

From “mora-mora” [slowly, slowly] to “results, results”

World Bank Group Supported Transformational Leadership Program in Madagascar

Final Evaluation

January 2008



Kabell Konsulting ApS
Managing for results



Kabell Konsulting ApS
Managing for Results

Søllerød Park 2, 4
2840 Holte
Denmark

Telephone: (+ 45) 45 56 67 37
Mobile: (+ 45) 20 97 38 37

www.kabell-konsulting.dk

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| TABLE OF CONTENTS | 3 |
| ACKNOWLEDGEMENT | 4 |
| ACRONYMS | 4 |
| EXECUTIVE SUMMARY | 5 |
| CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION | 7 |
| UNDERSTANDING LEADERSHIP | 7 |
| THE CASE OF MADAGASCAR | 8 |
| CHAPTER 2: THE EVALUATION | 9 |
| PURPOSE, APPROACH, PROCESS AND SCOPE..... | 9 |
| HYPOTHESIS AND FOCUS | 10 |
| METHODOLOGY, METHODS AND TOOLS | 11 |
| EVALUATION QUESTIONS | 13 |
| CHAPTER 3: PROGRAM DESCRIPTION | 13 |
| PHASE ONE..... | 14 |
| PHASE TWO | 15 |
| CHAPTER 4: SUCCESS STORIES | 18 |
| EPISODIC CHANGE: BEGINNING TO BUILD LEADERSHIP CAPACITY AT THE LOCAL LEVEL | 18 |
| DEVELOPMENTAL CHANGE: CREATING A PLAN THAT THE PEOPLE OWN..... | 20 |
| TRANSFORMATIONAL CHANGE: MOVING FROM TALK TO ACTION AND FROM ACTION TO RESULTS..... | 21 |
| CHAPTER 5: KEY FINDINGS AT SYSTEMIC LEVEL | 22 |
| CHAPTER 6: HALF FULL OR HALF EMPTY? | 24 |
| CHAPTER 7: LOOSE ENDS AND COMPLIMENTARY WORK | 26 |
| MISSING MIDDLE? | 26 |
| THE GROUND LEVEL..... | 27 |
| “CAPITALIZATION” AND EXIT STRATEGY..... | 28 |
| PROCESS REVIEW | 29 |
| EVIDENCE BASED DECISION MAKING – MORE SYSTEMATIC M&E..... | 30 |
| CHAPTER 8: FURTHER EVALUATIVE PROCESS | 30 |
| CHAPTER 9: CONCLUSIONS AND REPLICABILITY | 31 |
| ANNEX 1: EVALUATION QUESTIONS | 34 |
| CONCEPTUALIZATION AND DESIGN | 34 |
| RESULTS AND IMPACT | 34 |
| IMPLEMENTATION - RISKS..... | 34 |
| SUSTAINABILITY..... | 34 |
| EVALUATIVE PROCESS/FOLLOW-UP TO MID-TERM REPORT..... | 35 |
| REPLICABILITY AND POLICY IMPLICATIONS..... | 35 |
| ANNEX 2: AREAS OF FOCUS FOR PHASE TWO | 36 |

Acknowledgement

Evaluating the Transformational Leadership Programme in Madagascar is in itself a transformational experience, and one that gives a strong motivation to continue in the “development business” by the sheer commitment of the people involved, and the promise of a better Madagascar that seems within reach.

It is a privilege to be involved in this work and much appreciation is due to all the individuals who have given time and consideration to the evaluation; their reward is in the knowledge of contributing to something genuinely worthwhile.

Acronyms

| | |
|------|--|
| CdF | Chefs de Fokontany |
| MAP | Madagascar Action Plan |
| MTEF | Medium-Term Expenditure Framework |
| NLIM | National Leadership Institute of Madagascar |
| PGDI | Governance and Institutional Development Project |
| SG | Secretary General |
| TLP | Transformational Leadership Programme |
| WBI | World Bank Institute |



Executive Summary

Leadership development is a relatively new discipline for the donor community, including the World Bank. Following the experience gained with these programmes that are seen to hold much potential to effect systemic change even in difficult environments where such change has hitherto been slow, is thus particularly important.

In 2004, Madagascar embarked on a major experiment in using leadership development as a key strategy for developing the country. As of December 2008, the programme is still an important component of President Marc Ravalomanana's approach to development as evidenced by the frequent references to the importance of leadership in speeches, by a number of leadership training initiatives, and the use of leadership coaches. The programme is supported by the World Bank; indeed, the Transformational Leadership Programme (TLP) in Madagascar is one of the Bank's most longstanding leadership development programmes, and one which has been accompanied by an evaluative process; this has had the significant benefit of allowing for simultaneous learning about the programme, but also about the difficulties of evaluation of this type of evolving programme.

The underlying philosophy is that: "transformational change is at its essence about changing values. The process includes critically examining the prevailing underlying assumptions, habits and priorities that exist in government – and protecting what's valuable and discarding what no longer is useful. [] Through the transformation process a culture of constraint, bureaucracy, resignation, and mediocrity can be interrupted and replaced by a culture that supports action, initiative, innovation, accountability, participation, and commitment"¹

The TLP was based on a very comprehensive diagnostic work that led to the identification of five major areas of improvement: leading and managing change, increasing the capacity of staff, better communication, changing the mindset of the civil servants, and enhance the leadership capacity of executives. The programme evolved from doing diagnostic work for the government over doing diagnostic work with the government, to facilitating the process and building capacity for such diagnostic work. The consultants intervene through a mixture of the following:

- 1) Coaching: coaching the President, ministers, secretary generals, chief of regions, and key executives in government in problem solving and leadership strategy;*
- 2) Consulting: working with the President, Prime Minister and ministers on particular problems, programmes, and policies;*
- 3) Large Group Processes: bringing together hundreds, even thousands, of individuals at a time to participate in problem solving, commitment building, and leadership training;*
- 4) Formal training: providing leadership training to the cabinet, government executives, community leaders, and participants in the National Leadership Programme;*

¹ Madagascar Transformation Project. Phase One

- 5) *Advising: giving advice from a leadership perspective on how to deal with government policy, programs and leadership strategies that need attention;*
- 6) *Formulating key messages: the consultants have worked very closely with the President and ministers in formulating their speeches and messages to the public to ensure that they contribute to the mobilization process.*

This mix of interventions seems to have worked well in the Malagasy context and individual components have been adjusted to suit the local context.

The programme is credited from many sides with a very significant impact, in particular in systemic terms and culture change, something that very few other programs have ever achieved. Very visible results include the Madagascar Action Plan (MAP), not merely as a results framework, which is in itself an achievement, but also in terms of introducing new processes and working models, and building the capacity to orchestrate these processes around a common goal. Other significant results include the establishment of the National Leadership Institute, while less visible yet important changes include a drive to change some ingrained cultural values and attitudes that are not supportive of Madagascar's entry into the globalized world. One example is the recruitment of high level civil servants, now done on a merit base, while previously done often more based on personal affiliation.

Given the magnitude and depth of change that is foreseen, the TLP is still in its formative stages, and there remains much work to do. This includes some complimentary work such as examining and redefining control and oversight functions and processes and improving the M&E system and results tracking and reporting. Also, there is a concern with the "missing middle", but given the success of the programme otherwise, this group and dimension is very likely to be dealt with in the same effective manner as other levels of government, once it receives the political priority. The National Leadership Institute of Madagascar (NLIM) is another ground stone that need to be solid, and which needs added attention.

Particularly promising and interesting is the newly empowered community chiefs known as Chefs de Fokontany (CdF), who through a three day training programme are being positioned to accelerate the development process where it is most acutely felt. Hopefully, through an accompanying programme of support and M&E, this very innovative programme will prove a worthwhile investment and one that will reap benefits in terms of clear development outcomes.

While credit does go the government and the Bank for embarking on and sustaining this process, the most important ingredient to the success of the programme is the Malagasy people, or rather a still small but growing section of the Malagasy people; all those who have carried out their own personal transformation and who now bridge the old traditions and habits and the new values and ways of working, they carry the programme forward and they act as guides for those providing the external impetus to the process and those who try to widen and deepen the process from the inside: to them, the key merit for the success of the TLP.



Chapter 1: Introduction

In its striving to better understand and enhance the development process and ensure sustainable development outcomes, the World Bank is increasingly recognizing the role that leadership has to play in a country's development. It recognizes that "effective leadership is a critical prerequisite for ownership and accountability for development results".² Strengthening government and non-government leadership has thus taken on more and more importance in the Bank's public sector work, including in research, development and knowledge sharing as evidenced by the focus on Leadership at Capacity Day 2007.

The outcome of Capacity Day included a consensus on the importance of leadership for development results, but also revealed that much of the "hows" and "whys" and "what" need to be further explored. One finding, however, is that "leadership development is more than training individuals; it encompasses a broader set of changes in institutions, policies, and behaviours"

Understanding Leadership

It is generally acknowledged that leaders at various levels have an enormous potential to energize the development process and the relationships that shape the system within which it evolves and unfolds. Leaders of the state and its institutions and broader civil society are uniquely situated to change mindsets and habits, to inspire, motivate and support individuals and to convene people and organizations around the nation's most critical priorities; they hold responsibility for orchestrating the processes and constructive engagement that lead to sustainable development outcomes. Leadership thus goes well beyond individuals; it is as much about energy, systems and processes as it is about skills, knowledge and resources, and patterns of relationships and structures that shape them are often considered more important than roles and functions³.

This understanding is well illustrated by key findings from the present evaluation of the Transformational Leadership Programme (TLP) in Madagascar.

In the context of the Madagascar TLP, the term leadership has been used in a very distinct way. Dean Williams, the director of the TLP, defines leadership as "a process of mobilizing people to confront and deal with problematic realities for the purpose of improving the human condition." He sees leadership as a mobilization process: "People must be mobilized to do the adaptive work of shifting the values and behaviour so that they can better solve their problems and make progress. If people refuse to face reality and change, then leadership is lacking. But the process of change—adaptive work—is often painful for a people and generates resistance and work avoidance behaviour. The work of leadership is to provide a "holding environment" for adaptive work to occur and keep people engaged in the problem solving process."

² Capacity Day 2007: <http://info.worldbank.org/etools/capacityDay2007/>

³ See work done at the ECDPM on systems thinking and capacity development



On the Bank side, staff confirm the view of leadership being also about energy, systems and processes, and stress that a contributing factor to the programmes' interest has been the fact that the TLP is different from traditionally more technocratic approaches, and classical training programmes. "The programme generates excitement", the words "new energy" were frequently heard throughout interviews, and it is seen as dynamic with a great capacity for mobilization. Also, there is a very strong sense of ownership as the programme has generated this excitement about people's own contribution to reform.

The Case of Madagascar

Madagascar is the country in which the World Bank has had one of the longest engagements in developing leadership capacity. The Governance and Institutional Development Project (PGDI) has been the main instrument of the World Bank to support the governance reform agenda of the Government. Since 2003, this project has been successfully assisting the Government in (i) rationalizing and modernizing budget and expenditure management, (ii) improving accountability and transparency of Government operations; and (iii) strengthening the capacity of public institutions to deal with complex change processes. A key instrument to meet this latter objective has been a series of leadership interventions and change management support for the key decision-makers within the Government. Core among these has been an innovative transformational leadership programme, operating out of the Presidency and intended to build the leadership capacity necessary to orchestrate a qualitative uplift of the whole public sector.

The case of Madagascar and the various components that have contributed to build leadership capacity is well described in a WBI Working paper entitled: "A Leadership Approach to Achieving Change in the Public Sector: The Case of Madagascar". It is the story of how "delivery of customized support to those in power who are willing to make a difference can unleash capacity"; and this against a backdrop of "systemic and institutional barriers to development".

The document concludes that Madagascar has made significant progress through committed leadership and attention to systemic, underlying dysfunctions. It is the ambition of the present evaluation to examine and better understand how Bank support helped that committed leadership, and in what way it contributed to address the dysfunctioning of the system and through this, strengthened the likelihood of achieving sustainable development results.

Chapter two contains the evaluation framework, which is fairly extensively dealt with because of the innovative character of the programme and the methodological challenges of evaluating it. Chapter three presents and describes the programme. Chapter four presents some major success stories highlighted by interviewees and chapter five nuances this somewhat in presenting key findings at the systemic level. Chapter six looks into some of the issues where conclusions cannot yet be firmly drawn and this leads into chapter seven where remaining and complimentary work is analysed. A reflexion on how to continue to evaluate the programme is presented in chapter eight, and finally the concluding chapter, Chapter nine focus on replicability.



Chapter 2: The Evaluation

Conscious of the innovative character of the programme and the value of continuous feedback on performance and results achieved, the programme has been accompanied by an evaluative process, first consisting of self evaluation, but from the beginning of phase two conducted by an external evaluator. A Midterm evaluation was conducted in May 2007 and the findings from this have been instrumental in deciding the evaluation questions and framework for the final evaluation.

Purpose, Approach, Process and Scope

The Terms of Reference of the evaluation team stresses that the evaluation of the TLP will: i) facilitate the supervision ii) generate lessons learned for other countries and regions, iii) inform the Bank Group's approach to support for public sector reform, and iv) provide a practical tool to promote good governance, starting with a country's leadership.

A utilization-focused approach where the evaluation serves a dual purpose of gathering and analyzing evidence on results and impact of the TLP, but in so doing also contribute to reinforce the results-culture and raise awareness of the benefits of evidence based decision-making and hence the value of monitoring and evaluation has been used. Therefore, the evaluation team has worked closely with both government counterparts, with the TLP team, with the PGDI, and with World Bank task team members and the country office staff both in terms of developing the evaluation framework and methodology and determining key evaluation questions. The interpretation of findings and the conclusions are however the sole responsibility of evaluator.

The challenge of actually proving the causal link between specific activities and development outcomes in this type of programme means that attribution is difficult to establish with any certainty; and certainly not within the resources available for this evaluation. Therefore, focus has been on assessing contribution to outcomes rather than attribution. This has been made easier by the fact that there are no other programmes similar in scope and approach to which these outcomes could be attributed. However, some outcomes probably do build on previous leadership development work, and certainly the programme as such has benefited from a very high degree of awareness and receptiveness, partly the result of preceding leadership work.

The approach is qualitative rather than quantitative and the key interest is seen as gaining an understanding of how the programme works and achieves the results it is credited with achieving. Indeed, based on the view that knowledge comes from an analysis of the parts, but understanding from synthesis and a systems view, priority has been given in the evaluative work to examining the systemic aspects of the programme, rather than documenting individual parts or specific output.



While the external evaluator has followed the program from inception of Phase Two and has carried out a mid term assessment in May 2007⁴, there has not been an external assessment of Phase One, which has served mainly as a diagnostic phase and is also excluded from the scope of this evaluation.

Hypothesis and Focus

The underlying intervention logic of the program is that different types of outputs generated by the coaching team “congeal” and lead to capacity-outcomes and systemic change which help overcome bottlenecks that slow down or block the development process. That perception and understanding is shared at the highest levels of government; in introducing his newly appointed team to the press on October 27th 2007, the President Marc Ravalomanana stated that the new challenges require profound change in terms of mindset, savoir-faire, and leadership: “L’objectif étant que tout ceci ait des retombées positives et directes sur le niveau de vie de la population” [the aim is that this will have a positive and direct impact on people’s standard of living].

This calls for an evaluation design that can capture both proximal and distal changes and dynamics, i.e. those that can be linked to the program with more confidence and those that happen in arenas where program participants⁵ interact and where seeds of change are planted that may have more systemic impact at a later stage when maturing.

Given the nature of the intervention (the attempt to have a transformational effect), the evaluation is focused on critical evaluation questions at the systemic level. Valuable results seem, according to the Mid-term evaluation, to have been achieved in various sectors and on specific issues; ideally these should be documented and analyzed in a comprehensive manner. However, given the time and resources available, this has not been possible. Therefore, focus is on systemic effects rather than sectoral or thematic outputs as this may generate more significant insights into the advantages and constraints of the approach and its potential in terms of generating sustainable development outcomes, and be of interest beyond the Madagascar context. A thorough evaluation of the sectoral or thematic results would however be a welcome addition to the evaluative work on this innovative programme. The last chapter provides some suggestions for the continued evaluation of the programme and its impact.

Hence, the focus has been on the system wide impact rather than an assessment of individuals or specific activities, outputs, or commitments such as reforms in any one particular sector. Indeed, the key question is to understand how leadership outcomes can induce dynamics in a system, conducive to getting or accelerating development results. Such dynamics may be at individual, organizational and institutional level, may be evident in new processes or institutions, and may, taken together, result in the desired development outcome. This is what the evaluation will try to uncover.

⁴ Dorte Kabell: “World Bank Group Supported Transformational Leadership Programme in Madagascar: Report of the Mid-term Evaluation”, May 2007

⁵ Program participants include all those who have received individual coaching or formal training or who have participated in events where the coaches have conducted collective coaching

Methodology, Methods and Tools

The programme has elements of training, of capacity building, and of organizational development, all conceived within a logic that draws on systems thinking. This necessitates the use of a range of different theories and documented evaluation experiences to capture the outcomes in as robust a manner as possible. Given this, the following theoretical work underpins the evaluation:

- 1) Taking the individual as point of departure, the Kirkpatrick model⁶ is used with the aim of looking for evidence of changes in individual's knowledge and attitudes (levels 1 and 2) as well as processes and institutions (level 3 and 4)⁷
- 2) Taking a more systemic view and using output as proxy for capacity, the evaluation draws on pioneering work by Danida in evaluating capacity development⁸
- 3) Recognizing the fact that the processes employed to develop capacity is as important as the goals, the evaluation draws on work by Peter Morgan from ECDPM⁹
- 4) Given the difficulty of attribution, the evaluation draws on elements from contribution analysis¹⁰

Drawing from the above, the following key insights are at the core of the methodology used:

“An organization is strong to the extent that it taps the capacities of its individual members, shares them with others, assimilates them, and institutionalizes them.” (Douglas Horton)

“Capacity is as much about energy as skills and knowledge and resources, and patterns of relationships and structures that shape them are more important than roles and functions” (Peter Morgan)

“Favourable CD outcomes should lead to positive change in the outputs of the organization (the latter becomes proxies for organizational capacity change)” (Niels Boesen)

“The Process employed to develop capacity is as important as the goals: the key to effective change and capacity development is a process that creates the conditions in

⁶ For a presentation of the model see Kirkpatrick, Donald L. (1998): Evaluating Training Programs: The Four Levels, Berett-Koehler Publishers

⁷ Developing and Evaluating capacity in research and Development Organizations, ISNAR Briefing paper 62, September 2003

⁸ Danida: “A Results Oriented Approach to Capacity Change” and “Evaluation: Capacity development outcome evaluation: field testing of the methodology”

⁹ Peter Morgan: The Idea and Practice of Systems Thinking and their relevance for Capacity Development, ECDPM. March 2005

¹⁰ John Mayne: Addressing Contribution through contribution analysis: Using performance measures sensibly”, 2001 Canadian Journal of Program Evaluation, Volume 18



which self-organization can flourish – a sense of direction, guidelines and shared values” (Peter Morgan)

“Contribution analysis seeks to provide plausible evidence to reduce the uncertainty over the “difference” a program is making” (John Mayne).

Distinguishing different types of change: The evaluation attempts to capture both “up-stream” results and change – the direct influence on program participants – and “downstream” results – what participants do with skills and insights they acquire from the program as they engage as leaders. To facilitate analysis a distinction is made between three types of change¹¹:

Episodic change: well-defined, time-bound results directly attributable to the programme, for example the formal training sessions that the coaches have conducted.

Developmental change: occurs over time and is represented as a sequence of steps taken by individuals, teams, organizations, or communities that aim to achieve a specific outcome, for example the sustained change in behaviour of participants (upstream) or the implementation of the MAP commitments.

Transformational change: are fundamental shifts in individual, organizational, community or societal values and perspectives that are emergent over time but may appear episodic when notices, such as the move from “mora mora” to a results-focus.

The three types of results are seen as concurrent, in contrast to logic models where results are generally seen in chronological order – the results chain from input to impact.

In terms of methods, two types of inquiry are used: evidential and evocative¹². While the first supports deductive reasoning, the latter supports inductive judgement: Evidential inquiry attempts to capture and represent facts regarding what is happening and seeks descriptive, numeric and physical evidence of programme impact. Evocative evidence seeks the perspectives and sentiments of those influenced by the programme, directly or as subsequent beneficiaries of participants’ actions. Evocative inquiry is employed to assess a reaction to the change process as a whole rather than its parts, consistent with the wish as stated above, to gain understanding of the programme and how it works and achieves results, rather than knowledge about specific limited outputs.

Hence evaluative work and monitoring data has been used where available, combined with perception analysis and stories, which has been validated and triangulated where possible including through interviews and with evidence gathered from the media, government gazette, minutes from “Conseils de ministres” etc. Focus group discussions and personal observation have been important sources as has evidence provided through video clips of the President and ministers discussing leadership challenges in various fora.

¹¹ An Open Systems Perspective on Evaluating Leadership development: John T. Grove, Barry M. Kibel and Taylor Haas in The Handbook of Leadership Evaluation, CCL

¹² John T. Grove, Barry M. Kibel and Taylor Haas, 2005, EvaluLead: A Guide to Shaping and Evaluating Leadership Development Programs



Key evaluation sources and methods throughout the process (including for the Mid-term review) has included:

- ◆ Document review and content analysis of monitoring reports of PREA/PGDI, press coverage of the MAP process and activities at NLIM, post-course assessment from NLIM and ENAM, M&E reports from the MAP process, various results frameworks (Politique generale de l'etat, regional development plans, Plans de Travail Annual inter alia), video tapes with ministers and coach, DVD from CdF training;
- ◆ Interviews (open and based on strategic selection) with President, Prime minister, ministers/Secretary Generals/Chefs de Region, Chefs de Fokontany, Mayors, NLIM staff and management, ENAM staff and management, MAP and RRI coaches, MAP team, donors, and private sector;
- ◆ Focus group discussion with MAP team, coaches and trainers' trainers for the CdF training, graduating students of the NLIM.
- ◆ Direct observation

Evaluation Questions

The evaluation is based on the proposed OECD/DAC Evaluation Quality Standards¹³ and the five DAC criteria: relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact, sustainability.

In addition to these five criteria, a number of specific evaluation questions were developed organized around six clusters (see annex 1 for detailed questions):

- ◆ Conceptualization and design
- ◆ Results and Impact
- ◆ Implementation - risks
- ◆ Sustainability
- ◆ Evaluative process/Follow-up to Mid-term report
- ◆ Replicability and policy implications

Chapter 3: Program Description

The TLP was initially conceived as one of three components to a comprehensive leadership program. This, however, evolved; the first two components were completed¹⁴ and the TLP started taking shape in April 2004 when Dean Williams, a professor of Public Leadership at Harvard University's Kennedy School of Government held a series of interviews to identify the specific transformational leadership challenges in Madagascar.

¹³ DAC Evaluation Network: DAC Evaluation Quality Standards

¹⁴ D. Kabell: World Bank Group Supported Leadership and Management Initiatives in Madagascar 2004-2005. Synthesis of Evaluation Findings 6 Report I-IV, April 2006

The diagnostic work that was carried out permitted the identification of five major areas of improvement: leading and managing change, increasing the capacity of staff, better communication, changing the mindset of the civil servants, and enhance the leadership capacity of executives.

Each area was supported by evidence gathered through interviews with Ministers in the cabinet and with senior civil servants and included a wide array of issues ranging from the need to change mindsets and revisiting the traditional set of core values to the need for systemic change that would enhance the effectiveness of the government.

Dean Williams formed a small team of consultants to work with him to facilitate the TLP. The key members were Dean Williams and Paul Porteous, joined for short periods by Frank Peach, Vichit Ith, and Luc Roullet. The consulting team has developed a Malagasy consulting team in the Presidency to carry on this work. This team is known as the MAP Advisory Team and consist of a group of committed, often bi-lingual mid-career professionals. All the consultants have been trained by Dean Williams in adaptive leadership consulting.

This diagnostic work has since been refined and is increasingly undertaken not by the consulting team *for* the government but *with* the government both in collective settings such as cabinet meetings or with individuals where the coaches facilitate reflexion on this when discussing specific challenges and how to deal with them. It is indeed a very central component of the whole approach and one where capacity according to interviewees has increased as more and more individuals master and apply the concepts and analytical models, with the help for example of tools developed by the MAP team.

In order to better understand the programme and its evolution, below is a short summary of the two phases, although Phase One is not included in the scope of this evaluation.

Phase One

A proposal for phase one was submitted in April 2004. The project document explains the underlying philosophy: “transformational change is at its essence about changing values. The process includes critically examining the prevailing underlying assumptions, habits and priorities that exist in government – and protecting what’s valuable and discarding what no longer is useful. [] Through the transformation process a culture of constraint, bureaucracy, resignation, and mediocrity can be interrupted and replaced by a culture that supports action, initiative, innovation, accountability, participation, and commitment”¹⁵

This has remained the philosophy and ambition for Phase Two.

At the end of Phase One a self assessment was carried out to help reflect on outcomes and better target Phase Two. It recorded the following systemic outcomes:

- ◆ Developed leadership capacity in certain quarters of government

¹⁵ Madagascar Transformation Project. Phase One

- ◆ Helped the President become more strategically focused and establish priorities to make his vision a reality
- ◆ Contributed to the emergence of a new possibility for action and accomplishment with particular ministries
- ◆ Helped facilitate a clearer understanding of the problems blocking progress and the challenges facing the country in certain sectors
- ◆ Begun to mobilize people and stakeholders to address tough problems
- ◆ Developed in certain ministries a vision, strategy and priorities
- ◆ Contributed to the improvement in communication and coordination in particular areas of government
- ◆ Raised awareness of the importance of leadership
- ◆ Helped establish the foundation for Phase Two

In addition, a series of outcomes were identified in the following areas, specifically related to leadership capacity: Women’s participation; Private sector, investment and job creation; Lessons from Singapore; Education and Transformation; Transportation and Infrastructure Building, Land tenure; The regions and decentralization; The environment; Presidential Leadership.

While few of these were specifically mentioned in the project document for Phase One, and hence may be considered “emergent outcomes” they are nevertheless important results, but not within the scope of the current evaluation.

A key insight on the M&E side from this phase however, is that this type of program is by its nature transformational and thus goals and targets may evolve as insights are generated and new capacity built. This needs to be taken into account when defining and developing an appropriate evaluation approach. Given this insight, the question for M&E of Phase Two has included reflection on the advantages and disadvantages of primarily goal-based assessment framework or the need for more system based frameworks that might better capture emergent outcomes. As is evident from Chapter two, a mix of approaches is being used; this too can be considered an “emergent outcome” as it is partly based on the insights from Phase One.

Phase Two

Phase Two was initiated in December 2005 and builds to a large extent on the diagnostic work and the foundations laid by the first phase. Key objectives of Phase One, as recorded in the project Document for Phase Two included: diagnosis of primary leadership challenges, diagnosis of leadership capacity to address those challenges, and an understanding on the one hand of the work avoidance dynamics, persistent problems, and serious breakdowns in the system and on the other, the leadership strategies needed to address them.

The purpose of Phase Two, according to the project document, is: “to continue strengthening the leadership capacity of the President, the Prime Minister, and designated

ministries and Regions to deliver on the Government’s Poverty Reduction Strategy and contribute to the rapid development of the country”. Specifically, the project will “move to completion many initiatives that have been formulated, planned, or started in the first phase”.

The goals of the TLP (phase two) are to:

- ◆ Establish Priorities
- ◆ Broaden participation and buy-in
- ◆ Develop a cadre of change agents
- ◆ Enhance the leadership capacity of key people
- ◆ Identify and remove bottlenecks
- ◆ Get leaders to challenge systemic boundaries and practices
- ◆ Ensure the development of a new body of leaders through the National Leadership Program

The priority areas of focus are attached in Annex 2.

As the program evolves and results are achieved, the mix and type of activities and interventions is continuously adjusted, but the basic approach is consistent, with its key elements of:

- ◆ Coaching key individuals;
- ◆ Demonstrate what leadership looks like
- ◆ Giving practical advice and suggestions on ways to address problems and take advantage of opportunities;
- ◆ Being a partner in collaborative problem solving and thinking through alternatives and strategies; and
- ◆ Challenging prevailing assumptions and strategies when these appear counter productive or are impeding progress.

Feedback from participants revealed a strong appreciation for the case-based training using Malagasy reality, and for the individual coaching sessions, although interviewees also recognised the limits of this.

“The most important element is that it is not “formation” but “immersion”; the coaching helps me become aware of what I do and what might be alternatives as I am immersed in my leadership work.”

The programme aims to have an impact at the “upstream” level of individuals, discussing mindset, addressing behavioural issues and attitude, and understanding of role and

systems dynamics. It also aims to improve group processes through collaborative problem solving. And it aims, through the transformational nature, to generate systemic learning and institutionalization of this learning in new processes and working methods i.e. an impact at the “downstream” level.

Through the interaction with the coaches and through more formalized training sessions, participants are exposed to a number of useful concepts and analytical tools. These include distinguishing between authority and leadership, between adaptive and technical challenges, and carrying out a solid diagnostic of the leadership challenge using a model with six different types of leadership challenges: activist, development, transition, maintenance, creative and crisis challenges. When using and applying these concepts, participants consciously or unconsciously contribute to the organizational or systemic learning that is necessary to address key problems.

A brief summary of the results achieved as assessed at the mid-term evaluation, and at the final evaluation, is presented below. Further detail on the latter is given in the subsequent chapters.

Box 1: Achievement of Leadership Goals for Phase 2

| Goals of Phase 2 | Assessment at Mid-term Evaluation | Assessment at Final evaluation |
|---|---|---|
| Establish Priorities | The MAP is a prioritized roadmap towards a set of clear national goals. Priority setting will remain a key issue for the implementation phase. | The MAP is seen as a second generation PRSP, with higher country ownership, and broad donor alignment to support the government. The process of setting priorities has become more collective and participative and the mobilization around one national agenda rather than individual sectors is a real achievement. |
| Broaden participation and buy-in | The MAP process is universally credited with a very high level of consultation and dialogue. The extent to which a dialogue based process similar to the MAP process will be used in the future in Madagascar, including for the budget, may be a good indicator of enhanced capacity. | The inclusive way of policy making has been taken a step further with three major initiatives: the holding of Mini-cabinet meetings at regional level from time to time, a series of Presidential dialogues on each of the MAP commitments, and a major training and empowerment program for Chefs de Fokontany to accelerate the decentralized implementation of the MAP. The result has been that the MAP is firmly routed in the whole administration, irrespective of sector and hierarchy. |
| Develop a cadre of change agents | Some individuals have been identified in different ministries and have worked with the consultants and assimilated the leadership approach, but there is a need to do the same with a wider pool of staff in the Presidency, the Executive and at decentralized levels, as well as for more formalized teams for the implementation of the MAP. | The MAP team, together with newly appointed Secretary Generals (SG) and Director Generals (DG) and the Chefs de region make up the backbone of change agents. To these should now be added 17.500 Chefs de Fokontany and the graduates of the National Leadership Programme. |
| Enhance the leadership capacity of key people | The coaches have worked closely with the President, Ministers, Secretaries General, selected Ambassadors, and Chefs de region. Individual (self)assessments should be carried out in the final evaluation to fully assess the extent and nature of this new capacity. | The circles of people who have been exposed to the concepts and models of leadership is widening and there are examples of “cascading” exposure. There are concerns however that some key groups have not benefited sufficiently (“Missing middle”) and there are also concerns that close follow-up with Chefs de Fokontany is needed. (The decentralized coaching approach is under development). |



| | | |
|---|--|---|
| Identify and remove bottlenecks | Diagnostic analysis has been carried out in all sectors, and focus on addressing key bottlenecks has been (to January 2007) on the following priorities, selected by the President: Transport, Education, Economy and Private Sector, Environment, Health, Infrastructure, Prison Reform, Security, Women. | Examples abound of how crisis were resolved and constraints overcome, while capacity was developed in the process. The real proof, however, is in the pudding; i.e. in the achievement of the Map commitment, hence the critical importance of a M&E system to track performance on this. |
| Get leaders to challenge systemic boundaries and practices | Need for more in depth interviews with a larger number of people to make an assessment. | Good examples of peoples doing so at individual level in interviews; issue may be if cultural norms are shifting and it is becoming accepted and considered as constructive in more collective or public settings. |
| Ensure the development of a new body of leaders through the National Leadership Program | 33 students are currently enrolled. M&E system still needs to be developed to assess the quality of the program and learning by participants. | 32 students graduated. NLIM still need strengthening in terms of management and governance. |

Chapter 4: Success Stories

A number of key success stories that indicate the progress is being made were mentioned repeatedly. In view of the user-focused approach chosen, it is important to record these successes as perceived by the primary people involved; for the purpose of the evaluation, three have been singled out representing important results in terms of episodic change, developmental change, and transformational change. Keeping in mind that these are concurrent and that an episodic change may indeed contain the seeds for a transformational change for example, future evaluative work should re-assess these to track and understand the evolutionary aspects.

The three cases have been selected because they were mentioned several times as examples of perceived successes where leadership had played a great part in achieving results and where the new concepts, skills, and approaches to different types of leadership challenges had been applied

Episodic Change: Beginning to Build Leadership Capacity at the Local Level

A key example of episodic change would be the training of more than 17.500 community chiefs known as Chefs de Fokontany (CdF), an enterprise that it is not possible to do full justice in a few paragraphs and which it is hoped that the Government will document separately.

After the President’s re-election in early 2007, it was decided to strengthen the decentralization process and to build leadership capacity from the bottom. Therefore, a programme was initiated to provide leadership training to all 17.500 CdF – the Fokontany being the lowest administrative unit in Madagascar. This group of potentially powerful change agents had previously been left pretty much to themselves and been mainly occupied by keeping various records, such as records of people moving from one Fokontany to another. The purpose of the program therefore was to build the leadership skills of the community chiefs and to also enrol them in the goals and objectives of the Madagascar Action Plan. It was realized that if progress was to be made, the community chiefs needed to understand and own the MAP. Traditionally, the community chiefs spent

most of their time doing bureaucratic work in their offices; the goal of the training was to move them out of the office and into the field, working on real problems with their community rather than keeping records and signing papers.

A formidable challenge, the training took place in Antananarivo, where the 17.500 CdF were invited from all across the country in six batches for a three day/six module course, much of which was facilitated discussion and exploration on their own leadership challenges. The President addressed every group, and they were briefed about the MAP and their own role, and exposed to fundamental concepts and methods of leadership, including conceptual, analytical and practical tools. Much of the work was carried out in 45 groups of 60 with two trainers: these groups were in turn split into small groups of five. The training team was composed of a group of 20 trainers' trainers and close to 100 trainers who were trained specifically for this.

The logistics, programme contents and documentation development was orchestrated by the TLP in a joint undertaking between the Ministry of Decentralization, the National Leadership Institute (NLIM) and Ecole National d'Administration de Madagascar (ENAM) with the support of some donors, especially UNICEF and UNDP – in itself a transformational exercise for the institutions involved according to some interviewees.

The potential impact of this is considerable, but is too early to judge at this point. What is obvious is that the public awareness of the importance and role of the CdF has increased and hence their social and political status. Indeed, anecdotal feedback says that impact has been considerable in terms of emboldening and empowering the CdF, and raising awareness of their role, giving them the status they should rightly have but have not always claimed. Clearly, there are potentially important gains in terms of mobilization, but it still remains to be seen how this is capitalized in terms of concrete development results.

Each CdF has committed at the end of the training to initiate three development initiatives and there is a need both for follow-up and for a system is to track how this is done, what they decide to do, how, and with what impact. A huge investment has been made, with a great potential but also risk, including reputational and in terms of motivation. It will be imperative to support the process and to continue to track how this unfolds to ensure that the programme stays on track and intended benefits of this investment do occur.

Also, this is rare opportunity to integrate evaluation with program delivery, to work with CdF to set up tracking systems, and to build up a system of self assessment that will contribute to capacity development and demonstrate the value of evidence based decision making. There is much potential (and need) for innovative evaluation designs that would appeal to CdF including the use of storytelling and video-based evaluation and piloting Most Significant Change Technique¹⁶ That could be a really pioneering M&E work that should be undertaken by local institutions with external support only where necessary.

¹⁶ See for example: The Most Significant Change “MSG” Technique: a Guide to its Use by RJ Davies and J Dart

Developmental Change: Creating a Plan that the People Own

The “incontournable” development result is the Madagascar Action Plan (MAP), a comprehensive results framework developed through a wide consultative process which unifies various levels of government around a common goal. The key result is not the document alone, nor the strategy, or the institutions created; the key leadership result is the very example of leadership going beyond the individual level: it is the systems and processes that have emerged, the skills and knowledge that has been generated, the patterns of relationships and structures that shape these relationships and which have changed over the course of the work on the MAP, and become more and more imbedded in organizational culture and individual behaviours. And, according to very many of the persons interviewed, the MAP process is injecting a new energy into the government which results in faster implementation and a continuous focus on results.

A significant leadership change is in the way the MAP was developed and communicated. Consistent feedback both from donors and government staff highlight the difference between the “old” PRSP and the MAP in terms of ownership, outreach, dialogue and shared diagnosis. The MAP was an essential element for example in the training of the CdF. It is not a bureaucratic report for donor consumption, but is meant as a unifying framework that will help the country move towards its vision.

The MAP was developed through a consultative process involving all stakeholders, with considerable focus on the regional level. Collective diagnostic work formed the basis for prioritization of key challenges and desired development outcomes and resulted in the identification of eight MAP Commitments. Subsequently, other results frameworks have been aligned (or are in the process of alignment), and are shaped to support it including the annual Politique generale de l’etat, the sectoral strategies, the regional and communal development plans, the annual ministerial business plans etc. The MAP thus becomes the guiding results framework for the whole of the government, meaning that donors too should align their assistance to the MAP goal and commitments.

The key question now is implementation, and results measurement. As mentioned elsewhere, the government’s M&E capacity remains weak and therefore there is a risk that insufficient knowledge is available to track implementation performance and adjust as needed. (See chapter 6 for more analysis of this).

An example of concurrent *episodic, developmental and transformational change* may be found for example at the individual level. The coaches had identified a particularly dynamic staff member in the Ministry of Transport who received coaching and used his new skills and knowledge to effect change in the ministry. The staff member was concurrently accepted as a student in the National Leadership Program and graduated as one of the first cohorte – an episodic result. He was, while still in the programme appointed Secretary General in the ministry of Justice – if taking a career perspective this is a developmental result. The models and insights he gained through his participation in the national leadership programme helped him better analyze the issues facing him as a secretary general and shaped his leadership agenda when tackling difficult issues there, a transformational result.



Transformational Change: Moving from Talk to Action and from Action to Results

The Handbook on Leadership Development from the Centre for Creative Leadership¹⁷ defines transformative results as results that “represent a cross roads or an unanticipated new road for an individual, organization or community”. An example of a new road frequently mentioned during interviews, and where evidential evidence is found, was Madagascar’s performance at the Indian Ocean Island Games in August 2007. This proved a surprise and was the result of a deliberate leadership effort.

The Indian Ocean Island Games are held under the auspices of the country’s Olympic Committee and more than 200 athletes from seven islands in the Indian Ocean competed in 16 various sports. The event was considered so important that the day of the opening ceremony was declared a public holiday. The games were also identified as a leadership challenge and an innovative strategy was deployed where each minister was appointed coach in a discipline. (Several months later posters and calls for support to teams were still visible in ministries). This generated energy, strong personal and collective commitment, and a desire to demonstrate results which led to a host of innovative thinking in terms of mobilizing resources and motivating teams. It paid off: Madagascar won 101 gold medals this year against 27 gold medals in 2003, and also for the first time ever won the largest number of medals of all participating countries.

While the medals are a type of evidential evidence, evocative inquiry also reveals the level of transformational change when a very high level official states that “I had never thought we could change so much and so fast” and highlights three new leadership strengths: mobilization, delegation and assuming responsibility which in his view are the secret behind this success.

The Indian Ocean Island Games were important for the President of Madagascar and the cabinet because they wanted to present Madagascar to the region as a nation that was becoming increasingly more professional and serious in its commitment to development. The President also want to send a very clear message to the people of Madagascar that national pride was a direct consequence of team effort, hard work and focus. The Games were an important contribution to commitment number 8 in the Madagascar Action Plan – Build National Solidarity. The organization of the Games was seen as a test for the Government to see how well they could work as a team and show others what was possible through the better application of the leadership principles they had been taught.

Although the importance and relevance of the Island Games to Madagascar’s development objectives may be questioned (and in that sense also the decision to invest so much effort in them), they are nevertheless a clear example that new leadership capacity has been created, and can be mobilized for different purposes. The questions to pay attention to of course, is how that capacity is now being used, for what purposes, and how sustainable it is. Some pointers may emerge from the next chapters.

¹⁷ K. M. Hannum, J. W. Martineau, C.Reinelt, (ed): The Handbook of Leadership Development Evaluation, CCL, 2007

Chapter 5: Key Findings at Systemic Level

The theoretical insight that this chapter builds upon is what has emerged, inter alia from the comprehensive work of David Horton on capacity building in research institutions:

“Individuals possess capacities in the form of knowledge, skills, and attitudes. Individual staff members make these capacities available to their organization but, when they leave, their capacities often go out of the door with them. However, when individuals share their knowledge, skills, and attitudes with others and when these capacities become imbedded in group activities and processes, it can be said that they become part of the group’s capacity. And when individual and group capacities are widely shared among the organization’s members and become incorporated into the organization’s culture, strategies, structures, management systems, and operating procedures, they become truly organizational capacities¹⁸.”

With this in mind, the evaluation focused on trying to gauge the extent to which individual learning had taken place, had been shared, had become institutionalized, and had resulted in organizational learning and real sustainable change.

Much of the evaluative evidence, including interviews, videos with Ministers in other settings (Madagascar’s Minister for education at Capacity Day for example) training material for Chefs de Fokontany etc. demonstrate that there has been a clear appropriation of the vocabulary and the concepts. Again and again, references are made to authority vs. leadership, to technical vs adaptive challenges, to “holding environment” and to different types of leadership strategies. For the people who are in regular contact with the coaches and the programme, these concepts have clearly become part of their “tool box” as managers and leaders, and several interviewees stated that it had had significant impact on their effectiveness; the statement in the box below is testimony to this.

“Before, when facing a problem, we spent a lot of time trying to find out how to start tackling it; now we have a clear diagnostic and analytical framework that we all know and can apply without too much discussion, and hence we can go straight to discussing the key issues.”

The same is likely to be the case for the Chefs de Fokontany and the Mayors who have also been exposed in various settings to the leadership programme. However, a question remains on the technical, mid-management level – the deconcentrated services of the ministries.

These levels are more drawn into the programme through the new ways of working including through the more collaborative decision-making processes. There is clear evidence for example from interviews of a significant change in the way Cabinet meetings are held. From being very formal and essentially a somewhat ritual exchange of information, they have become real working sessions where Ministers have a collegial dialogue on systemic issues, and how to assume their collective responsibility. This new

¹⁸Evaluating capacity Development: Experiences from Research and Development Organizations around the World; ISNAR and IDRC and CTA, 2003

sense of shared/collective responsibility does not only apply to the highest level of Government, but seems to be spreading throughout the ministries. It is supported by new formal and informal coordination structures which are key to the sustainability of the change-process.

Evidence of this is found for example in the case description of Madagascar for the assessment of the implementation of the Paris Declaration¹⁹. This report mentions that during the MAP formulation, “the government consulted stakeholders through a series of national, regional and thematic workshops”. Similarly, stakeholders were consulted for the validation of the Regional Development Plans in early 2005 and for sector strategies in 2005 and 2006. The DAC report also stresses that “private sector participation in both policy formulation and implementation is becoming stronger” institutionalized in the *Comité d’Appui au Pilotage de l’Entreprise (CAPE)* which includes the regional level. Thus, new consultative processes are emerging, some of which are formalized and institutionalized.

A precondition for constructive involvement of stakeholders is transparency, and a considerable investment has been made in developing the government’s web-based information portals. For example, the MAP website is very well developed - with the worrying exception of the section on MAP implementation arrangements. Documents such as minutes of the “Conseil des ministres” are available on the Presidency’s website.

An important motivating factor and one credited with contributing to infuse the much mentioned “new energy” is the fact that through the new ways of working, the whole picture becomes visible and understandable, each person understands the stakes. As explained very illustratively by one interviewee:

“Before we only saw one level, and did not always understand why things moved the way they did. We were on our bicycles and did not know where we were heading; now we are up in the Boeing we see the big picture, we see where the bicycles need to go to achieve our results. We are more motivated and more effective.”

The joint effect of these new processes and new capacity is credited with also reinforcing a set of new values and a shared sense of urgency. Among staff close to the Presidency, from where much of the change is orchestrated, there is also a strong appreciation for what is seen as new values. These are taught during classes, in formal training where participants are made aware of the implications of the values such as “fihavanana” and practices such as “mora mora”²⁰, for example during the CdF training. Values are also a frequent subject in presidential speeches and interventions in collegial settings where the sense of urgency is stressed along with the obligation to take initiative and assume responsibility.

The combined effect of new values, stronger mobilization, more effective processes, and a pervading sense of urgency, should be visible in the speed of implementation of the MAP. This however, cannot at this time be measured with any certainty.

¹⁹ Madagascar, November 29, 2006, OECD/DAC

²⁰ Very simplistically, the first refers to an attachment to the past and to family, and the latter is reminiscent of the concept of “festina lente” – hurry slowly.



In sum, both interviews and other supporting evidence showed a strong general appreciation for the changes that are happening and the TLP is credited with important results in terms of outputs and outcomes, as well as behavioural and process change. Most of all, however, the Programme is credited with having laid the groundwork for systemic change.

Chapter 6: Half Full or Half Empty?

The TLP' approach clearly focuses on the need for change in the culture of government and getting people to be more responsible for their problems and challenges. Madagascar has had a highly bureaucratized civil service where rules, red-tape and personal status were more important than service and contribution; the TLP has been the first serious intervention to explicitly try to shift the mindsets and behaviour towards a results focus, a focus on responsibility and action. Fundamentally, the goal of the TLP has been to change the governance culture of Madagascar, a very high-level and long-term goal. Given the time involved, what the current evaluation can do is to try to assess if the TLP seem to be on the right track, and point out areas of success, and areas where more effort seem to be needed.

An important part of the culture change process has been in getting the President and his cabinet to be more focused on key results, and breaking the “silo” mentality. In the past, the cabinet rarely worked together to address shared national problems; this was one of the key findings from the very first leadership interventions that the Banked helped finance. While there is still some way to go, this does however seem to be changing. The quality of dialogue in the cabinet has, according to interviews, improved significantly. This, in turn, has improved the quality of problem solving and decision making. There is now a greater sense of cohesiveness and coherence at the top levels of government.

A shift in values and practices at the very top has induced change in other aspects of governance; these include as mentioned above a new coherence, energy and dynamism, and a greater sense of ownership and commitment for the MAP, and new processes of collective and more transparent decision-making. It is clear that in many quarters that the government as a whole is becoming more professional. A key word here is “becoming.” The process has begun, but the challenge is to ensure the institutionalization of new habits, practices and systems.

One example of positive reform is the process of filling the posts of Secretaries General (SG) and Director Generals (DG) which it is hoped will become standard practice. Selection committees were set up with participation from the Presidency, the Prime Minister's office, PGDI and the ministry of Civil Service who sifted through all written applications and made recommendations on a short list. Only applicants on the shortlist were interviewed and the interview panel included representatives of civil society. Focus was not only on technical skills, but also on leadership skills (see box).



Candidates to the posts of SG are expected to demonstrate:

- 1) Leadership and understanding of MAP reforms: Advanced ability to achieve MAP reforms through outstanding leadership and results orientation
- 2) Management: Excellent management skills in dealing with reforms and complex issues, including management of human and financial resources
- 3) Attitude, Commitment and Motivation: Outstanding commitment and motivation in all aspects of their work, reliability and integrity and an ability to inspire others towards reform
- 4) Relationships and Partnerships: A proven capacity to develop and maintain effective partnerships both within Ministries and with external stakeholders
- 5) Communication: Demonstrated ability to communicate effectively, orally and in writing, including effectiveness in consultation, negotiation and representation.

The end result was a set of young, competent, energetic professionals recruited through a transparent and competitive process where leadership skills were among the key qualities required. This was in stark contrast to previous practice of nominations based on intransparent criteria and without due process. In general today, there is a perception of a young team of “movers and shakers” at the highest levels of Government and in the decentralized services and the recruitment process and visibility given to the new SGs and DGs have probably contributed to this perception.

Another perceived positive change is the shift “from tunnel vision to inclusiveness” and a reduced distance between top and bottom, as well as a shift from “silo mentality” to higher horizontal collaborations, within and across ministries. This is partly the result of the dialogue processes and higher degree of transparency. This is supported by a coherent results framework – the MAP process and the processes and documents that link up to it, such as the annual Politique generale de l’etat, the Regional Development Plans, the Annual Development Plans of each ministry etc. This does indeed add up to an impressive framework where all key planning processes are linked and where results in one area will depend and build on outcomes in another. However, there still seem to be a challenge in refining the link between the budget and the MAP and ensure that Map priorities are adequately reflected in the Medium-Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF).

So much for the fairly unanimous positive changes; however, while appreciated and perceived as positive, voices are also heard tempering the positive assessment and lighting a few warning lights.

The three key areas of concern are linked to institutional issues, to the depth of change, and to sustainability.

With respect to institutional issues, there is concern that accountabilities are not always clear and that there is weak follow-up. The diagnostic process and the dialogue with stakeholders to identify problems and agree on solutions seem to work very well. However, when it comes to deciding who is doing the follow-up, and holding that person or institution accountable, there is perceived to be serious flaws sometimes, meaning that



these processes have not been as well developed and internalized as the “up-stream” processes.

The depth of the change is another issue of concern. There is a fairly strong consensus on the need to work more targeted with the deconcentrated services and the mid-level management. Views on the change vary from the very sweeping “I had never expected to see that degree of change in Madagascar” to the more modest, “seen from my vantage point, it is merely small lights here and there.” While there are more positive perceptions than negative overall, the latter however does go to show that it is important to assess progress and be transparent about the degree of change so that perceptions are not too far from the reality, a reality that should inform the further development and direction of the programme.

At the individual level, two statements reveal the differences of perception:

”People want to change”

”I struggle for survival”

This shows that the change-process may be uneven. Closest to the “Heat” or the “Heart” (the Presidency), there is a wish and a willingness to change, and the very process attracts individuals with that set of values and dedication. Further away, however, some SGs are having a hard time being effective, leading change processes in ministries where motivation and capacity is low, old networks constrain their ability to manoeuvre, and where the sense of urgency and direction has not yet fully penetrated.

Indeed, statements like “Le cloisonnement persiste” (“silo mentality remains”) are also heard, meaning that there are still strong barriers to reducing hierarchy and improving horizontal coordination. The very first evaluation of the World Bank’s first leadership programme showed a concern with “la logique sectorielle”, i.e. the well known effect of “turf” between ministries which reduces effectiveness and works against joint outcomes. This, thus seem to be a hardnosed problem that the TLP may be loosening up through the more collective processes, but has not solved. Linked to this is the issue of poor communication, an issue that also persist and on which the TLP may not have dwelled in a sufficiently systematic way to deliver visible and recognized results.

Chapter 7: Loose Ends and Complimentary Work

A major challenge for the evaluation has been that the programme spans so widely and has the ambition to have so deep an impact; keeping focus therefore has meant hard prioritising. In this chapter five key dimensions have been singled out because they are seen to be essential for achieving sustainable results in the future.

Missing Middle?

The very fist issue concerns the depth of the change and which staff groups are “on board”. Concern about this has been voiced since the start of the programme and is documented in the first evaluation reports where many participants talked about the need



to enlarge the concentric circles, i.e. starting with the individuals who had received training and coaching, their most immediate team and peers should be trained and so forth so the effect would ripple through the ministries in waves. The extent to which has happened seems modest, judging from the most recent country evaluation of Madagascar²¹: “In contrast with earlier regimes, the current administration (at the highest levels) is decisive and unusually reform minded, and this gives some confidence that policies and outcomes will be sustained. On the other hand, it is unclear how much the commitment and dynamism of the upper echelons of the current administration have filtered down to the staff responsible for the implementation of the reform agenda “

The approach of the earlier types of leadership programmes, which focused more on individuals and less on systems and processes, thus seem to have had some results, but the depth of the change-process has been limited. In contrast, the TLP approach has brought about significant change at the systemic level as evidenced by the above.

However, interviews revealed a concern with two specific levels or groups: one was what is termed “les services déconcentrés”, the line-ministry staff at regional and local level, the other is the level of mid-level management in the line ministries.

The Chefs de Region (who are appointed by the President) and their teams have received coaching and formal training and have expressed appreciation for this. But their counterparts representing the line-ministries at the regional level have not, nor have Directors and “Chefs de service” in the ministries in any systematic way. This was highlighted by some interviewees as a clear limitation to achieving development results and delivering the expectations of the MAP. The two groups need to work together as teams and accept shared responsibility for the implementation of the MAP. They need to be on a “level playing field” in terms of leadership skills in order to truly achieve the expected development outcomes at their level.

There are thus indications of a growing demand for leadership training coming from both central and deconcentrated administration. To deliver that, a strong cooperation between the Ministry of Public Service who is responsible Human Resource policies, capacity development and staff training, and NLIM in partnership with ENAM and other relevant institutions could be one element in widening the concentric circles of agents of change.

The Ground Level

The second issue is that of how to sustain the remarkable process that has been set in motion with the training of the community chiefs, the CdF. This has been a huge investment, but to ensure the full benefit, systematic follow-up is needed.

When the CdF return to their Fokontany, they will take new initiatives, they will meet resistance and they will face a large number of challenges. The training may have prepared them for some of these challenges, and the successes they will hopefully also

²¹ IEG, report nr. 38213, December 2006 evaluation of Madagascar Country Assistance evaluation

have, may help motivate them to continue; however, they will still need a support structure, somebody to talk to, to discuss problems with, to share concerns. The coaches filled that role during the training and the Government has decided to set up decentralized leadership coaching and is now considering how best to extend the support needed to the CdF. The quality of that support structure will be critically important for the sustainability of the results.

A solid M&E system should be a core component of any support structure. The Government deserves much recognition for its courage in using such innovative approaches; it is all the more important that the process is a learning-process with adequate feedback loops to allow for adjustment if needed, but also that it documents the process and the results as this deserves to be shared with a wider audience.

“Capitalization” and Exit Strategy.

The third issue is fundamental for the sustainability dimension. Given the nature of the programme, what is at stake is whether there are (or will be within a reasonable time frame) leaders, who are able to continue: “orchestrating the processes and constructive engagement that lead to sustainable development outcomes”, as stated in the introduction.

Several interviewees raised the issue of “capitalization”, i.e. fully leveraging the achievements, sharing knowledge and insights, ensuring that the capacity is there to continue the processes, not in a mechanical way, but to continue to shape it and direct it.

In the long term, NLIM must play a key role in this if it is to demonstrate its value; partnership with other key local institutions (such as the one initiated with ENAM) will have to be deepened and formalized; there is an urgent need to make NLIM fully effective. To gain the necessary credibility and be able to attract funding, students and partners, NLIM needs a formally appointed CEO, a Board, a fully developed programme, including an M&E system, and a more clearly defined role. Urgent attention to this is needed on the part of the government, to ensure sustainability in the long term, and to effectively cope with the increased demand for leadership training. Inability to do so may seriously jeopardize achievements till now; it could be seen by potential partners and sponsors as a wasted opportunity, and thus further aggravate difficulties of mobilizing the necessary support.

In the short term, the keys are with the present change agents - in particular the MAP team. The team has provided much of the drive and energy that help move the process forward. In their own words they are “a disturbing force” that continuously questions the old ways and habits and values, a very difficult role. And a role that can only be successfully filled by individuals with a very thorough knowledge and understanding of the culture, institutions and systems they work in, and who command the respect of the people with whom they work. That respect is earned through the contribution they are seen to make, not through titles or formal positions. They therefore need to have a good feedback system to tell them what that contribution is and how it is perceived to continue to be effective.



Some of the resistance and the doubts (“the glass half full”) referred to above may be overcome if there was seen to be a clear exit strategy in place, if it was clear that the programme within a reasonable timeframe would no longer need expatriate consultants in the drivers seat. “Endogenization” is the word that is sometimes used; there seem to be a desire for clarity on how and when the reliance on the Harvard team would be phased out and the processes set in motion could to a larger extent rely on national expertise and capacity.

Process Review

While much has indeed been achieved as is evident from the above, there is however still an unmanageable administrative burden on many managers, SGs and ministers.

Firstly, there is a need to streamline reporting. The results framework in Madagascar is remarkable, but involves a considerable reporting burden, and contrary to good practice in performance management, people who spend time reporting rarely see how that information is used, or get the benefit of it. Thus there is frustration with having to use time and resources on this, and there could be questions about the quality of the reporting that is done.

Secondly, the accountability and oversight framework needs revision. There is too much routine signing off by higher levels of authority, who do not have a remote chance of knowing what they are signing, and therefore must trust their staff blindly – making the signature a sterile bureaucratic exercise. An example is the process of hiring teachers: there are thousands of teachers in Madagascar, and hence a very, very large number of appointments over the year. The SG of education signs every letter of appointment to teachers, even temporary teachers who are hired for 6 months. Yet, he has no way of knowing if the right process of recruitment was followed, if the right person was appointed, if the right decision was made. This exercise thus takes away precious time from more important management and leadership tasks and adds no value in terms of improving governance or ensuring due process.

Thirdly, there may be a need to further examine key government processes that are at the core of the Paris Declaration principles, namely the budget process and the procurement system. If indeed donors are to use country systems as they have committed to do in the Paris Declaration, there seem to be an urgent need to improve those. World Bank reviews of the ongoing portfolio suggest that there is limited capacity for budget execution within sector ministries - notably with respect to procurement procedures and financial management. This is evidenced by execution delays in most sectors. The switch to program budgeting may have exacerbated this situation and further complexified budget execution. Delays in the implementation of procurement reforms are seen to be due in part to capacity constraints to operationalize the Operational Oversight Institution and the procurement entities in ministries.

These are core processes for enhancing public sector capacity and hence processes that should figure high on a priority list of focused leadership efforts.



Evidence Based Decision Making – More Systematic M&E

M&E is much talked about in Madagascar, but despite this, a WB review concludes that “progress toward the implementation of the M&E system has not taken place as the program had originally scheduled. In mid-2007, the Government is still in the process of developing the PRSP framework and designing the legal and institutional framework for M&E. The INSTAT remains very weak. A new census has not been implemented. With the exception of a few ministries and programs, no monitoring indicator system is in place. Delays in M&E implementation may be due to overly optimistic expectations, capacity constraints and, possibly, a low level of political priority.”²²

This latter point is clearly a leadership issue and one it is hoped that the TLP will soon address.

Indeed, a weak M&E system, weak statistics, and poor priority given to this means that decisions may be made on false grounds, that anecdotal evidence is used as a basis for important decision. It also weakens accountability as decisions may be politically driven, but in the absence of facts and hard evidence, it is impossible for stakeholders to hold leaders accountable.

Chapter 8: Further Evaluative Process

The TLP is unique in many ways, including in the way that it has been accompanied by an evaluative process from its inception. There are indeed still many lessons to be learned, and many issues to be further examined, and hence a continuation of this process is highly desirable.

It should build on the insights derived from the current process, and hence should continue to evaluate both process and product. It should have realistic expectations and be mindful of the various trade offs that are inherent in any evaluation. It should contribute to building capacity and evaluation culture, making the case for leaders to take M&E seriously so as to ensure that decisions are made on evidence rather than political preference. It should use existing reporting and administrative records. And preferably, when there are complementary initiatives, a common conceptual framework should be applied.

More traditional evaluation work may also be done simply to record and assess the outputs of the programme, at sector level, at individual level and in terms of major bottlenecks.

All this being said, the most challenging, and possibly the most rewarding – definitely the most exiting seen from a evaluator’s perspective – is the new M&E system that should be set up to accompany the CdF as they embark on their individual leadership quests.

²² ICRR Report No: ICR0000537

There is a rare opportunity to incorporate M&E from the start – to design a process from conception to follow-up, to work with CdF to set up tracking systems using existing systems such as the “tableau de bord” where possible, and to build up a system of self assessments that will contribute to capacity building and demonstrate the value of evidence based decision making.

Given the skill level of CdF and there is a real need for innovative evaluation designs that would appeal to CdF. That could be video, rather than document based, could use cases and stories as a complement to the quantitative data that are also needed, and could for example pilot methods such as the Most Significant Change Technique²³ That could be a really pioneering M&E work that should be undertaken by local institutions with external support only where necessary.

In addition to comprehensive M&E of the CdF intervention, of general interest could be smaller case studies of the successes as perceived by the government. The Indian Ocean Island Games, for example, was what would be termed an “emergent outcome”, i. e. one that was not included in TLP’s results framework, but which nevertheless is a clear though indirect result of the programme. More in depth understanding of how this came about might have some generic lessons for this type of very open-ended programmes.

Chapter 9: Conclusions and Replicability

In conclusion, the programme clearly is credited with significant results, both in terms of output, process and outcomes, and in terms of infusing new dynamics. Such dynamics are perceived to be at individual, organizational and institutional level, are evident in new processes and institutions, and are likely to - when taken together - result in the desired development outcome. Indeed, the combined effect of new values, stronger mobilization, more effective processes, and a pervading sense of urgency, should be visible in the speed of implementation of the MAP and hence in development outcomes.

Key outcomes include:

A more collective and participative process of setting priorities

The inclusive way of policy making has been taken a step further with three major initiatives: the holding of Mini-conseils at regional level from time to time, a series of Presidential dialogues on each of the MAP commitments, and a major training and empowerment program for Chefs de Fokontany.

A cadre of change agents have been developed spearheaded by the MAP team, the newly appointed Secretary Generals, Director Generals, and the Chefs de region. To these should now be added 17.500 Chefs de Fokontany and the graduates of the National Leadership Programme.

²³ See for example: The Most Significant Change “MSG” Technique: a Guide to its Use by RJ Davies and J Dart

The circles of people who have been exposed to the concepts and models of leadership is widening and there are examples of “cascading” exposure, including SGs holding training sessions for civil society organizations.

Examples abound of how crisis were resolved and constraints overcome, while capacity was developed in the process.

Challenging beliefs is a key concept of the coaching and there are many examples of peoples doing so at individual level in interviews; the extent to which this is becoming culturally accepted and considered as constructive in more collective or public settings is yet to be seen.

32 students graduated from NLIM and some are already in key leadership positions.

Both the government and the Bank deserve credit for having embarked on this without knowing fully where it might lead. And hopefully, they will see it through and address the issues raised in this paper to ensure sustainable results and reap all the benefits that are still potentially there, but need an added push

A key question to pay attention to is how the new capacity is being used, for what purposes, and how sustainable it is.

Issues needing further attention include: “the missing middle”, a comprehensive support and M&E programme for the CdF, attention to unresolved issues at NLIM, review of key business processes relating to the control and oversight framework to alleviate unnecessary workloads on high level officials, systematic follow-up to decisions, and concerted efforts at fully developing the M&E system to ensure that a system is in place including one that generates reliable and useful data, that allows leaders to take enlightened decisions based on evidence rather than anecdotes or political flair, or worse

Now, taking a step back, one might ask: “Should the Bank do this again and if yes, under which circumstances is this kind of work likely going to be most successful?”

A WBI Working paper, summarizing the experience of Madagascar²⁴, concludes inter alia that:

- ◆ It is important to have an entry point and high level commitment;
- ◆ Because it is a continuous learning process, it is necessary to have flexibility in design and implementation;
- ◆ Much depend on the coaches, their ability gain trust and operate effectively;
- ◆ Monitoring and evaluating is critical as the need for feedback loops is particularly important in a program that is “fluid by nature”.

²⁴ G.Heidenhof, S. Teggemann, C. Sjetnan: A Leadership Approach to Achieving Change in the Public Sector; The Case of Madagascar., WBI Working Paper, 2007

These are all valid points. To these however, should be added that the high leverage brought by such an approach means that it is a high stakes programme, in the sense that it has both potential high returns, but also high risk.

Given the high risk nature of such an intervention, the World Bank must also play an important role in supporting the consultants in this work. Dean Williams explains: “The success of the program to date has also been due to the support and protection received from the country and program managers of the Bank in Madagascar. They have been critical in providing feedback on concerns, fears, doubts and progress being made. Having them as supporters, critical evaluators, and occasionally as shoulders to cry on, has made the process more effective.”

The risk involved in this type of programme needs to be clearly identified and closely monitored. The programme was initiated by the President and continues to be very much top driven; it is very close to the centre of power. While recognizing the fact that this has probably been fundamental for achieving the results it has, some interviewees expressed concern about the ensuing risks for the Bank. Being as closely identified with the person in power, the Bank when funding such a programme must monitor the political process and popular perception closely so as to be able to detect any negative trends that may jeopardize the attainment of the programme’s development objectives.

Lastly, there are two strong trends in Madagascar and a bridge between the two that have been critical to the success of the programme and which may not be found to the same extent elsewhere. On the one hand, there is a remarkable openness at the highest level of society to new ideas, a drive for change, and a reception to external advice that not all cultures and nations have. This attitude has been cultivated by the President, and supported by the TLP; people clearly feel that change is not something being done to them but with them, and that is paramount for having ownership of these change-processes. At the same time, there is national pride and deep-rooted values and traditions that permeate the habits, thought patterns and behaviours of people, some of which are inconsistent with the winds of change. Bridging the two, however, there is a fair number of people (change agents, leaders) in all sections of society with a genuine wish to change, and with the capacity to identify and take what they feel they need and adjust it to fit the Malagasy context, thus gaining the best of both worlds. A key message in the TLP has been throughout that not everything has to change, and an important part of leadership lies in protecting certain values and traditions. In fact, figuring out what to protect and what to discard is difficult adaptive work. So far, the Malagasy people seem to have done very well at that; indeed, the fact that they have and apply this adaptive capacity may very well be the uniqueness of Madagascar that could be very difficult to replicate, and it is the full merit of the Malagasy people, not the Bank or any other partner.



Annexes

Annex 1: Evaluation Questions

Conceptualization and Design

Looking back, to what extent did the program spring from a perceived national need? How and where was this articulated?

What process was used for designing the program? Was it linked to parallel government planning processes? How was alignment with government priorities ensured?

Results and Impact

Has the objective been met and results anticipated been achieved (linear approach)? Has there been any significant deviations from the objectives and expected results (emergent outcomes)? Through what process have these been decided/assessed?

At what level are the leadership outcomes most clear: individual, organizational or institutional? What are the most important new processes or institutions that have emerged as a result of the TLP and how do these support the achievement of priority development outcomes? How have the leadership interventions and outcomes induced the necessary dynamics in the system to get or accelerate development results?

Implementation - Risks

The Mid-term report identified a number of risks:

- i) That capacity is only generated and transferred to the few individuals with whom the consultants work in specific issues/problems, and is not institutionalized and spread in “concentric circles” beyond this limited group;
- ii) That resistance builds up and impact does not go beyond what can be directly pushed from the Presidency with the authority that that position gives and as soon as pressure is diminished, efforts are reduced; and
- iii) If there is not a good system of feedback across institutions at different levels, the consultants may be isolated and not know exactly what impact they are having, and hence if adjustment to the approach is necessary.”

What has been done to mitigate these risks?

Sustainability

Given the importance for the sustainability of the TLP of the results and performance of NLIM, how does NLIM respond to needs identified through the TLP? What is the current capacity of NLIM to respond adequately to identified needs? What system is in place within NLIM for M&E?



How has TLP contributed to the Leadership landscape in Madagascar? Evaluations have shown a clear demand for more capacity development in “concentric circles” or in “cascades”. What major activities have been directly inspired by TLP?

Have activities/initiatives been actively coordinated with other development partners?

Evaluative process/Follow-up to Mid-term report

What Follow-up has been taken to conclusions of the Mid-term report

“The systemic impact desired is unlikely to materialize if the programme is not deepened and broadened, i.e. plans to work with SGs, DG,s with Chefs de region and Chefs de Fokontany will be critical to a full impact. Also, a full systemic effect is unlikely if organizational issues of overlap, duplication and unclear mandates are not simultaneously addressed.”

“The NLIM is a critical element but there is an urgent need for professionalization and setting up an M&E system to track and document results.”

“To achieve an impact at the organizational level in the Executive and at regional level, new MAP implementation structures need to be build and teams formed and trained in the leadership approach. However, the mandates and roles and responsibilities of any new organizational structure need to be very clear.”

“Pressure from the top in terms of continuously stressing the need for change, leadership and results, and demonstrating the personal commitment which is clearly there is likely to help accelerate the process. However, a feedback system to be able to monitor developments and continuously assess degree of change and commitment would be desirable. This might be achieved through a two-way communication system.”

Replicability and Policy Implications

The preliminary conclusion from the mid-term report was that for the Bank to replicate this type of investment in other countries, there is a need to closely examine the lessons of this pilot in terms of the possible tensions and inconsistencies when Consultants are not aligned on Bank policy.

Furthermore, conditions in Madagascar were maybe particularly favorable. Is it possible to identify the core conditions necessary for success?

What are the key lessons in terms of using leadership development as a component in public sector reform programs and programs aiming at strengthening good governance?



Annex 2: Areas of Focus for Phase Two

| |
|---|
| Areas of work for Phase Two |
| National Leadership Institute |
| Madagascar Action Plan |
| Presidential leadership |
| Leadership of the cabinet |
| Assessment of ministers and coaching |
| Trade, industry and Private Sector development |
| Creation of an Economic Development Board |
| Transformation of the national education system |
| Women's affairs and population issues |
| Customs reform |
| Health and provision of medical and social services |
| Security in rural areas |
| Decentralization and Rural development |
| Special projects and urgent problems |