance the capacity of stakeholders – closer to the needs	Supply driven
Appropriate institutional structures	
Independence through multiple sources of funding	

External factors	
Opportunities	**Threats**
The context of decentralization and the devolution of authority and responsibility	The negative effect of per diems and expectation of them from training participants
The context of the urbanization and complex problems create demand	The heavy dependence on external financing
The fast and continuing changes in political and institutional environment in many countries	Lack of national policy framework for capacity development that contains among others standards incentives, linked with performance management and certification systems
Need of local authorities for practical relevant and easy to learn and use skills knowledge and practices	The lack of societal awareness valuing capacity development
Global concerns such as climate change, economic crisis	Competition
The current reforms that are going on in different countries such as constitutional reform	Corruption and vested interest
	The multiplicity of training centres
	Donors' ever changing priorities

The results of the SWOT were explored through a facilitated discussion by Dr. Perera; it was noted that the SWOT analysis would then be brought back in the action planning session.

2.3 What makes an enabling environment for training institutions?

This session brought two speakers to present their points of view on what makes an enabling environment for training institutions. Dilan Fernando Pulle from the Sri Lanka Institute of Local Governance (SLILG) was the first presenter on the thematic issues of the EGM. SLILG is an institute under the central

government providing capacity development support for elected officials of local authorities. However, the local authorities are under the provincial governments in Sri Lanka and thus harder for SLILG to influence, which is a constraint to capacity development interventions. Another constraint is that local authorities often do not have any budget for training. According to SLILG factors of an enabling environment are:

- A legal framework with clear mandates and responsibilities
- Rich with physical and human resources
- Rich with training materials (guidelines etc.)
- An ability and political will to support the institution in being demand driven
- A clear role to support the decentralization process

The second presenter was Neha Pandya from International Law Institute (ILI) – African Legal Center of Excellence based in Uganda which works with building legal infrastructure for sustainable development, (in contrast to physical infrastructure). An enabling environment for a training institution is defined by ILI as:

- Government having a purposeful vision for development.
- Policy-makers must see value in capacity building and political will and support present
- Very close relationship between the public and private sectors
- Independence from political influence and the political climate
- Training curriculum must directly relate to the needs of the public and private sectors.

Following the presentations buzz group sessions on the topic of what makes an enabling environment for training institutions were organized. The intense discussion flowed over to the morning of the second days. The following points were noted when the participants reported back to plenary.

- The demand side is crucial to create an enabling environment. Without demand from national and local authorities there is no rationale for a training institution. This demand can be created through a top-down process (Kenya for example has a mandatory five days of training for year for all civil servants – this is an obvious example of stimulus) or can organically come from the local authorities themselves. For the latter, it is crucial that training budgets are provided. Underpinning this is of course a legal framework that recognizes the clear role of local authorities and their importance and the political will behind decentralization where it is occurring. Another element related to the supply side is how to leverage the past trainees to ensure continued relevance of course offerings.   For example in Uganda, the Uganda Management Institute (UMI) has a student appraisal system – former trainees are appraised by their supervisors – after they leave the UMI they follow up and see how their students are doing and whether the courses were applicable; feedback then affects course design and offering.
- A clear institutional and legal framework is necessary – clear mandates are required without overlaps and duplication. Some countries have multiple training institutions that actually end up competing and undermining each other. National policies that focus of capacity development and merit and performance based career development are also aspects of an enabling environment. Liberia for instance has a national training policy. In some countries such as Uganda there is only one training institution mandated so matters are clearer. For example UMI is the one chosen by government to provide such capacity development services.

- It was also noted that a strange dichotomy related to the education sector often provided an enabling environment for training institutions. Namely in some countries there are deficiencies in the education sector that the training institutions can address. This is an odd case of a negative factor actually contributing to an enabling environment.
- Other colleagues noted that one factor that can contribute to an enabling environment is the accreditation of training center courses and their recognition as formal education. In some cases the courses offered by training institutions actually could be combined for a formal education credential over time.
- The topic of financing received significant focus. Many institutions noted that regardless of the business model training institutions needed a predictable and steady core funding to maintain a level of activity.
- The topic of institutional arrangements was also a key discussion point – specifically whether if the training institution was attached to a ministry or other government body or independent had any bearing. Some attendees noted that being tied up to one 'client' could possible erode the work as a guaranteed target audience could cause stagnation within the training institutions. Others questioned whether there was such a thing as true independence as most training institutions received some level of government financing regardless. The case of Egypt's Urban Training Institute was noted as being interesting as it is very closely linked to a national body, yet still had considerable influence and free scope to develop its services and clients.
- A key point in the discussion was the role of the private sector training institutions and their role on the creation of an enabling environment. One key question was if the private sector is well developed, should the public training institutions continue to provide such training? Or do the training institutions need to redefine the role? A key point made in response is that the debate should not center on a question of survival for the training institution, rather a question of relevance to their clients.

2.4 Conclusions on the enabling environment

At the end of the session it was clear that significant further investigation in this area is required. There was general agreement that an enabling environment is comprised of multiple components including strong demand side articulation, a supportive policy, legislative and financial framework, and an institutional arrangement that is well fit for purpose. The matter of political will to support capacity development also featured strongly in the dialogue. Lastly, explicit recognition of the constantly changing complexity of cities and the urban space and concerted advocacy around this topic by training institutions could be useful so as to garner support for their mandate and build political will at national and local levels. It was also clear that the issue of an enabling environment can be made more specific at the national or sub-regional levels and thus should feature prominently in the upcoming regional level work, using the themes articulated in the EGM as lines of further inquiry.

3. Day 2: Institutional arrangements and business models

The second day of the workshop focused on collaborative arrangements and the different types of business models that training institutions utilize. These sessions flowed from the earlier examination of the enabling environment and began the interrogation of the internal functioning of the training institutions themselves. As with the first day, the sessions began with two keynote addresses by participants followed by plenary discussion.

3.1 Collaboration

The first presentation on collaboration was done by Himasari Hanan, of Yayasan Inovasi Pemerintahan Daerah (YIPD), based in Indonesia. YIPD an independent nonprofit organization that focuses high quality, professional technical assistance on strengthening the managerial capacity of local governments in Indonesia in the fields of administrative management, strategic management and planning, organizational development, financial management, policy analysis, and training. YIPD noted the essential role of multiple partnerships at multiple levels (national, provincial and local levels) to address the capacity needs of local authorities. At the national level and with academia YIPD has collaborated in the areas of analysis, assessment, evaluation and project formulation. At the national government level, the collaboration has focused on sharing experiences at the local level nationwide and influencing policy. At the provincial and local levels, collaboration has focused mostly on provision of experience and expertise to the authorities. YIPD also engages with the private sector in the areas of corporate social responsibility, as well as the provision of technical assistance. Lastly, with donor agencies there has been collaboration for funding, but also exchange of YIPD experiences to inform their work and programmes. Key lessons learned from YIPD's experience include the need for a diversity of partnerships to meet the demand for capacity, the acknowledgement of the key role YIPD plays by the local and national authorities in coordinating such partnerships, and the need to engage in collaboration based on a tangible and jointly-recognized problem with a strong demand.

The second presentation was provided by Dritan Shutina of the Co-Plan and Polis University based in Albania. Co-Plan is a non-profit organization that contributes to sustainable development by enabling good urban and regional governance, tackling key environmental issues, developing civil society, and promoting community participation. The presentation provided an overview of the rapidly changing urban context in Albania that has moved from a centralized state through a rapid series of reforms which has dramatically impacted the urban space in the country. The presentation noted that collaboration was a multi-faceted and multi-dimensional aspect of Co-Plan's work and included a key 'client focus,' coupled with partnerships with 'free-lance' expertise external to Co-Plan. Multiple collaborative partners were described including local government, civil society, communities, central government, private sector, and the international community. Co-Plan also adopts a multi-systems approach to its collaborative arrangements including forming bridging partnerships, providing training and capacity building, undertaking institutional development, lobbying, enabling governance, and legal revision. This multi-actor and multisystem framework for collaboration provides co-plan with a high degree of flexibility and adaptability to meet the challenges of the rapidly changing urban context in Albania.

Following the two presentations a facilitated group discussion took place. The key points emerging from the discussions included the following:

- Participants noted that collaboration should be driven by demand, not just for the sake of it. But it was also noted that training institutions must be aware of where the drive for collaboration comes from – does it come from the training institution itself (and thus the benefit is likely to the respective training institution) or does it come from the end beneficiary of the capacity development support? Do they see the need for collaboration? Either way participants felt strongly that training institutions must be partners in collaboration and not seen as a 'leader' of it.

- It was noted that training institutions should likely not seek collaboration on an individual basis – such collaboration is often very short-lived due to staff turnover and the like. It would be preferential to seek collaboration between institutions.
- Dialogue also centered on the time-frame for collaboration. Often it is short-lived and project based, but what about long term collaboration between a training institution and another partner? For such a longer term vision and purpose may be required.
- It was noted that collaborative models will lead to training institutions becoming a learning organizations – knowledge management thus becomes key even though this is an overlooked aspect in most organizations.
- It was also noted that academia can play a key role and should not be relegated to research roles only. Many students do field work with local authorities and can be a key resource.
- Collaboration can be at multiple levels as well. Regional, local, inter-regional etc. But thus far south-south collaboration is not examined often as a modality for support by training institutions. This requires regional and sub-regional networks, or even global networks to support such exchange, but could be a very interesting area to examine more.
- Networks need strong members, clear common goal, and an organization that keeps it together – some driver or stimulus at the heart of the effort and training institutions can play that role provided they move beyond their traditional models.

3.2 Private-public funding business models

Two presentations were focused on the mixed funding models that blend private funding with public sector support.

The first presentation was given by Lineo Kolosoa of the Institute of Development Management (IDM). IDM was established in 1974 as a regional organisation in Botswana, Lesotho and Swaziland to help meet the management needs of the Region through management development activities including training, consultancy, and research. IDM receives core funding from the governments of Lesotho, Botswana and Swaziland to support the operation of a headquarters office and staff, but needs to mobilize additional resources from an array of sources to support the operation of its country campuses, its trainer pool, and additional costs such as the development of new courses. Some of this funding is derived from specific training done for public sector institutions, while other revenue is generated in a wide array of topics in the areas of business and financial management as well as NGO governance, project management, resource mobilisation, leadership and mentoring on an individual fee arrangement for each course. The advantage to this business model is that the diversified funding sources do not make IDM dependent on one provider, which in turn gives the organization a greater degree of independence than other training institutions, as well as letting it be quite entrepreneurial in the development of the curricula. Some of the drawbacks of the model include the difficulty in ensuring synergy with government plans, a lack of leverage that may be gained by being a public funded institution, a degree of financial uncertainty which can hamper long term planning, and the possibilities of duplicating services being provided by other training institutions.

The second presentation was provided by Rafael Moreira Cesar Da Costa, CIFAL Curitiba based in Brazil. CIFAL Curitiba is part of the CIFAL Network, comprised by another eight centres around the world. The CIFAL Network is an initiative from UNITAR's Local Development Programme, which coordinates the work of the decentralized regional units in capacity-building, training, and dissemination

of knowledge in urban management. CIFAL Curitiba receives core funding in terms of office space, conference facilities, communication, events management, ICT, legal, training facilitation and other areas from the Federation of Industries of the State of Parana (FIEP) which is a political-institutional entity representing the industry in Parana State (97 business syndicates) and has over 2000 employees and numerous local development initiatives. Some of the strengths of the business model include the flexibility that CIFAL has in course design as a body given relative independence from its primary funder, the high recognition the relationship with UNITAR and FIEP beings, a consistent and solid base of core funding, and ability to leverage its main partners to serve as a partnership facility. On the downside it was noted that the complexity of the business model led to excessive multi-tasking due to the multiplicity of partnerships. There was also a level of dependency on one funding source that could pose a risk and has resulted in minimal capacity within the organization to mobilize resources from other sources.

Following the presentations there were numerous questions and comments from the plenary in which the attendees noted the following:

- There were clear advantages expressed by the two presentations for the mixed business model of private public funding, but it also entailed a degree of risk management that fully public sector funded models may not have to deal with.
- It was noted that the connection with the demand side seemed to be weakened with this business model (as both IDM and CIFAL mentioned difficulties in getting known by the local or national authorities or ensuring synergy with national plans). The attendees thought it useful to pick up this point in the subsequent regional level work and assess ways in mitigating this feature.
- It was also noted that in some countries the ability of people to pay for courses was very minimal which may impact the sustainability of a mixed funding model. But at the same time this is perhaps where a larger government subsidy can come in.
- Participants in the meeting also noted that the private sector contribution was not always financial and that as CIFAL showed there were plenty of other ways through premises or other services that could be very supportive of a training institution.

3.3 Public funded business model

The final presentation for day 2 was provided by Samson Kassahun of the Ethiopia Civil Service College (ECSC). The ECSC was established in 1995 to support the transformation of the Ethiopian Civil Service. It has several specialized institutes focusing on areas such as urban development studies, public management and development Studies, tax and custom administration and many others. The ECSC provides short term training, undergraduate (BA and B.Sc) and postgraduate (MA, M.Sc and PHD) degrees, and conducts research and consultancy services. It is the sole capacity development provider for the Ethiopian civil service and receives all of its funding from the national budget. The advantages of the model include having direct access to the internal working procedure of the government and as such first hand and close knowledge of government priorities and needs. Another benefit is the relative predictability of funding and clear understanding of the costs as determined through the budgeting process. As such it is easier to analyse cost/benefit of the capacity development services provided. In terms of weaknesses, the sole funding source does present a concern in times of budgetary constraints. Also the cost of the ECSC's courses are generally higher than those offered by private sector or other

bodies as it maintains a full staff whereas others can be more nimble and only have on-call or temporary lecturers that do not cost as much as a full time civil servant.

The presentation generated substantial conversation amongst the EGM participants. The points raised included the following:

- The higher cost of the ECSC courses in general made to some attendees the mixed funding model seem more appealing. For others though it was difficult to compare the cases given the widely different contexts and scope and lack of information concerning quality of services provided
- Many participants noted that the close association to government as a result of its total budget being funded by national budget was a clear benefit that would allow the ECSC to have a much better understanding of the needs in comparison to the mixed business models.
- More information was requested on how the ECSC actually did its budgeting and how they worked to ensure funding for new courses or programmes. Several participants questioned whether the public funded model could stymie growth and innovation.

3.4 Conclusions on the institutional arrangements and business models

The presentations on the varying collaborative and business models raised numerous issues that the participants to the EGM felt warranted greater discussion in the follow on regional level meetings. The dialogue primarily centred on the principle for collaboration rather than the different forms as there was general agreement that training institutions must engage in a variety of partnerships to ensure that the capacity development needs of their primary beneficiaries are met. One of the main principles discussed was that collaboration must be driven by the demand on the ground and not the needs of the training institution. Another key principle was that collaboration needs to be set in a longer term vision of capacity development rather than a one-off event or activity. Concerning the business models discussion, one key point that emerged from the debates was that the mandate, mission and specific purposes of the training institutions must drive the business model; in essence the only way of knowing which model is better is to ask whether the model is fit for the purpose of the institution and allows it to meet the demands of its primary target audience. If the model constrains or does not support such than perhaps diversification is required. Some attendees thought that asking whether the business model is fit for purpose should be part of the regular review training institutions perform of their relevance and impact.

4. Day 3: From training to learning

The final day of the expert group meeting focused on the future of training institutions, what a move towards 'learning institutions' would entail and the work plan for the future activities of the project. The day began though with an intervention by the UN Habitat Executive Director, Dr. Joan Clos.

4.1 Statement from the Executive Director of UN Habitat

The Executive Director of UN Habitat began by welcoming and thanking all participants for their attendance and noted the high relevance of the meeting. He stressed that sustainable urban development was not just about economic resources, but also social and institutional capacity. The Executive Director continued that the strategies we are proposing to address an issue in a slum or tackle other problems in an urban space are generally well known, but then asked if the theory is known why do we not see more dramatic change? The Executive Director proposed that it was at this point that capacity and institution building are such fundamental issues. He continued by noting that Manhattan set a plan 200 years ago for

its streets which is still having impact today and noted that this was because they managed to create the basic institutions to this planning and develop their capacity over time. Without institutions there can be no planned city, and that to move from unplanned extensions of cities to managed and well planned requires strengthening of not only the public sector institutions, but also the political and social institutions as well. He stressed that training institutions play a key role in creating a framework for the establishment of norms, regulations and institutions to address the planning of the future. Another key role of the training institutions was their advocacy functions for the creation of such frameworks. In closing the Executive Director asked that the training institutions move beyond focusing on individual training to advocating for and supporting process that build social and institutional capital.

4.2 From training to learning: theory and practice

Following the intervention of the UN Habitat Executive Director, the EGM moved to a session discussing the shift from training institutions to learning institutions. This session was felt to be key by many participants as this topic features prominently in the current development discourse, including in a recent OECD study entitled "Seeking Better Practices for Capacity Development: Training and Beyond." Two presentations featured in this session of the EGM.

The first presentation was made by Jean Jacques Helluin from Institut des Métiers de la Ville (IMV), based in Antananarivo, Madagascar that focused on how IMV has moved to become a learning institution. IMV was formed in 1989 is the result of cooperation between the Urban Municipality of Antananarivo and the Ile-de-France Region in Paris, which brings value by use of competencies and experiences from the French partner. IMV engages in a wide array of activities that go far beyond training provision to include activity based learning, peer based and informal learning activities, arranging debates and discussions with all stakeholders, and mentoring through placement of IMV staff within the municipality as technical advisors. Another interesting feature of IMV's work is the role that the French experience brings in terms of study visits and coaching; the north-south engagement around tangible learning objectives has proven valuable. Lastly IMV has a longer term perspective for its learning activities to see results – up to five years in the case of some initiatives.

The second presentation on was made by Yossi Offer from Weitz Center for Development Studies based in Israel and focused on the experience of the local government support network called MIFAM. The presentation specifically discussed the transformation of MIFAM from a technical training approach into taking a new, more strategic, role. The new approach of MIFAM also moves well beyond training to one that combines organizational development aspects, with personal support/coaching, provision of quality assurance tools, mentoring and learning activities for policy makers and executives, provision of appropriate technology solutions and partnership development. Indeed MIFAM has moved to become a broker and facilitator of capacity development support for local authorities that helps them both articulate their needs and match with the supply of expertise and knowledge and partnerships available nationally, regionally, and globally.

The presentations were followed by a discussion where the below questions and points were raised:

- When moving from training to learning; how can training institutions handle issues of interactivity, diversity and capacity for research? Cooperating with research institutes is an option if you do not have internal resources for research. Research should be connected to the needs of the authorities and preferably involved them and citizens.

- Getting to know well your partners and beneficiaries is crucial to enable the type of interaction and nuanced information necessary to support learning.   It is useful to bring together all the actors, to create a multi-sector platform. Outsourcing training important for diversity.
- What mechanisms are being used to ensure working to meet real demands? What indicators are being used to measure impact of learning? Evaluation of learning outcomes is essential if training institutions are to move towards this focus, yet it is also one of the weakest areas.
- The shift from training to learning institutions should be an incremental process and must be accompanied by advocacy efforts targeting local and national authorities as well as civil society and private sector.

4.3 Building a common understanding on measuring Learning Results

The final content presentation of the EGM was given by Dr. Adeboye Adeyemo from the African Capacity Building Foundation (ACBF) and focused on a theoretical framework of measuring learning results. Learning was described as the result of training and learning results as the change that occurs when one makes use of what has been learned. Dr. Adeyemo noted over the years training has emphasized outputs (how many), whereas learning results emphasizes the transformation that occurs as a result of application of knowledge and skills acquired through training. The shift to learning results is important as it puts an emphasis on development problem analysis, identification of key capacity constraints, and the expected change that should result from training. Dr. Adeyemo noted that Measuring learning results should be considered a core function of any development intervention because they help to learn from experience to improve service delivery, gather information on the effect of your program, focuses intervention on results rather than activities, reduces budget-driven mind sets, place an emphasis on Results-for-money (planning and resource allocation), promotes M&E and can help in resource mobilization as well. Dr Adeyomo learning institutions have to move from an input-output approach to consider outcome and impact. By demonstrating results, not just in number of participants but in what has been achieved on different levels, the institutes demonstrate relevance. Crucial in the process of reaching and measuring learning results are an ability to identify capacity constraints and an ability to identify change agents (participants) correctly.

The session was concluded by a discussion on the following issues:

- A strong application process is helpful for appropriate training design. Create an application that requires participants to express needs and expectations, from both an individual and organizational point of view.
- When to measure learning result was key – at an immediate, intermediate or longer term stage?
- How to convince governments to go from traditional training and evaluation to learning? What are some of the key advocacy messages that can be used?
- Who should conduct the evaluation (the provider or local authorities)? Perhaps evaluation of learning results should incorporate multiple different perspectives?
- It is often hard to identify causes of performance impact but close relations with clients help.

4.4 Conclusions on moving from training to learning

The sessions on moving training institutions to learning institutions was well regarded by participants and spurred extensive discussion. Participants noted that training institutions would need new several competencies and different forms and volumes of funding to engage fully in learning activities. The

discussion again came back to the need to collaborate and working with partners to get access to expertise and resources that are not to be found within the institute. Attendees also noted the difficulties in measuring impact, first of all to make it an institutional practice recognized by clients, and secondly, when results are to be measured, to identify what is the cause of the result. In addition a long-term perspective is required to allow for results to develop. Close relationships with clients is valuable in the process of identifying needs and measuring the learning results. There was agreement that such a shift must be incremental and peer-to-peer learning between institutions that have made this shift and those considering it would be valuable. Further, a training course on learning results was mentioned as a possible starting point for work in this area.

5. Action plan development

The final session of the EGM focused on development of initial action plans for regional level work. Joe Hooper of UN Habitat provided an overview of the UN Habitat project that is supported by the UN Development Account funding through UN DESA. The project is titled "Enhancing the Contribution of Local Authorities and their Partners towards achieving the MDGs through Capacity Building of Local Government Training Institutes" and will run for three years starting in December 2010. It has a total budget of USD$ 687,200 and has the primary objective to "Enhance the contribution and role of local authorities and their partners in achieving the MDGs, through sustainable human settlements development with a focus on local governance and urban development by strengthening the organizational capacities of local government training institutes as well as the substantive and training skills of the training staff." The project has two expected accomplishments:

- Expected Accomplishment 1: National local government training institutions and international local government training networks and support structures strengthened to effectively respond to the training needs of local authorities as to contribute to human settlements development with a focus on local governance and urban development.
- Expected Accomplishment 2: Increased training and organizational development skills of local government trainers and managers in the areas of local economic development, gender, financial management, transparency urban environment and climate change.

It was stressed that the project is designed to be catalytic in nature and that obviously the budget could not meet demands of all training centres, or even a smaller group of those present. It was stressed that the partnerships would be essential to leverage both financial and human resources to meet the needs on the ground. Though not specifically referenced in the project document it is the intention of UN Habitat to seek partnerships that can truly leverage smaller amounts of funding into greater impact. It was then explained that the action plans that were going to be developed by the institutions present should consider both the overall objective of the project, its expected accomplishments and the information on catalytic partnerships.

5.1 South-south cooperation

The action plan development – and the meeting as a whole - benefited from the attendance of Her Excellency Ambassador Maria Victoria Diaz de Suarez, Colombian Ambassador to Kenya (representing the Colombian Escuela Superior de Administracion Publica) and Mrs. Juana Carrere of the Colombian Embassy. The Bogota High Level Event on South-South Cooperation (SSC) and Capacity Development held in March 2010 and its final declaration provided a valuable direction for the participants to consider

– namely how south-south partnerships could support the strengthening of training institutions. Three points in the declaration specifically were applicable:

i). Enabling environments and adequate policy and institutional frameworks and conditions in partner countries are key to successful strengthening of SSC.

ii). Partnerships need to be based on trust, confidence, and respect.

iii). Successful SSC experiences have the flexibility to adapt to particular contexts.

iv). Southern-based practitioners and technical experts need to share their experience not only at the country level, but also at the regional and global levels, to facilitate mutual learning and capacity development.

These points are well reflected in the action plans below, and the Bogota Declaration will continue to provide guidance through the implementation phase of the project.

The Colombian experience is also interesting from the perspective of the different training and capacity development institutions present. The first of these is ESAP which provides undergraduate and graduate level degrees, one year specialized courses, and technical consultancies for the public administration. But beyond the more traditional training institutions Colombia also has other more grass-roots focused institutions that serve as a reminder that there are other types of training institutions that can support the training needs of local authorities than what was generally discussed during the meeting.

The first of these institutions is SENA which provides and implements comprehensive professional training for the inclusion of workers in a variety of technical areas as providing business development services, technology advising to the productive sector and support for innovation projects, technological development and competitiveness. SENA links closely with local authorities to support the capacity development of workers and the private sector, which are key partners in fulfilling the mandate of local authorities. The second interesting example of a training institution is called MALOKA. MALOKA also targets the grass roots and provides learning opportunities in the area of science and technology through interactive means, thereby strengthening awareness of technology and innovation and its application. With three different models of training institutions in Colombia there is ample room for further exploration of these models and learning about them through a south-south cooperation modality.

5.2 Action Plans by Regional Grouping

Group 1: Asia and Pacific
- Map out institutions in the region so as to ascertain the full understanding of the number and types of institutions present on the ground in the different countries. This will serve as a baseline for the future regional level work. The mapping should include the mandate, focus, activities, business model, challenges and opportunities for the institutions as well as other pertinent details as necessary.
- Document experiences of successful transformation to learning institutions and provide via a knowledge exchange platform such as the UN Habitat Urban Gateway
- Focus on climate change as an entry point to build the skills of the training institutions and for the undertaking of the organizational development aspects of the project. There is significant work in the area of climate change already being undertaken and it is a high priority area for many local and national authorities.

Group 2: Europe ,North Africa and South America
- Assist regional collaboration/exchange/networking of local government capacity building institutions. This will include identification of the existing networks and centers of innovation that have – in the words of the Executive Director of UN Habitat Dr. Joan Clos moved "beyond building human capacity toward social and institutional capacity."
- A potential to use funding in the form of a small grant facility to support innovative ideas, tools, adaptation, application, and growing of the network. Criteria should be put in place including co-funding, multiplier impact, cost-benefit, direct correlation to the project expected accomplishments and other elements, as well as a firm ceiling for maximum funding.

Group 3: Anglophone Africa (divided into 2 groups due to number of institutions)
- Establish database of training institutions and experts that will include elements of such as the profile of institutions, types of programmes offered, development partners, scope of coverage (national, regional or international), level of infrastructure and organizational development, Accreditation status
- Business plan development support
- Develop a Training needs assessment or learning results methodology and train institutions on how to apply it. This will include developing a core team of trainers who can are capable of replicating this and training representatives of other training institutions.
- Form a community of practice that includes local government training institutions and local authorities for knowledge and experience sharing

Group 4: Anglophone Africa
- Identify training institutions engaged in capacity building. Who is doing what? Undertake a rigorous inventory at the regional and sub-regional levels to have a better understanding of the number and diversity of training institutions that exist.
- Expression of Learning Outcomes, understand expectations.
- Learning Results methodology is key
- Map competencies of training institutions and who can do what in the region.
- Support to develop marketing plans and business plans.
- Create political recognition of capacity building and the role of training institutions. UN-Habitat has an important role in bringing these activities to a global scale in cooperation with UN DESA, OECD and other actors. At the national level the training institutions may require training in market analysis and advocacy so as to better support their positioning and support of their mandate.

Group 5: Francophone Africa
- Create a database of training institutions that will include thematic areas of focus, strengths/opportunities as well as weaknesses and threats, target audiences, regional networks, and other elements.
- Learning results training programme is important
- Undertake thematic regional seminars that will identify shared needs of local authorities to achieve the MDGs, and thus discern what training needs and other interventions are required of the training institutions.

- Support the development of a training impact evaluation tool, as well as other evaluative methods to be able
- Internet exchange platform or community of practice development – potentially utilizing the UN Habitat Urban Gateway
- Concerted joint advocacy and resource mobilization efforts by all training institutions in a specific sub-region as well as organization of further mutual technical support for training institutions specifically in areas of organizational development skills.
- Establish South-South cooperation between local authorities on specific subjects (e.g. staff exchange around projects) with the training institutions acting as a facilitator of this support.

Annex 1: Participant List and Contact Information

	Name	Organization	Country	Email
1	Sophie Rivière	International d'Ingenierie de l'Eau et Environment (2iE)	Burkina Faso	sophie.riviere@2ie-edu.org
2	Jean-Pierre Mbwebwa	Université Catholique du Congo	DRC	mbwebwa@yahoo.fr
3	Samson Kassahun	Ethiopia Civil Service Training College	Ethiopia	s_kassahun@yahoo.com samson.kassahun@ecsc.edu.et
4	Joyce Nyambura	Association of Local Government Authorities in Kenya	Kenya	jjnyambura@yahoo.com
5	Nicholas Njoka	Institute for Governance and Sustainable Development Studies	Kenya	nicknjoka@gmail.com
6	Samuel Githaiga	Independent Expert	Kenya	githaigasm@gmail.com
7	Lineo Kolosoa	Institute of Development Management	Lesotho/Botswana/ Swaziland	kolosoal@idm.co.ls
8	Harold Monger	Liberia Institute of Public Administration	Liberia	harold.monger@lipa.gov.lr
9	Jean-Jacques Helluin	Urban Development Institute of Antananarivo	Madagascar	jj.helluin@yahoo.fr
10	Mustapha Zubairu	Federal University of Technology, Minna.	Nigeria	mzubairu2002@hotmail.com
11	Bachir Kanoute	ENDA Tiers Monde-ECOPOP	Senegal	bkanoute@enda.sn
12	Joe Mavuso	Institute for Democracy in Africa	South Africa	jmavuso@idasa.org.za
13	Leon Malisa	Eastern and Southern African Management Institute	Tanzania	lwmalissa@yahoo.co.uk
14	James Nkata	Uganda Management Institute	Uganda	jlnkata@yahoo.com
15	Neha Pandya	International Law Institute, African Center for Legal Excellence	Uganda	npandya@ili.or.ug
16	Adeboye Adeyemo,	Africa Capacity Building Foundation	Zimbabwe	a.adeyemo@acbf-pact.org
17	George Matovu	Municipal Development Programme for Eastern and Southern Africa	Zimbabwe	gmatovu@mdpafrica.org.zw
18	Doaa El Sherif	Urban Training Institute	Egypt	doaa_elsherif@hotmail.com
19	Yossi Offer	Weitz Center for Development Studies	Israel	bikta@013.net DSC1@netvision.net.il
20	Himasari Hanan	Yayasan Inovasi Pemerintahan Daerah (YIPD)	Indonesia	hanan@ar.itb.ac.id

21	Yeonghoon Kim	International Urban Training Center	Korea	bluesky1130@korea.kr bluesky11301@hotmail.com
22	Marivel Sacendoncillo	Local Government Academy Philippines	Philippines	execdir@lga.gov.ph
23	Ranjith Perera	Asian Institute of Technology	Thailand	ranjithp@ait.ac.th
24	Dilan Fernando Pulle	Sri Lanka Institute of Local Governance	Sri Lanka	engdilanlaksiri@yahoo.com
25	Dritan Shutina	Co-Plan/Polis	Albania	dritan_shutina@co-plan.org
26	Ana Vasilache	Partners Foundation for Local Development	Romania	ana@fpdl.ro
27	Rafael Cesar da Costa	Centro Internacional para Formación de Autoridades Locales (CIFAL)	Brazil	rafael.costa@cifalcuritiba.org.br
28	Ms. Juana Carrere	For the Colombian Embassy at Nairobi - representing Escuela Superior de Administración Pública - ESAP	Colombia	juanacarrere@hotmail.com
29	Lars Pedersen	Danida Fellowship Center	Denmark	lp@dfcentre.dk
30	Hans Teerlink	Institute for Housing and Urban Development Studies (IHS)	The Netherlands	h.teerlink@ihs.nl
31	Sam Okello	Mayor of Kisumu City	Kenya	mayorkisumu@yahoo.com
32	John Sande	Municipal Council of Kisumu	Kenya	Jo_Sande@yahoo.com
33	Tomasz Sudra	Expert	Kenya	tsudra@gmail.com
34	Joe Hooper	UN-Habitat – Training and Capacity Building Branch	UN Habitat	joe.hooper@unhabitat.org
35	Hanna Hasselqvist	UN-Habitat – Training and Capacity Building Branch	UN Habitat	hanna.hasselqvist@gmail.com
36	Gulelat Kebede	UN-Habitat – Training and Capacity Building Branch		gulelat.kebede@unhabitat.org
37	H.E. Ambassador Maria Victoria Diaz de Suarez	Embassy of Colombia representing ESAP (Escuela superior de administracion publica)	Colombia	enairobi@cancilleria.gov.co

Annex 2: Expert Group Meeting Agenda

Day 1, March 28: **Introductions, setting the stage, and looking at the enabling environment**		Day Facilitator: Joe Hooper, UN Habitat	
Time	**Event**	**Description**	**Person(s) responsible**
0845-0930	**Arrival at UN Complex – meeting will be in CONFERENCE ROOM 9. Registration and welcome tea and coffee**	An opportunity to meet informally, register your details and place any information of documents out that you wish to share	Pamela Odhiambo, UN Habitat
0930-1000	**Opening remarks:** UN Habitat Danida Fellowship Centre IHS	Opening remarks by the day facilitator, followed by introductions from each of the hosting organizations, the reasons why they have convened the meeting and their organization's interest.	Axumite Gebre-Egziabher UN Habitat Lars Pedersen, DFC Hans Teerlink, IHS
1000-1030	**3 sentence round-the table introductions and documenting of expectations**	Each participant gets three sentences to introduce themselves and their organization. Expectations to be written on cards and pinned up on the wall sheets.	All participants, Joe Hooper
1030-1045	Coffee Break	-----	-----
1045-1200	**Group session. Training Centers as critical actors for capacity development part 1: Making the case for focusing on training institutions.**	Small groups form and discuss the reasons why training institutions are a critical actor for capacity development and the strengths and opportunities they have. Groups will present to plenary after which there will be time for questions and answers. Groups will be divided according to language primarily, though mixes of different regions will be done wherever possible.	All participants. Facilitated by Ranjith Perera, Asian Institute of Technology. JH, LP and HT to circulate.
1200-1330	Lunch	-----	-----
1330-1445	**Group Session. Training Centers as critical actors for capacity development part 2: Arguing the other point- why not focus on training institutions?**	Groups discuss the weaknesses and challenges they face, and what hinders them from fulfilling their goals. Present back to plenary and open for discussions.	All participants. Facilitated by Ranjith Perera, Asian Institute of Technology. JH, LP and HT to circulate.
1445-1500	Coffee Break	-----	-----
1500-1600	**Training Centers as critical actors for capacity development part 3: Pulling the pieces together – an analysis of the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats.**	Session summarizing the points according to a simple SWOT matrix, but also dividing it along the lines of the enabling environment, organizational and individual levels.	All participants. Facilitated by Ranjith Perera, Asian Institute of Technology. JH, LP and HT to circulate.

Time	Event	Description	Person(s) responsible
1600-1730	**Presentations: What makes an enabling environment for training institutions?**	Thinking about what policy and legislation lends to an effective training institution? Also looking at the different institutional positioning of the training institutions such as whether they are attached to Ministries or independent organizations. Q & A	Dilan Fernando Pulle, Sri Lanka Institute of Local Governance Neha Pandya International Law Institute African Centre for Legal Excellence
1730-1755	**Looking ahead to the next day and closing remarks**	Post it session whereby attendees group in 2s and write one or two questions they have related to the next day's session. Housekeeping matters, logistics, information on the cocktail and dinner and starting time for the next day. Transfer to bus or cars.	Joe Hooper with Pamela Odhiambo, UN Habitat
1800-2100	**Cocktail and Dinner**	Lord Erroll Restaurant. Cocktail at 1800hrs will be followed by a dinner (cost is covered by UN Habitat except for beverages).	Pamela Odhiambo, UN Habitat
Day 2, March 29: **Institutional arrangements and business models**			Day Facilitator: Hans Teerlink, IHS
Time	**Event**	**Description**	**Person(s) responsible**
0830-0900	**Arrival at UN Complex– meeting will be in CONFERENCE ROOM 9**	Participants to make their own travel arrangements to the UN complex	-----
0900-0915	**Review of yesterday's progress and introduction of the day's themes**	Quick look back at what was covered and then what questions will be addressed in day 2	Hans Teerlink, IHS
0915-1045	**Independent or attached? A very friendly debate between two training institutions with different institutional arrangements**	A discussion in the form of a debate between two training institutions that have different institutional arrangements – one that is independent and services all of government, the other that is attached to one specific ministry (such as the ministry of local government or other cross-cutting ministry). Each will try to persuade the audience that their model is best, and through this will emerge the pros and cons of each. Q&A to follow.	Hans Teerlink, IHS to facilitate. George Matovu, MDPESA and Harold Monger, LIPA
1045-1100	Coffee break	-----	-----
1100-1230	**Presentation: Collaboration - a key aspect of training centers' institutional arrangements** Presenter 1: Himasari Hanan, YIPD Presenter 2: Dritan Shutina, Co-Plan	An overview of how a training institution collaborates with different parties (universities, local authorities, central authorities) to ensure its success and relevance. The focus will be on the multiple aspects of collaboration.	Hans Teerlink, IHS to facilitate Himasari Hanan, YIPD Dritan Shutina, Co-Plan, co-founder Polis

21

Time	Event	Description	Person(s) responsible
			University
1230-1330	Lunch	-----	-----
1330-1500	**Presentation: Private-Public Funding Business Models** Presenter 1: Lineo Kolosa, IDM Presenter 2: Rafael Moreira Cesar Da Costa, CIFAL Curitiba	An examination of the public/private hybrid model that is utilized by IDM and CIFAL in its operations. Pros and cons of such and how it developed into this model. Questions and answers from the group.	Hans Teerlink, IHS to facilitate Lineo Kolosa, IDM Rafael Moreira Cesar Da Costa, CIFAL Curitiba
1500-1530	Coffee Break	-----	-----
1530-1630	**Presentation: Public funded models** Presenter: Samson Kassahun, Ethiopia Civil Service College	An examination of the public funding model that is utilized by the institution. How it operates, how the budget is determined, pros and cons of this business model. Questions and answers.	Samson Kassahun, Ethiopia Civil Service College
1630-1645	**Closing remarks for the day**	Housekeeping matters, logistics, information on the starting time for the next day.	Hans Teerlink, IHS

Day 3, March 30. **From training to learning, and developing a plan of action**			Day Facilitator: Lars Pedersen, DFC
Time	**Event**	**Description**	**Person(s) responsible**
0830-0900	**Arrival at UN Complex**	Participants to make their own travel arrangements to the UN complex	-----
0900-0930	**Statement by the UN Habitat Executive Director, Dr. Joan Clos to the participants on the catalytic role of training institutions in supporting sustainable urban development.**	Introduction by Global Division Director, Axumite Gebre-Egziabher, followed by Dr. Clos' remarks. Questions and comments from the participants.	Joe Hooper, UN Habitat
0930-0945	**Review of yesterday's progress and introduction of the day's themes**	Reflections on the ED's comments vis-à-vis the ground that has been covered and what is ahead for the day and the future collaborative work.	Lars Pedersen, DFC

0945-1130	**From Training to learning: the theory and the practice** Presenters: Jean Jacques Helluin, Institut des Metiers de la Ville Yossi Offer, Weitz Center for Development Studies ** Coffee break included in this session. Participants take coffee at their seats **	Firstly a theoretical examination on why there is a focus on shifting from training to learning? What are the incentives for doing so? What challenges could this bring? Following this experience of training institutions that have moved to become 'learning institutions'. How it decided to make this shift, what it entailed in terms of organizational changes and personnel, the results of it. Questions and answers from the attendees.	Lars Pedersen, DFC to facilitate Jean Jacques Helluin, Urban Development Institute of Antananarivo Yossi Offer, Weitz Center for Development Studies
1130-1230	**Building a Common Understanding on Learning Results** Presenter: Dr. Adeboye Adeyemo, ACBF	Results of Learning events are important as it would assist practitioners to be guided on what training program to implement, in what organizational context, what should a training program be designed for, who should be trained and what outcome to expect beyond the number of people trained. At what level should training outcomes be measured and what are the 'best' indicators to measure training outcomes. This is a key topic if we are to truly consider moving from training to learning. Questions and answers	Lars Pedersen, DFC to facilitate Dr. Adeboye Adeyemo, ACBF
1230-1330	Lunch	-----	-----
1330-1430	**Exploring the modalities of support: a group discussion**	An overview of different modalities of support that have and have not worked, and exploring the roles of local, regional and international collaboration. Direct training, provision of pre-packaged training materials, twinning, and other aspects.	Lars Pedersen, DFC Modality is yet to be determined.
1430-1700	**Action plan development** ** Coffee break included **	Start with an overview of the UN Habitat project that could support the action plan. Then move into a developing a 12-18 month action plan to follow up on the points raised. Who does what and when, how to work together, when to do the regional level events etc.	Joe Hooper presents the project. Lars Pedersen, DFC to facilitate the session..
1700-1715	**Evaluation**	Written event evaluation by participants	
1715-1730	**Closing remarks from the event organizers**	Final remarks by UN Habitat, DFC and IHS	Gulelat Kebede, UN Habitat Lars Pedersen, DFC Hans Teerlink, IHS

Annex 3: Participant Expectations

Learning & sharing
- Innovative ideas for strengthening the role of training institutes.
- What promotes enabling environment of training institutes.
- Learn & listen.
- Find new ways/activities & institutional arrangements
- Share experience
- Learn from other experiences of capacity building in urban development, especially in large cities.
- Share best practices with training institutions.
- Learn more about the sustainability of training institutions.
- Learn and share what works and what does not work.
- Experience sharing on capacity building.
- Learning from the participants.
- Good practices and lessons on how to build sustainable capacity building institutions in area of local governance and local development.
- Learn best practices.
- Exchange lessons learned, innovations and build partnerships.
- Sharing of expertise and learning how capacity building is effectively done.
- Learn more about ways of building institutional capacity to build capacity through collaborations and partnerships.
- Share experiences of strategic networking to build capacity.
- Share experiences and explore sustainable strategies of engaging with training institutions and partners to enhance capacity for improved service delivery.
- Learn new tools.
- Simple solutions to complex urban matters.
- Strengthening training institutions in professionalising urban management.
- How to ensure sustainability of our actions.
- Improve our ability to serve society.
- Exchanging expertise to empower training institutions.

Specific topics
- Discuss issues related to quality and impact of service delivery in support of capacity development.
- From theory to practical approach and solutions.
- To stimulate government to be a learning organization.
- How to create a local government network and animate it through training activities?
- How to effectively manage the relationship with government without compromising your objectives.
- To raise the awareness of local government for capacity building (training for the staff/organization)
- How to become a learning organization? Tools, processes etc.

Finance
- Ideas for supporting income generation and more sustainable business models
- How to fund programmes in collaboration with private sector organisations.
- Lear how to get governmental funding support in an efficient manner.
- Learn more on how to mobilize and leverage resources for funding of capacity building activities.

Networking
- Seeking new partnerships.
- Possibility of synergizing the capacity building efforts of different training institutes working in similar focal areas.
- Network with people and organisations.
- Networking between urban development training institutions.
- Developing new networks.
- Contacts for more effective networking.
- In the changing times and government priorities shifting, we hope to network and share experiences how other institutions are able to gain sustainability; network and establish strategic partnerships that would enable our organisations to grow.
- Learn how institutions extended partnership.
- To network on change mgt in local government.
- To consolidate and expand my network.
- To link up with more potential partners and to learn from the participants.

Annex 4: Demand Mapping of Urban Issues

To map urban issues that currently are of high relevance all participants from training institutions were requested to list three topics and/or services where there is a high demand from partners and clients. One or two low demand topics could be listed as well. Below is a compiled list of urban issues with the number of institutes indicating the topic within brackets. Some listings have been slightly rephrased to allow for categorization. Since different countries have different priorities and needs a few topics occur both as high and low demand.

Sub-Saharan Africa
11 institutes

High demand topics
- Leadership and (local) governance (5)
- Urban management (3)
- (Strategic) Urban planning and land management (3)
- Local economic development (3)
- Public-Private partnership (2)
- Climate change (2)
- Participatory budgeting (2)
- Local financial management (2)
- Urban low-income housing (1)
- Monitoring and evaluation (1)
- Water and sanitation (1)
- Cultural heritage (1)
- Urban agriculture (1)

Low demand topics
- Gender equality (3)
- Climate change (2)
- Transportation (2)
- Waste management (1)
- Environment management (1)
- Food security planning and management (1)
- Decentralization legislation (1)
- Crime reduction (1)

Other countries
11 institutes (Asia, Europe, Brazil, Egypt)

High demand topics
- Local economic development (5)
- Environmental planning and management (including biodiversity for local sustainable development) (5)
- Strategic planning at regional and city level (5)
- Climate change (4)
- Water, sanitation and waste management (3)
- Urban infrastructure (and services) (3)
- Financing city/municipal development strategies (1)
- Financial management (1)
- Urban governance (1)
- Urban regeneration (1)
- Informal settlement upgrading (1)
- Shelter (1)
- Anticorruption (1)
- Adaptation/Disaster mitigation (1)
- Poverty reduction (1)
- Monitoring and evaluation (1)

Low demand topics
- Land management (2)
- Climate change mitigation/adaptation (1)
- Environmental planning (1)
- Human resources development (1)
- Policy analysis (1)
- Urban informal sector (1)
- Service delivery (1)

Annex 5: Event evaluation

Total number of respondents: 25 out of 31

1=Strongly disagree; 2=disagree; 3=agree somewhat; 4=agree; 5=strongly agree

Average score and number of responses indicated after each question.

Logistics and Administration

1. The background paper and narrative agenda was sufficient to allow me to prepare for and participate in the EGM. **(4.2) (24)**

2. The conference room and facilities were favorable to learning. **(4.6) (24)**

3. The organizers were supportive and sensitive to my needs. **(4.7) (24)**

4. The logistics for my travel were adequate and met my needs. **(4.5) (22)**

Purpose of the Meeting and Scheduling

1. I clearly understood the purpose of the Expert Group Meeting (EGM) **(4.0) (25)**

2. The stated purposes of the EGM were fully met. **(4.3) (24)**

3. The scheduling, timing and length of the EGM was suitable to my needs. **(4.4) (25)**

Programme Design and EGM Materials

1. The EGM was designed to allow me to learn from and share my experiences with participants effectively in order to produce effective results. **(4.5) (24)**

2. The EGM provided sufficient time for discussion and networking amongst attendees. **(4.0) (24)**

3. I found the EGM consistently stimulating, of interest and relevant to me. **(4.6) (24)**

4. The geographic, gender and organizational mix of participants was about right. **(4.2) (24)**

EGM Delivery

1. Presentations made by EGM participants were inspiring and useful. **(4.2) (25)**

2. I have obtained new ideas on how to strengthen my training institution in order to be more sustainable in our actions. **(4.6) (25)**

3. Facilitation by the host team was about right. **(4.6) (25)**

Perceived Impact

1. The knowledge and ideas gained through this EGM are applicable to my institute. **(4.3) (25)**

2. When I return to my institute, I will inform my colleagues and other stakeholders about the EGM. **(4.7) (25)**

3. I have during the EGM made new contacts whom I think will be important in my future work**(4.8) (25)**

4. Overall, I am very satisfied with this EGM. **(4.7) (25)**

Overall average – 18 questions (4.4)