

SEA-HSD-247
Distribution: General

Development of Project Formulation Skills for Mobilization of External Resources for Health Development

*Report of an Intercountry Workshop
Kathmandu, Nepal 22–26 January 2001*

WHO Project: ICP ECP 001



World Health Organization
Regional Office for South-East Asia
New Delhi
April 2001

© World Health Organization 2001

This document is not a formal publication of the World Health Organization (WHO), and all rights are reserved by the Organization. The document may, however, be freely reviewed, abstracted, reproduced or translated, in part or in whole, but not for sale or for use in conjunction with commercial purposes.

The views expressed in documents by named authors are solely the responsibility of those authors.

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
1. BACKGROUND	1
2. OBJECTIVES	2
3. ORGANIZATION.....	2
4. WORKSHOP STRATEGY	2
4.1 Planning Phase	3
4.2 Cooperative Writing Phase	3
4.3 Writing Tools: WHO Format for Writing Proposals and Paragraph Outline Approach	3
5. WORKSHOP METHODOLOGY IN THE PLANNING AND WRITING WORKSHOPS	4
6. WORKSHOP MODULES.....	4
7. SUMMARY REPORT	4
7.1 Opening Session.....	4
7.2 Planning Workshop	6
7.3 Cooperative Writing Workshop	8
8. CLOSURE	9

Annexes

1. Programme.....	10
2. List of Participants.....	13
3. Formulating Sound and Aid-Worthy Project Proposals	16

1. BACKGROUND

A project is often defined as a “coherently linked envelope of resources designed to fulfill a set of development objectives”. In fact, project documents are a key tool for mobilization of external resources for health development. The health sector has emerged as an important sector for international development investments. There is substantial room for increasing external resource flows for health in the countries of the Region. However, a major factor is the success with which the project proposals, for external funding clearly enunciating health development needs, defining objectives, setting out strategies and implementation arrangements and determining internal and external resource requirements based on a comprehensive financial analysis are formulated.

Dearth of well-formulated and technically sound project proposals is one of the major constraints the countries of the Region often face in negotiating external aid for the health sector. In the national health sector, there is a shortage of manpower with sufficient professional skills for designing sound and aid-worthy project proposals for external funding. At various intercountry and country workshops the lack of capacity and skill for developing appropriate project portfolios has been mentioned as a major limiting factor in resource mobilization. The need for organizing workshops for developing skills in project formulation as a part of strengthening national capacity for resource mobilization was also emphasized at the group discussion of the 47th meeting of the WRs. Many donors found the lack of skill in this area a major constraint to effective and successful aid negotiation on the part of recipient countries or organizations. Thus, there was a clearly identified priority need to develop skills within the Ministry of Health and the WHO Country Offices for formulation of sound and aid-worthy project proposals. In view of this need of the Member Countries in the SEA Region, it was decided to organize an intercountry workshop on project formulation skill development.

2. OBJECTIVES

The overall aim of the workshop was to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of the Ministry of Health and WHO Country Offices in mobilizing resources to meet the needs of health development in countries. This was achieved through the following operational objectives:

- (1) To increase awareness and understanding of the rules and techniques of systematic, logical examination of the interrelated elements that constitute a well designed and technically sound project document using the logical framework approach;
- (2) To increase awareness and understanding of the techniques of writing relevant proposals based on readers' needs, using both the WHO Format for Writing Proposals and the paragraph outline approach, and
- (3) To qualitatively upgrade project planning skills and proposal writing skills of the officials of the ministries of health.

3. ORGANIZATION

The five-day workshop was organized in Kathmandu, Nepal by WHO/SEARO with the assistance of the HMG of Nepal. (See Annex 1 for programme of workshop.)

The participants were from the Planning/Programming Divisions of the Ministries of Health of the ten SEAR Member countries. In addition, one WHO Field Staff from each country associated with project/programme formulation and resource mobilization activities participated. The workshop was conducted with the assistance of Mr Vincent Martino and Mr Frank Little of the DANIDA Training Center, Copenhagen. (See Annex 2 for a list of participants.)

4. WORKSHOP STRATEGY

The workshop was conducted in two phases in order to achieve the objectives.

4.1 Planning Phase

During the first three days of the programme, the participants concentrated on making good plans, i.e. outlining a health project – its ultimate goal, objectives and the strategy for achieving them. A tentative sequence or timetable for the project activities, indicating how and when the health objectives would be met was also prepared. The first operational goal of the workshop was to increase awareness and understanding of the rules and techniques of systematic logical examination and presentation of the interrelated elements that constitute a well-designed and technically sound project idea.

Course Material: Logical Framework Approach (LFA), A Flexible Tool for Participatory Development, DANIDA 1996.

The planning workshop was based on the above book which was distributed on the first day of the course. However, other interpretations of LFA as given in *the Logical Framework Approach (LFA) Handbook for Objectives Oriented Planning – Norad 1996* and EU's book: *Project Cycle Management, an Integrated Approach to Logical Framework 1993* were also discussed and the strengths and weaknesses compared.

4.2 Cooperative Writing Phase

In the second phase, good sound project ideas were translated into a proposal format that met the needs of national authorities and donors. The focus was a shift to practical matters, i.e. what was relevant to write up. The starting assumption was that information in proposals should match national authorities/donor priorities, focus and funding area.

4.3 Writing Tools: WHO Format for Writing Proposals and Paragraph Outline Approach

WHO has developed a format for writing project proposals. In the WHO format it is suggested that it may help to make a detailed outline of a proposal before actually beginning to write. It is also suggested that the Proposal Summary may be the most important section of the entire document and

might, in fact, be the only part of the document that some reviewers read. Taking these assumptions as the starting point for the Cooperative Writing workshop, the group then planned a proposal that fulfilled the needs of national authorities and donors. Planning a relevant proposal document implied doing an analysis of the readers' needs, determining concrete objectives, designing the sequence of the contents, making a summary and finally writing up the proposal itself.

5. WORKSHOP METHODOLOGY IN THE PLANNING AND WRITING WORKSHOPS

The facilitators introduced a number of structured thinking activities to the group from the Logical Framework Approach, WHO Format for Writing Proposals and the paragraph outline approach to proposal writing. The group then considered the selected case study. During these active phases of the course, the trainers asked the group to make decisions about what they think should be done with regard to the situation outlined in the case. Participants were asked to contribute actively with their own ideas, share experience and look for patterns while analyzing and making decisions on the case study.

6. WORKSHOP MODULES

The workshop comprised theoretical presentations, simulations of project negotiation with donors, facilitated discussions and some practical application of the tools and framework to the actual presentation and negotiation situations. During the course of the workshop, efforts were made to achieve the objectives of the Workshop.

7. SUMMARY REPORT

7.1 Opening Session

The workshop was inaugurated by Dr B.D. Chataut, Director-General of the Department of Health Services, Ministry of Health, Kathmandu. In his

inaugural address, Dr Chataut congratulated WHO for organizing this workshop at a very appropriate time when there was a strong need for external resource mobilization for the health sector. Dr Klaus Wagner, WHO Representative to Nepal read out a message from Dr Uton Muchtar Rafei, Regional Director, WHO/SEA Region. In his address, the Regional Director noted that despite remarkable achievements in health and incredible technological developments, the countries of the Region were yet to tackle the challenges of equity in health care, health security for the vulnerable groups of populations, gender inequity in access to services, malnutrition, health of the aging population, environmental degradation, poverty-related diseases, changing lifestyles for better health and many more emerging and reemerging diseases, for which enormous and incremental resources were needed. While it was necessary to mobilize all available national resources and make the best use of them, there was an urgent need to augment the flow of external resources for the health sector. He underscored the importance of genuine efforts for collaboration and coordination amongst all external partners to support the national health programmes. The Regional Director emphasized that both the Ministries of Health and WHO work hand in hand to make full use of the available opportunities to generate financial, technological and human resources for health development in the Region. He mentioned that WHO had worked with its Member Countries to strengthen their national capacity for external resource mobilization. A sound project proposal is a key element in the process of resource mobilization. A shortage of manpower with sufficient skill for formulating sound and aid-worthy project proposals had been a limiting factor for resource mobilization in the countries. He hoped that the workshop would provide the participants with a useful learning experience in the project formulation process as well as knowledge of improved techniques and skills in writing aid-worthy project proposals. The Regional Director expressed satisfaction that the faculty of the DANIDA Training Centre, Copenhagen, specialized in this particular area of skill development, could facilitate this workshop.

Dr Wagner stressed the need for preparing technically sound proposals so that donors could decide whether or not to fund them.

The opening session concluded with a briefing of the participants by the moderators, Mr Vincent Martino and Mr Frank Little on the objectives, programme and methods of the conduct of the workshop.

7.2 Planning Workshop

The workshop process was based on DANIDA's Logical Framework Approach (LFA). Its tools for planning, namely, focus on context, problems, objectives, choice, action and monitoring and evaluation were used during the simulation. The LFA as well as LF Matrix was introduced to the participants followed by discussions with regard to their use in and adaptation to the simulation exercises. Each participant received a copy of the manual on LFA published by DANIDA Training Center for use as a resource book.

In view of the emerging common health risk in SEAR countries, HIV/AIDS was chosen as the simulation topic to launch an effective campaign by the ministries of health of the Member countries to improve services to vulnerable groups affected by HIV/AIDS.

The participants were initially divided into three groups. The first group dealt with drug distribution and accessibility of vulnerable groups to treatment facilities. The second group looked into the monitoring system of drug distribution, while the third group addressed the issue of accountability and transparency in utilization of resources. All the three groups identified problems in their respective areas and tried to provide solutions to each of these problems.

Focusing on "Context", analytical work was done in five groups on stakeholder mapping, policy concerns, uncertainty and high risk list, values and principles.

In stakeholder analysis, critical target groups, government and other decision-makers, donor and funding agencies, service groups including NGOs and support providing groups were identified as the probable stakeholders.

In analyzing the policy considerations, political, economic, social, legal, environmental and intersectoral aspect were highlighted and discussed in details.

Focusing on the uncertainty and high-risk list, the group identified types of affected population, social factors including poverty, life-style, other causes, priorities and solution to the problems.

In the exercise on values and principles, values respected and shared personally and nationally were identified.

The participants were then divided into groups named after each of the ten SEAR Member Countries and worked as a country team on each of the elements of the LFA. Each group conducted their group work, building problem tree, objective tree, scenario development and adapting them to LF Matrix and its elements namely – project elements, indicators and assumptions.

The groups then worked on the organization of problems. The areas considered in this exercise were – safe blood transfusion, awareness campaign, including IEC, surveillance, training, resource and monitoring. Each group dealt with issues preventing the achievement of a desired situation, identified problems and developed problem clusters or trees.

In the area of safe blood transfusion, issues such as low community participation; inadequate use of disposable syringes and needles; commercial donors; unauthorized blood banks; absence of blood transfusion policy; low awareness about HIV/AIDS transmission; lack of testing and screening facilities; donor information; skilled manpower; financial resources; research and blood storage facilities and available modern technology were identified and addressed.

Policy, strategy, sustainability, evaluation and activities of the programme in the area of awareness campaign, including IEC were emphasized and the need for identification of the target groups stressed.

Focusing on surveillance, factors like inadequate data, strategies, funds and political commitment, shortage of testing kits, cultural and geographical problems, absence of priority on surveillance, insufficient training and number of health workers and limited private sector involvement in the process were identified. Action, strategy and policy in various aspects of training activities were highlighted.

Details of human, financial, physical and community resources, including tied aids, donor fatigue, poor management, transparency and accountability in the area of resources mobilization were discussed. Various

aspects of political decision-making in mobilizing domestic resources also came up for discussion.

Focusing on objectives, each group concentrated at the levels of action, strategy and policy in tackling HIV/AIDS in their respective countries. The groups developed objective clusters or trees and also worked on shared objectives based on the objectives identified by each group.

Working on the "Choice Focus", each group analyzed resources, developed scenarios, compared scenarios, chose and designed a strategy on development and immediate objectives. In the scenario development exercise, immediate objectives, strategy, ownership, primary target group and main problems of the proposal were discussed.

Focusing on action, each group identified development objectives, outputs, activities, inputs and assumptions in the format of LF Matrix, which comprised these elements.

7.3 Cooperative Writing Workshop

In the cooperative writing workshop section, the participants performed group work on proposal writing using the WHO Format for Writing Proposals and the paragraph outline technique which included the tools for proposal-writing and focussed on the users of the proposal, impact objectives, contents of the proposal, paragraph, proposal summary and proposal text. In this process, LFA was applied as a practical exercise.

In the analysis of key users/readers of the proposal, background knowledge, beliefs, values, interests and expected response to the proposal were considered. The prospective key users might include the health secretary, social development technical officer/donor, local representative of donor agency, public health director, budget and finance officer, planning analyst, external resources, task manager, national economic and social board.

In the exercise on focus on impact objectives of the proposal, the groups tried to determine which concrete key actions were required from the key users after they had read the proposal. Focusing on the contents of the proposal, each group strove to generate items to be included in the proposal

and to arrange these items in a logical manner. Working on paragraph writing by drafting, the groups drafted appropriate “topic sentences” for each item of their proposals.

It was emphasized that the proposal summary being an important part of a proposal should be written before writing the body of the proposal.

In the same vein, equal emphasis was also laid writing the concluding statement of the proposal, as it could be used to reiterate the problem and to plead for continuity of the project for its sustainability.

In the end, the country groups prepared country-specific proposals based on the lessons learnt over the week. As a part of simulation and role play, each of these proposals was then presented to and negotiated with the prospective donors who were represented by other country teams. The donor group inquired about various aspects of each of the proposals and made observations. The proposals were revised accordingly in view of the comments made by the donor groups.

8. CLOSURE

The session ended with the completion of a written evaluation (see Annex 3 for a summary of the evaluation).

The highlights of the entire proceedings of the workshop were compiled in a document and distributed to all the participants at the meeting.

Annex 1

PROGRAMME

Monday, 22 January 2001

- 08:30 hrs. Registration of participants
- 09:00 hrs. Inaugural session –
Regional Director's message
Welcome address by local organizers/secretariat
Introduction of participants
Presentation of agenda and norm setting
- Planning Workshop
Logical Framework Approach - Tools for Planning:
- Focus on Problems
 - Focus on Objectives
 - Focus on Context
 - Focus on Choice
 - Focus on Action
 - Monitoring and Evaluation
- 09:45 hrs. Introduction to DANIDA's Book: LFA - A Flexible Tool for Participatory Development
Introduction to workshop simulation and roles
- 10:00 hrs. Initial Focus Question of the Simulation and Role Play
How can we, the Ministry of Health in Country X, launch an effective campaign to improve services to vulnerable groups affected by HIV/AIDS?
- Focus on context**
Stakeholder mapping
Policy concerns
Uncertainties and high risk list
Values and principles session
- Focus on objectives**
Identifying objectives

Tuesday, 23 January 2001

Focus on problems

Issues preventing the achievement of a desired situation
Identifying problems
Developing Problem Clusters or Trees.

Focus on objectives (revisited)

Movement from problems to objectives
Developing objective clusters or trees.

Focus on choice

Analyzing resources
Developing scenarios
Comparing scenarios
Choosing and designing a strategy (Immediate and development objective)

Wednesday, 24 January 2001

Focus on action (Project planning matrix)

Identifying outputs
Developing activities
Identifying inputs
Identifying assumptions

Monitoring, evaluation and reporting

Designing TOR for Project Monitors
Six system design question

Thursday, 25 January 2001

Cooperative Writing Workshop

- WHO format for writing proposals and paragraph outline technique:
- Tools for proposal writing
- Focus on the users of the proposal
- Focus on the impact objectives
- Focus on the contents of the proposal
- Focus on the paragraphs
- Focus on the proposal summary

Focus on the users of the proposal

Analyzing the “key” users’ background knowledge, beliefs, and information needs.

Focus on the impact objectives of the proposal

Determining which concrete "Key" actions are required from the "Key Users" after they have read the proposal.

Focus on the Contents of the Proposal

Generating items to be included in the proposal, clustering items, ordering the items into a logical flow

Friday January 26, 2001

Focus on the paragraph

Drafting a "Topic Sentence" for each item of the proposal.

Focus on the summary

Writing up the proposal summary

Focus on the concluding statements of the proposal

Closing Session – Winding down

Evaluation of the planning workshop and the cooperative writing workshop.

Appreciations

Final remarks by local organizers/secretariat

Annex 2

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

Bangladesh

Ms Begum Hasmat Ara
Senior Assistant Chief
Ministry of Health and Family Welfare
Bangladesh Secretariat
Dhaka

Mr M.A.N. Siddique
Senior Assistant Secretary
Ministry of Health and Family Welfare
Bangladesh Secretariat
Dhaka

Dr Ohn Kyaw
WHO Management Officer
C/o WR, Bangladesh
Dhaka

Dr George John Komba-Kono
WHO Medical Officer (DHS)
C/o WR, Bangladesh
Dhaka

Bhutan

Planning Officer (PPD)
Mr Kinley Penjor
Asstt Health Department
Ministry of Health and Education
Thimphu

Mr Norbu Wangchuk
National Programme Officer
C/o WR Bhutan
Thimphu

DPR korea

Dr Ri Chang Bom
Senior Official
Department of Science and Technology
Ministry of Public Health
Pyongyang

Dr Pak Tong Chol
WHO National Programme Officer
WHO, Pyongyang

India

Mr Om Vir Singh Veerwal
Department of ISMH
(Information Support Management)
Ministry of Health and Family Welfare
Government of India
New Delhi

Indonesia

Ms Nasirah Bahaudin
Chief, Division of International Cooperation
Bureau of Planning
Ministry of Health and Social Welfare
Jakarta

Dr (Mr) Asyikin Iman Hidayat Dahlan
Chief, Division of Policy Analysis
Bureau of Planning
Ministry of Health and Social Welfare
Jakarta

Ms Antarini Antoyo
Staff
Bureau of Planning
Ministry of Health and Social Welfare
Jakarta

Mr Mohamed Rasheed
Programme and Administrative Officer
C/o WR, Indonesia
Jakarta

Dr Stephanus Indradjaya
WHO National Consultant
C/o WR, Indonesia
Jakarta

Maldives

Mr Abdul Raheem Hassan
Assistant Under Secretary
Ministry of Health
Male

Dr S. Puri
Medical Officer
C/o WR, Maldives
Male

Myanmar

Dr Myo Thein
Assistant Director
Department of Health
Government of the Union of Myanmar
Ministry of Health
Yangon

Dr Than Oo
State Health Director
Kayah State
Department of Health
Government of the Union of Myanmar
Ministry of Health
Yangon

Dr Anton Fric
Public Health Administrator
C/o WR, Myanmar
Yangon

Nepal

Dr Shyam Prasad Bhattarai
Chief, PPFA & M Division
Ministry of Health
Kathmandu

Mr Arjun Bahadur Singh
Chief
Foreign Aid Section
Ministry of Health
Kathmandu

Prof. A.M. Das
Planning Officer
C/o WR, Nepal
Kathmandu

Dr Shailesh K. Upadhyay
Liaison Officer
C/o WR, Nepal
Kathmandu

Sri Lanka

Ms Asoka P. Munasinghe
Deputy Director General (Administration)
Department of Health Services
"Suwasiripaya"
385 Deans Road
Colombo 10

Dr A.P.P. Somarathna
Medical Officer
Preventive Health Care
Ministry of Health
"Suwasiripaya"
385 Deans Road
Colombo 10

Dr Lokky Wai
Management Officer
C/o WR, Sri Lanka
Colombo

Thailand

Dr Chuchai Sornchumni
Senior Medical officer
Provincial Hospital Division
Office of the Permanent Secretary
Department of Health
Bangkok

Ms Nonglug Chawalpaiboon
Senior Policy and Plan Analyst
Bureau of Environmental Health
Department of Health
Bangkok

Ms Noppavan Janejai
Senior Medical Scientist
National Institute of Health
Department of Medical Sciences
Ministry of Public Health
Bangkok

Mr Richard B. Kalina
Management Officer

C/o WR, Thailand
Bangkok

Dr Somchai Peerapakorn
National Professional Officer (Programme)
C/o WR, Thailand
Bangkok

Mr Narintr Tima
RTG/WHO Programme Monitoring and
Evaluation Officer
C/o WR, Thailand
Bangkok

Facilitators

Mr Vincent Martino
DANIDA Training Centre, Copenhagen
Denmark

Mr Frank Little
DANIDA Training Centre, Copenhagen
Denmark

Secretariat

WHO/SEARO

Mr S.G. Muktader
External Cooperation Officer

Dr Khallilur Rahman
STP-ECU

Dr Lin Aung
STP-EHA

WHO Country Office

Dr Klaus Wagner
WHO Representative to Nepal
Kathmandu

Mr Kiran Bahadur Shrestha
Assistant II
C/o WR, Nepal
Kathmandu

Ms Liu Yingle
Administrative Officer
C/o WR, Nepal
Kathmandu

Mr Subhash Pokrel
Report Writer

Resource Person

Dr Robert J. Kim Farley
WHO Representative to India
New Delhi

Annex 3

FORMULATING SOUND AND AID-WORTHY PROJECT PROPOSALS

Summary of Evaluation Report:

Purpose:

This report assesses the workshop course and makes recommendations for future action in respect to this course.

Conclusions and recommendations:

The assessment is that the course was successful and that this kind of training is needed in the future. Recommendations are made as to how the course can be further developed and consolidated.

Structure:

The report is based on the course participants' evaluations, both written and oral. These evaluations are at Hornnbækhus and are available upon request. The conclusions below are based on the Workshop Evaluation Questionnaires and the course co-ordinator's own assessment.

The overall objective of the workshop was to allow participants to become familiar with a range of tools and techniques relevant to a well-designed and technically sound project proposal.

Participants' overall impression of the course in relation to the above objective.

- 5 participants wrote excellent
- 13 participants wrote very good
- 7 participants wrote good
- 3 participants wrote satisfactory
- 1 participant wrote less than satisfactory

(36 participants were actively involved in the workshop activities. From Thursday, the Nepal delegation began preparing for a WHO Retreat to be held in Nepal and could not be present for the remainder of the Workshop.)

The 29 evaluations received reveal that the course was successful in improving knowledge and awareness in Planning and Proposal Writing techniques. It was also successful in improving knowledge, awareness and activation of certain specific personal skills that would be useful in the planning context. Furthermore, it conveyed the idea that planning skills and writing techniques as well as the way in which donor meetings are designed and conducted in terms of presenting proposals to donors contribute to a successful outcome.

The course was less successful in giving feedback to participants on their individual and group skills in planning and writing. The assumption that participants would have a pool of experience that could be shared and adopted as a working standard proved to be difficult in the country specific working groups. The North Korean group had, for example, only two members. The evaluations further reveal considerable participant learning insights as they felt that the course was in general good, relevant and necessary and that it should be continued.

The course coordinator would concur with these findings. Furthermore, the desire of a number of participants to be "told how to do things" actually reveals the uncertainty that many expressed with regard to planning and proposal writing and confirms the need for a course like this.

Participant impressions of the course in relation to six workshop objectives:

- (1) *It was the intention of the workshop to introduce Logical Framework Approach as a project planning tool using Danida's Logical Framework Handbook so that participants become acquainted with the LFA tools and can, at the end of the course, appreciate the conceptual thinking.*
 - 22 participants said this objective was fully or largely achieved.
 - 7 participants said this objective was moderately achieved.

- (2) *It was the intention of the workshop to share different ideas about the topic from different countries, learn about people who are here, explore the breadth of opinions, create trust and explore different values.*
- 16 participants said this objective was fully or largely achieved.
 - 11 participants said this objective was moderately achieved.
 - 2 participants said this objective was achieved to a small extent.
- (3) *It was the intention of the workshop to practice applying problem analysis, objective analysis and scenario development techniques in small groups.*
- 22 participants said this objective was fully or largely achieved.
 - 6 participants said this objective was moderately achieved.
 - 1 participant said this objective was achieved to a small extent.
- (4) *It was the intention of the workshop to practice making a proposal sound, internally consistent, complete, and SMART, using an LFA matrix that allows monitoring and evaluation to take place.*
- 15 participants said this objective was fully or largely achieved.
 - 10 participants said this objective was moderately achieved.
 - 4 participants said this objective was achieved to a small extent.
- (5) *It was the intention of the workshop to enable participants to practice the paragraph outline techniques in conjunction with the WHO Format for Writing Proposals for designing aid-worthy country-specific project proposals.*
- 19 participants said this objective was fully or largely achieved.
 - 6 participants said this objective was moderately achieved.
 - 4 participants said this objective was achieved to a small extent.
- (6) *It was the intention of the workshop to create an environment where participants experienced the challenge of working in an interdisciplinary team using tools not only for analysis and planning but also to foster communication and promote dialogue.*
- 17 participants said this objective was fully or largely achieved.
 - 7 participants said this objective was moderately achieved.
 - 5 participants said this objective was achieved to a small extent.

An assortment of comments taken from the Evaluation Questionnaires:

- Course was too short (This was written by almost everyone)
- I particularly like scenario development
- We needed more examples
- We needed more time for writing proposals
- Examples from book not directly related to presentations
- Time too short on each topic
- Not enough feedback to groups. Facilitators didn't tell us if we were right or wrong.
- Every one should have a chance to write topic sentences, not just WHO staff
- More comments from facilitators based on their experience
- Clearer relationship between LFA book and WHO Format
- Workshop documents not as important as facilitator leadership and presentations
- Country groups good but mixed groups with a hypothetical case with options would have lead to more interactive dynamism
- Facilitators could have adhered more closely to LFA Book
- It would have been better if the facilitators had made a summary after each session.
- The objectives should have included something about the programme/sector approach
- More time on proposal writing
- WHO representatives should have been separated
- Documents not coherent. Too much jumping around
- More feedback by facilitators

Conclusions

It is not an exaggeration to say that the objectives stated above for a four and one-half day course for 35 participants were ambitious. It was both a planning workshop and a writing workshop. The evaluations reveal that these objectives were not fully achieved. Participants experienced the course much like an express train with very few stops. All, however, felt the course should be continued.

Taking these objectives seriously and addressing the comments of the participants in relation to these objectives, it appears we need to be even more efficient in the use of participant time. I believe there are three major

directions we should move to use the existing time frame in a more efficient way and to decrease the gap between our espoused objectives and participant perceptions. These directions would be:

- Improved workshop materials that would be perceived by the participants to more closely relate LFA planning techniques, paragraph outlining and WHO proposal writing. These materials would follow the session outline and incorporate facilitator presentation materials. The jumps and bumps on the express train that participants said they felt would, I believe, be reduced considerably.
- A one-case approach. This would allow the many groups to compare their results with each other and more importantly allow more individual feedback and instructions from the facilitators. Our working assumption that each of the 10 country-specific groups had a pool of experience to share would be less critical.
- Adjustments in the sequence of the sessions to get to the heart of LFA faster.

In conclusion, it appears that the objectives of the workshop were the right ones. All participants felt the course should be continued. However, it was felt that the course could be even better with improved workshop documents and a one-case approach.