Economic Commission for Africa
Subregional Office for Southern Africa

Knowledge Management Training Workshop for SADC, COMESA and Partners

Workshop Report

Johannesburg, South Africa
3-4 May 2012

Economic Commission for Africa

Knowledge Management Training Workshop for SADC, COMESA and Partners

Workshop Report

Johannesburg, South Africa
3-4 May 2012

United Nations Economic Commission for Africa
Subregional Office for Southern Africa

Table of Contents

Abbreviations and Acronyms

APDev	Africa Platform for Development Effectiveness
AU	African Union
CAADP	Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme
CMS	Content Management System
COMESA	Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa
COPs	Communities of Practice
CSO	Civil Society Organization
ECA-SA	Economic Commission for Africa-Southern Africa Office
GIZ	Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit
HDR	Human Development Report
ICT	Information and Communication Technology
IGOs	Intergovernmental Organizations
IMF	International Monetary Fund
KM	Knowledge Management
LFA	Logical Framework Approach
Logframe	Logical Framework
LPI	Land Policy Initiative
M & E	Monitoring and Evaluation
NEPAD	New Partnership for Africa's Development
OECD	Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development
OPM	Office of Strategic Planning and Programme Management of ECA
RBM	Results-Based Management
RECs	Regional Economic Communities
RSS	Really Simple Syndication
SADC	Southern African Development Community
TQM	Total Quality Management
UEM	University of Eduardo Mondlane
UNCTs	United Nations County Teams
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNDP RSC-ESA	UNDP Regional Service Centre for Eastern and Southern Africa
UNECA	United Nations Economic Commission for Africa

1.   Introduction

1.   The United Nations Economic Commission for Africa Southern Africa Office (ECA-SA) has a mandate to strengthen regional integration in the Southern Africa subregion. In this regard, it is committed to strengthen information and knowledge networking with key stakeholders involved in subregional development activities, including governments, the Southern African Development Community (SADC), the Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa (COMESA), private sector, civil society, United Nations (UN) agencies and development partner organizations. As part of this strengthened information and knowledge networking initiative, the ECA has developed a Knowledge Management (KM) strategy to better serve its stakeholders and to optimize the synergies between its work and that of various partners in knowledge generation and dissemination, policy advisory and outreach. The KM strategy will allow ECA to establish a system to rationalize the acquisition, storage and sharing of knowledge, which will optimize the impact of its work. ECA-SA aims to set up Communities of Practice (CoPs) on regional integration, macroeconomic analysis, infrastructure, agriculture, trade, social and human development, and gender and development.

2.   The thematic focus of the CoPs is to facilitate access to, exchange and share information related to the above areas of ECA's work among SADC member States. Against this background, the ECA organized a training workshop to share its knowledge products and services with Regional Economic Communities (RECs) and Intergovernmental Organizations (IGOs) and to enable participants to share analytical knowledge across the full range of development themes and sectors. The two-day training workshop on Knowledge Management (KM) was held from 3-4 May 2012 in Johannesburg, South Africa.

3.   Participants comprised 16 experts drawn from SADC, COMESA, Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ), the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) Regional Service Centre for Eastern and Southern Africa (RSC-ESA), the New Partnership for Africa's Development Planning and Coordinating Agency (NEPAD PCA), the Centre of Studies on Regional Integration and SADC Law at Eduardo Mondlane University (CEDIR-UEM), and member States within the subregion covered by the ECA-SA.

2. Workshop Objectives

4.　　The principal aim of the workshop was to enhance networking of information and knowledge with key stakeholders, including governments, SADC, COMESA, the private sector, civil society, UN agencies and development partner organizations involved in regional development and integration activities.

5.　　The specific objectives of the workshop were to:

(a)　Share ECA's knowledge products and services with RECs and IGOs;
(b)　Enable participants to share analytical knowledge across a full range of development themes and sectors;
(c)　Facilitate the development of stronger partnerships and more dynamic knowledge networks through CoPs with these key stakeholders.

3. Opening of the Workshop

6.   Mr. Sizo Mhlanga, Officer-in-Charge of the United Nations Economic Commission for Africa Southern Africa Office, welcomed participants to the workshop and underscored the critical role that the knowledge economy played in the development sector and particularly in the Southern Africa subregion. Noting that the workshop came at an opportune time, Mr. Mhlanga said: "It presents us with practical training on mechanisms and strategies for promoting dialogue, increasing space and knowledge sharing and also a chance to strengthen capacities for effective performance and results in our respective organizations."

7.   He also informed the meeting that the ECA had identified the development of a KM platform as key to strengthening networking of information and knowledge. The platform was envisaged to facilitate the search, selection, adaptation, advocacy and dissemination of best practices in national and subregional policy development. It could also help catalyse international cooperation in specific policy issues to support member States in their development agendas.

8.   Mr. Mhlanga indicated that the KM platform or strategy was therefore expected to serve as a means of positioning the ECA to serve its stakeholders better and to optimize synergies with the efforts of various partners in generating and disseminating knowledge, policy advisory and outreach.

Finally, he assured participants of ECA's support in implementing the workshop recommendations at national and regional levels.

4. Agenda

9.   The workshop addressed the following agenda:

(a)   Opening Remarks;
(b)   Participants' Expectations;
(c)   Knowledge Management Strategy;
(d)   Communities of Practice;
(e)   Knowledge Networks in Action;
(f)   Knowledge Products and Services;
(g)   Presentation of Knowledge Management Mapping Responses;
(h)   Presentations by Partners and Member States;
(i)   Linkage between KM and Results-Based Management (RBM); and
(j)   Closing Session.

5. Summary of Training Proceedings

5.1 Participants' expectations

10.   At the commencement of the workshop, participants from COMESA, SADC and CEDIR-UEM shared their expectations from the workshop.

11.   The participants from COMESA expressed their desire to get assistance from ECA to set up a KM unit at the COMESA Secretariat. They also wished to learn the difference between KM and services offered by a library, linkages, gaps and the way forward in integrating library work and KM.

12.   The SADC participants said that KM was work-in-progress and the ICT strategy was the pillar of this. They reported that they were carrying out policy planning work to come up with a KM platform. The representatives also emphasized the need to explore linkages between the KM programmes of SADC and those of the UN. They indicated that SADC was ready to learn from the experiences of those that were advanced in KM.

13.   The participant from UEM informed the workshop that the institution was networking its units, training programmes and publications. He pointed out that KM was considered a key tool for the institution's 2008 activities and acknowledged previous ECA input and support to UEM on KM. He expressed his appreciation for the current training as a good opportunity for an update on KM issues and activities. He informed the workshop that UEM had put in place a process to benchmark ways to use KM for research, training and publications.

14.   In response to the participants' expectations, the ECA urged RECs and member States to take action in KM areas and assess how ECA-SA could work with them and assist in capacity-building through access to advisory and policy services to promote development and regional integration in the Southern Africa subregion. The facilitator briefed the participants on the goal of the KM questionnaire circulated before the workshop and said that the responses would be shared later during the workshop.

5.2 Knowledge management strategy

15.   This session commenced with the explanation that KM was one of the three core services at ECA. The other two core services were advocacy and consensus building, and advisory services

and technical cooperation. The presentation explained how the mission of ECA was shaped by the priorities of African leaders, the African Union (AU) and its NEPAD programme, aimed at promoting regional integration and meeting Africa's special needs. The presentation also explained how the ECA's knowledge clusters operated to deliver core services to member States and RECs. The knowledge clusters are: Food Security and Sustainable Development Promoting Advancement of Women; Trade, Finance and Economic Policy; Economic Cooperation and Regional Integration; ICT, Science and Technology; Statistics and Statistical Development; Social Development; Governance and Public Administration; Subregional Activities for Development; and, Development Planning and Administration.

16.   The presenter further explained the transformation model used to achieve ECA's goals. In the model it was illustrated that all initiatives were underpinned by a common framework to ensure that changes were continuous and replicable and were managed as a portfolio, aligned to the ECA strategy. The presenter also pointed out that a balanced portfolio of improvement initiatives was imperative and would ensure that longer-term improvements were funded by quick wins, of which KM was one, and that this would sustain commitment to change.

17.   The workshop proceeded to discuss the comparative advantage which the ECA had in the following areas: KM, power to convene interested parties, advocacy, communication, consensus-building, monitoring progress on Africa's development, a continental and subregional mandate, partnership and international cooperation. It was stressed that this comparative advantage positioned the ECA to contribute better to meeting Africa's development agenda.

18.   The session concluded with providing participants with details of the ECA KM strategy, which was anchored on four main pillars: improving programmes and project implementation; improving service delivery; expanding relations; and operating with efficiency. Details were given of capacity development of member States, stressing that this required cross-regional partnership with an emphasis on sharing knowledge. The presenter explained the involvement and roles of partners, clients and the ECA in the strategy. The workshop was taken through a description of data, information and knowledge under the theme that knowledge was information combined with experience, context, interpretation and reflection. The session ended with an elaboration on the creation of knowledge repositories, where documents were stored and there was a facility to retrieve them easily. The three types of repositories were described: external knowledge, structured internal knowledge and informal internal knowledge.

5.3   Communities of practice

19.   In this session, the workshop examined CoPs in detail with respect to: their composition, functioning, needs, modalities of implementation and necessity; the ECA COPs architecture; and links to policy and programming. The CoPs connect practitioners and experts who have common professional interests and they identify commonalities and strategic priorities and provide incentives for collaboration. It was emphasized that CoPs should be driven by demand. The process of implementing a CoP was described, with details of sample objectives, strategies, measures and metrics, through to the implementation stage.

20.   The session also addressed issues of ECA's CoPs architecture and walked participants through the five areas of focus, which were: promoting the identity of network members as a group of peers; sharing professional experiences, interests and concerns; facilitating peer reviews for identifying and disseminating good practices; framing opportunities for collective learning, working collaboratively on developing policy and favouring new ideas; and jointly developing thematic service lines with and for member States, RECs, academia, civil society organizations (CSOs) and UNCTs.

21.   The workshop trainer further explained that the impacts of the CoPs were meant to come through the following links: using them as a consultation mechanism, "bottom up" definition of policy issues, setting agendas through practice meetings or knowledge networks, and peer reviews to identify good practices to feed into policy development. The session concluded with a statement that CoPs were meant to bridge the knowledge gaps within the ECA, enhance efficiency, capitalize on experience on the ground, maintain the high quality of services through existing knowledge, and leverage on expertise globally and within the UN system.

5.4   Knowledge networks in action

22.   This session focused on providing participants with information on the different types of knowledge networks, which were classified as: thematic/functional; internal and advisory groups (external); regional/subregional; division/cross-division/section; cross-(sub)regional and driven by member States or RECs. The role of a network facilitator was explained as that of a community animator, change agent, strategist and advocate.

23.   The session also covered the functioning of knowledge networks and some of their achievements across the UN system. Two knowledge networks that had made significant achievements were highlighted: the Democratic Governance Network and the Human Development Report (HDR) Statistics Network. The presenter outlined some incentives for participating in knowledge networks.

24.   The session concluded by highlighting some tips on knowledge networks, including: enhancing access by translating queries and key products; fostering relationships through communication; enhancing quality of contributions by inviting guest moderators; ensuring communication between ECA Headquarters and Subregional Offices, between the developed North and developing South and between Programme Officers and Directors; and periodically assessing benefits of the networks and results.

5.5   Knowledge products and services

25.   The ECA trainer in this final part of the training on KM provided information on the knowledge products and services that were key to the success of knowledge networks. These knowledge products and services were: consolidated replies, e-discussions, news updates, expert referrals, work spaces and face-to-face meetings. He also provided information on sample knowledge services and results, stressing that knowledge shared by practitioners and policy experts about actions at the regional level were critical in informing global discussion, providing policy guidance and contributing to efforts to speed up implementation of initiatives such as the Land Policy Initiative (LPI) goals. Finally, the trainer posed questions that were key to addressing delivery of knowledge products and services such as: continued interest by colleagues to engage actively in a CoP; whether a proposed CoP was strategically relevant; whether any knowledge networks already existed that were working on the proposed area; whether any organization was willing to invest resources, expertise and management support to sustain the knowledge network; and identifying relevant products and services of the knowledge network.

5.6   Presentation of knowledge management mapping responses

26.   ECA e-mailed Knowledge Management Mapping questionnaires to participants before the workshop and the responses were shared at this stage of the workshop.

27.   The representative from COMESA informed the workshop that the KM activities in his organization were done on an ad hoc basis and that they happened at a frequency of less than once a year. He also mentioned that there was no consistency in staff participation at both in-house and outside activities, and proposed that ECA comes up with a list of people to invite to KM activities and events. He further indicated that COMESA had publicly accessible KM manuals. The representative then shared the responses to the KM Mapping Questionnaire with the workshop.

28.   He informed the workshop that the number of staff in the regional organization was within the range of 101-500. The organization currently had no central KM unit and KM is attached to

the Library. The main objectives of KM were to be a repository and for dissemination. KM features explicitly in business processes and is mainstreamed in the Total Quality Management (TQM) area. COMESA uses several methods to share knowledge, including: Online learning and peer assistance with guidelines, training resources and materials publicly available for online learning while those for peer assistance are only available for internal consultation. Regarding knowledge products and content, the representative informed the workshop that COMESA had an Information Disclosure Policy, which was only available for internal consultation, and a *Taxonomy and Manual of Style for Publications*, which was publicly available. Knowledge products developed by COMESA staff include: case studies, comparative experience papers, consolidated replies, fact sheets and "how-to" guides. He also said that COMESA staff had access to subscription-based online e-journals.

29.   The representative listed the publicly accessible ICT tools for KM at COMESA as: blogs, content management system (CMS), discussion forums, the Internet, learning management, micro-blogging/status update, Really Simple Syndication (RSS), search engines, social networking sites, user ratings and recommendations, video, and Voice Over Internet Protocol (VOIP). Tools available for internal consultation only, include: the intranet, chats, collaborative workspaces, publications management, tagging and "wikis". A Yellow Pages ICT tool for KM was reported to be in progress. The representative from COMESA concluded by saying that the organization had a newsletter which was regional in geographic focus and publicly accessible free of charge, in the same way as its Experts Roster.

30.   In the ensuing discussions, COMESA inquired about the possibility and modalities of accessing funding from GIZ. In reply the representative from GIZ indicated that such support was linked to a Memorandum of Understanding between RECs and the German Government and was subject to negotiation and agreement between the two parties.

31.   The ECA trainer noted that all ingredients required to build a KM strategy were in place at COMESA and wondered what was missing to set up a KM platform. He urged COMESA to leverage on the presentation by the representative of UNDP RSC-ESA to assist in developing the KM platform and also take advantage of ECA technical support.

32.   In response, the COMESA representative indicated that they needed to get support and buy-in from management, and a budget to start the process of building the KM platform and system. Further, COMESA needed to sensitize its staff about KM.

33.   In his update, the SADC representative reported that the staff complement of his organization fell in the bracket of 101-500 employees. SADC did not cooperate with any organizations on KM. He also noted that the senior management had already given their support and commitment to the development of a KM framework and system and he said that the programme was only awaiting an

implementation strategy and funding to progress further. He acknowledged the assistance that GIZ was providing to SADC in order to establish a sustainable structure with which to make SADC's KM plans operational.

34.   The representative highlighted the main objectives of KM as: storage, retrieval and sharing of information among key stakeholders in SADC, including member States, cooperating partners and Directorates of the SADC Secretariat. He indicated that the organization still had no central KM Unit, apart from a KM Officer position on the organizational chart. When the post was filled, the job-holder would report to the Senior Officer – Statistics, under the Policy Planning and Resource Mobilization Directorate.

35.   Elaborating on knowledge products and content available at SADC, the representative informed the workshop that these comprised the Information Disclosure Policy and the Publications Policy, which were both publicly available. Knowledge products developed by SADC staff included: case studies, papers on comparative experience, consolidated replies, fact sheets and papers on lessons learned. ICT tools for KM available only for internal consultation and for use only within SADC included: applications sharing/synchronous web meetings, blogs, chats, collaborative workspaces, CMS, discussion forums, extranet, and intranet. He also reported that Internet and search engines were publicly accessible. On the matter of newsletters, the representative informed the workshop that SADC produced the *SADC News*.

36.   The SADC representative indicated that having benefited from the experiences of other participants at the workshop, SADC was now in a position to focus their efforts as they developed their own KM strategy.

37.   The representative of UEM briefed the workshop that the staff complement at his regional institute fell in the range of 1-30 staff and its network of partners fell in the range 31-100. He highlighted the main objectives of KM as being: to develop policy research, to provide academic training and publications and to establish a centre of excellence. Among the KM activities the institute had completed were the knowledge needs assessment projects which were available for internal consultation. He said the knowledge audit and inventory projects were in progress, as were the KM strategy and framework and the communications strategy. He also informed the workshop that UEM had developed a corporate strategy for defining the use of Web 2.0/Social Media in its business.

38.   The representative further informed the workshop that the institution was in the process of setting up a central KM unit and that KM activities were attached to the Office of the Special Advisor on Knowledge Management and Partnership. The institution was reported to have a KM focal point with the recruitment underway for a KM Chief and for the ICT staff for KM. KM areas covered by UEM include training, publications and design of a library; the last two were reported to be in progress. KM

training for staff was done on an ad hoc basis, about twice a year. He said that guidelines were being prepared on featuring KM tasks in staff job descriptions and performance appraisals. He emphasized that the institute systemically featured KM activities in business processes and procedures and the areas where KM was mainstreamed were research, academic training, networking within universities and publications. UEM also systemically undertook joint KM activities with other organizations, including collaborating in an academic network of universities and partnerships with centres of excellence and with the University of Lund.

39.   The representative highlighted the knowledge-sharing methods the UEM implemented as: after action reviews, meetings, online knowledge networks, online learning, world café and best practices. He mentioned that guidelines, training resources and materials for online learning and best practices were available for internal consultation only. The knowledge products and content guidelines that were available at UEM and publicly accessible included the Publications Policy, the Manual of Style for Publications, "how-to" guides, lessons-learned papers and policy notes.

40.   The UEM representative indicated that the institution had access to subscription-based e-journals with accompanying publicly accessible training resources (presenting the e-journals). He pointed out that a quality assurance/user satisfaction process to vet the use of the e-journals existed in the UEM Documentation Centre.

41.   Finally, the representative said that the publicly accessible ICT tools for KM currently in progress at UEM were collaborative workspaces. Discussion forums were available for internal consultation only. Other KM tools were the Internet and learning management, which were for internal use only at that stage. There were guidelines and training materials for staff on the utilization of tools such as publicly accessible social networking sites and user ratings and recommendations.

5.7   Presentations by partners and member States

42.   In this part of the workshop, representatives of the UNDP RSC-ESA, NEPAD's Planning and Coordinating Agency (NEPAD PCA), GIZ and Zimbabwe made presentations.

43.   The representative of UNDP reported that the agency had more than 20,000 staff and that capacity development and training in KM were ongoing. He also reported good progress in developing KM tools and said that UNDP was steadily doing summaries and blogs of projects for posting on Teamworks, a platform that he briefed the workshop on later. He further informed the workshop that they were still working on optimal utilization of resources and that the intranet and extranet were not connected in such a way as to be able to "talk to each other".

44.   The UNDP representative then presented an overview of the Teamworks platform, highlighting the key features and ways of sharing information. Finally participants were walked through a video demo of the platform, after which they registered and had a practical hands-on session of the working of the Teamworks platform. Winding up the UNDP presentation, the ECA facilitator informed the workshop that ECA, UNDP and GIZ were collaborating to provide support to organizations as they made efforts to come up with an African position to the Rio+20 Conference.

45.   The presentation from NEPAD highlighted that KM fundamentals were in place in programme implementation and support, as the valuable role of KM was recognized at the outset by the architects of NEPAD's structure. However, he indicated that the KM structure was awaiting approval and that the organization was understaffed to carry out KM functions adequately. He also alluded to the 2011 Bussan Conference, where KM was effectively employed as a best practice which could be leveraged across the NEPAD Secretariat for effective KM results. He further highlighted the need for a knowledge audit at NEPAD to assess what was feasible in terms of KM and the need to coordinate activities to achieve maximum benefit and impact of programmes. He concluded by stating that NEPAD needed an overall KM strategy that was well supported by appropriate infrastructure, ICT and other tools, as it determined what KM activities to carry out.

46.   In his observation, the ECA trainer emphasized that infrastructure went beyond technology to include best practices from which COMESA, SADC, and member States could learn including how the Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP) and the Africa Platform for Development Effectiveness (APDev) developed their KM systems.

47.   The GIZ representative informed the workshop that GIZ had about 17,000 staff members. The organization considered KM as the responsibility of each staff member but noted that the practice needed monitoring. The ECA facilitator commended GIZ for their best practice in KM and encouraged member States to take advantage of GIZ's experience in setting up their KM systems.

48.   The official from the Zimbabwe Ministry of Economic Planning informed the workshop that most of the KM activities in the ministry were being carried out by the ministry itself and wondered whether the Department of Economic Research could incorporate a KM unit. In his response, the ECA trainer pointed out that a KM unit did not have to be a separate unit, as knowledge was created by the substantive divisions.

5.8   Linkage between KM and results-based management (RBM)

49.   This session was divided into the following seven modules:

(a)   Module 1: Basic RBM Principles;

(b)   Module 2: RBM and Knowledge Management;

(c)   Module 3: Planning for Results;

(d)   Module 4: Monitoring & Evaluation;

(e)   Module 5: Selecting Indicators;

(f)   Module 6: Evaluation; and

(g)   Module 7: M&E Systems and Management Information Systems.

50.   Module 1 focused on the basic principles of RBM. The trainer explained that RBM was a management strategy centred on results and was a combination of Strategic Planning and Programming, and Monitoring and Evaluation. The strategy originated from public-sector reforms in some OECD countries and in developing countries was driven by development aid agencies such as the World Bank, International Monetary Fund (IMF) and UNDP.

51.   The trainer also explained the following key RBM concepts: activity, benchmark, beneficiaries, base-line study, data collection tools, effect, effectiveness, efficiency, impacts, indicator, inputs, logical framework (Logframe, results framework), outcome, outputs, performance, reliable, results chain, stakeholders, sustainability and target group.

52.   The second module addressed the two linkages between RBM and KM. In the first, KM was part of the RBM cycle and, in the second, KM projects were planned and implemented according to RBM principles. An illustration was made of the RBM cycle from strategic planning and programming, through implementation, monitoring and evaluation, to learning and KM.

53.   The module also stressed that learning and KM improved institutional performance and that a process for generating, reporting on, and utilizing lessons learned and best practices needed to be developed. The trainer emphasized the imperative of ensuring that learning influenced strategy development and programme/project design, and that lessons were fed back into programme/project implementation.

54.   The trainer concluded the module with questions to participants on their experience with RBM and KM, how the nexus RBM/KM could improve performance in their organizations, whether they anticipated any resistance, and whether they had potential champions in their organizations.

55.   In Module 3 the trainer dwelt on the issue of planning for results and the associated logic models and planning elements. He illustrated how the logic models linked the problem (situation) to the intervention (inputs and outputs), and the impact (outcome). The trainer also demonstrated that the model facilitated the identification of partnerships critical to enhancing performance. He further defined the following planning elements: situation, inputs, outputs, outcomes and external influenc-

es. The participants were then asked to share how strategic planning and programming were handled and organized in their respective organizations, and what the main elements of planning were.

56.   The trainer then explained the Logical Framework Approach (LFA) as a long-established methodology for design activities, which was used by a range of major multilateral and bilateral donors. The LFA was based on a systematic analysis of the development situation, particularly key development problems, and of the options for addressing the problems. To illustrate the LFA, a stand-ard analytical product of the LFA, the Logical Framework Matrix (LFM) was presented. It consisted of a matrix with four columns and a number of rows, which summarized selected aspects of the design of a project or programme.

57.   Further, the trainer provided details of the four main analytical elements of the LFA process which were: problem analysis/problem tree, stakeholder analysis, analysis of objectives and analysis of alternative strategies. In this module participants did a group exercise on the development of a KM unit. The trainer concluded by reminding participants of the importance of approaching effective development planning as an iterative process, not a linear set of prescribed steps, and that they should investigate multiple ways of solving a development problem, while aiming for the best.

58.   Module 4 contained a detailed discussion on Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E). The trainer defined the concepts "monitoring" and "evaluation" along with the complementary roles they played. The trainer explained the key features of traditional M&E systems that focused on implementation and were based on results. He explained the elements of implementation monitoring that were tradition-ally used for projects and the elements of results monitoring that were traditionally used for a range of interventions and strategies.

59.   The trainer elaborated M&E implementation and results stages using a logic model in which the implementation stage comprised inputs, activities and output, and the results stage consisted of the outcome and goals. He also indicated that results-based M&E could be applied in the follow-ing aspects: project, programme, policy applications, internal and external applications, knowledge capital, transparency, accountability and decision-making.

60.   The trainer further gave a brief explanation of potential political and technical challenges to building results-based M&E systems. He concluded by asking the workshop participants whether they had noticed or experienced challenges in the establishment of M&E in their organizations and what could be the possible solutions to address those challenges.

61.   Module 5 focused on explaining the selection of indicators to measure progress in inputs, activities, outputs, outcomes and goals. The trainer emphasized that this was important for providing necessary feedback to the management system to determine whether the organization was achieving

results as planned. The trainer explained the criteria for selecting indicators as "**CREAM**": **C**lear - precise and unambiguous; **R**elevant - appropriate to the subject at hand; **E**conomic - available at reasonable cost**; A**dequate - provide a sufficient basis to assess performance; and **M**onitorable - amenable to independent validation. Another criterion for selecting indicators was explained as "**SMART**": **S**pecific, **M**easurable, **A**ttainable/**A**ttributable, **R**elevant and **T**ime-bound. The module concluded with the trainer giving brief explanations on the following data-collection methods: conversation with concerned individuals; community interviews; field visits; reviews of official records; key-informant interviews; focus-group interviews; direct observation; questionnaires; one-time survey; panel surveys; census; and field experiment.

62.   In Module 6 the trainer provided critical information on evaluation. He discussed the objective of an evaluation and its use and he explained the difference between the concepts "evaluation", "audit", "assessment", "appraisal" and "investigation". He demonstrated that evaluations helped to answer the following eight different types of questions that managers frequently posed: descriptive; normative or compliance; correlational; impact or cause-and-effect; programme logic; implementation or process; performance; and appropriate use of policy tools.

63.   Seven different types of evaluations were presented to the workshop comprising: performance logic chain assessment; pre-implementation assessment; process implementation evaluation; rapid appraisal; case study; impact evaluation; and meta-evaluation. If these evaluations were to be considered high quality, they needed to include the following characteristics: impartiality, usefulness, technical adequacy, stakeholder involvement, feedback, dissemination and value for money.

64.   The module also addressed issues around developing terms of reference for evaluations and walked the participants through the eight stages of development, which were: purpose, scope, background, issues (primary questions to be answered), methodology, schedule (timetable for preliminary research, data collection, data analysis, draft report and final report), resources (staff involved, consultants and other resources) and intended use of findings and/or next steps.

65.   In conclusion, the trainer presented a suggested format for an evaluation report with the following sections: executive summary, context, purpose and scope, key issues, summary of methodology, findings, conclusions and recommendations, lessons learned, appendices (ToRs, other documentation and data).

66.   In module 7, the trainer addressed M&E systems and management information systems, indicating that M&E systems should be designed as management information systems. The ECA training officer stressed that M&E manuals needed to incorporate the following components: actors, data, procedures and tools.

6.   Closing Session

67.   In his closing remarks, the Officer-in-Charge of the ECA-SA Mr. Sizo Mhlanga thanked participants for their contributions and lively debates, which would facilitate moving the KM agenda forward in the Southern Africa subregion. He reassured participants of ECA's support and indicated that, with the collaboration of partners, the KM activities and outputs would be delivered.

Annex I: List of Participants

Member States

1. Ms. Tamara Esther Mughogho, Economist, Ministry of Finance and Development Planning, P.O. Box 30136, Lilongwe, Malawi. Tel: +265 1 788 888, Cell: +265 999 273 246. E-mail: tamaramughogho@yahoo.com
2. Mr. Tobias Machinga Sisamu, National Development Advisor, National Planning Commission, P.O. Box 86739, Windhoek, Namibia. Tel: +264 61 283 4236, Cell: +264 81 732 5242, Fax: +264 61 226 501. E-mail: tsisamu@npc.gov.na
3. Mr. Nohlupeko Phiri, Acting Director, Economic Research Department, Ministry of Economic Planning and Investment Promotion, P.O. Box 7772, Harare, Zimbabwe. Tel: +263 4 252840, Cell: +263 772 421 373, Fax: +263 4 251372. E-mail: nohlupekop@yahoo.com

RECs

COMESA
4. Mr. Willis Wilberforce Osemo, Webmaster, COMESA Secretariat, P.O. Box 30051, Lusaka, Zambia. Tel: +260 211 229725 Ext. 7305, Cell: +260 977 243628, Fax: +260 211 225107. E-mail: wosemo@comesa.int
5. Ms. Catherine Chimpa Zulu, Librarian, COMESA Secretariat, P.O. Box 30051, Lusaka, Zambia. Tel: +260 211 229725, Cell: +260 966 958266, Fax: +260 211 225107. E-mail: czulu@comesa.int

SADC
6. Mr. Robin Tahendranat Unuth, Senior Officer – ICT, SADC Secretariat, P/Bag 0095, Gaborone, Botswana. Tel: +267 395 1863, Cell: +267 716 31882, Fax: +267 318 1070. E-mail: runuth@sadc.int
7. Mr. Ackim Jere, Senior Officer – Statistics, SADC Secretariat, P/Bag 0095, Gaborone, Botswana. Tel: +267 364 1936/+267 395 1863, Fax: +267 318 1070. E-mail: ajere@sadc.int

Partners

NEPAD

8. Mr. Aziz Jardine, Knowledge Management Coordinator, NEPAD Planning and Coordinating Agency, Johannesburg, South Africa. Tel: +27 11 256 3617, Cell: +27 83 675 9969. E-mail: azizj@nepad.org

GIZ

9. Ms. Karin Dahlhoff, GIZ Associate Expert, GIZ, Private Bag X12, Village, Gaborone, Botswana. Cell: + 267 726 18654. E-mail: karin.dahlhoff@giz.de

CEDIR-UEM

10. Mr. Charles Edward Minega, Senior Researcher and Advisor, Centre of Studies on Regional Integration and SADC Law, Eduardo Mondlane University, P.O. Box 257, Maputo, Mozambique. Tel: +258 21 490 764, Cell: +258 82 114 27880, Fax: +258 21 494639. E-mail: charles.minega@uem.mz

UNDP

11. Mr. Francis Neuman, Knowledge Management Advisor, UNDP RSC-ESA, P/Bag X46, Sunninghill, Johannesburg, South Africa. Tel: +27 11 603 5089, Cell: + 27 84 350 989. E-mail: francis.neuman@undp.org

Secretariat

ECA HQ

12. Mr. Talla Kebe, Senior Regional Advisor on Knowledge Management, Office of Strategic Planning and Programme Management (OPM), United Nations Economic Commission for Africa, P.O. Box 3001, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia. Tel: +251 11 5445697, Fax: +251 11 5514461. E-mail: tkebe@uneca.org
13. Mr. Pacome Kossy, Programme Management Officer, Office of Strategic Planning and Programme Management (OPM), United Nations Economic Commission for Africa, P.O. Box 3001, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia. Tel: +251 11 544 5269, Fax: +251 11 5514461. E-mail: pkossy@uneca.org

14. Dr. Sizo D. Mhlanga, Senior Economic Affairs Officer and Officer-in-Charge, United Nations Economic Commission for Africa, Southern Africa Office, P.O. Box 30647, Lusaka, Zambia. Tel: +260 211 228502-5, Fax: +260 211 236949. E-mail: smhlanga@uenca.org

15. Mr. Anthony Ademola Taylor, Economic Affairs Officer, United Nations Economic Commission for Africa, Southern Africa Office, P.O. Box 30647, Lusaka, Zambia. Tel: +260 211 228502-5, Fax: +260 211 236949. E-mail: aademolataylor@uneca.org

16. Mr. Ian C. Filakati, Knowledge Management Officer, United Nations Economic Commission for Africa, Southern Africa Office, P.O. Box 30647, Lusaka, Zambia. Tel: +260 211 228502-5, Fax: +260 211 236949. E-mail: ifilakati@uneca.org

17. Ms. Dailes E. Matoka, Senior Staff Assistant, United Nations Economic Commission for Africa, Southern Africa Office, PO Box 30647, Lusaka, Zambia. Tel: +260 211 228502-5, Fax: +260 211 236949. E-mail: dmatoka@uneca.org