

THE UNITED REPUBLIC OF TANZANIA



**A REPORT ON CAPACITY NEEDS ASSESSMENT
FOR CABINET SECRETARIAT AND REFORMS COORDINATION UNIT**

June 12, 2014

Table of Contents

1. INTRODUCTION	6
1.1. Background of the Study.....	6
1.2. Purpose and Objectives of the Study.....	7
1.3. Approach and Methodology	7
2. ROLES AND FUNCTIONS OF CS AND RCU.....	9
2.1. Cabinet Secretariat: roles, functions, and structure	9
2.2. RCU: roles, functions, and structure.....	12
3. CAPACITY NEEDS ASSESSMENT	14
3.1. Capacity Area 1: Organizational Level.....	14
3.2. Capacity Area II: Human Resource.....	18
4. CONCLUSION AND FURTHER RECOMMENDATIONS.....	22
4.1. Concluding Remarks	22
4.2. Capacity Areas for Further Consideration.....	23
Appendix A1: Three-Year Training Program for Skills Development and Upgrading among CS and RCU Staff.....	24
Appendix A2. TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR CAPACITY NEEDS ASSESSMENT FOR CABINET SECRETARIAT AND REFORMS COORDINATION UNIT (excerpt)	29

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

CNA	Capacity Needs Assessment
CAS	Cabinet Assistant Secretary
CC	Clerk to the Cabinet
CLOs	Cabinet Liaison Officer
CS	Cabinet Secretariat
CUS	Cabinet Under Secretary
DPS	Deputy Permanent Secretary
HR	Human Resource
ICT	Information and Communication Technology
IEC	Information, Education and Communication
IMTC	Inter-ministerial Technical Committee
IRC	Information Resource Center
KB	Kamati ya Katiba na Sheria
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MDAs	Ministries Department and Agencies
MJ	Kamati ya Maendeleo ya Jamii
MTEF	Medium-Term Expenditure Framework
MZ	Kamati ya Mazingira
NUU	Kamati ya mambo ya Nje, Ulinzi na Usalama
POSH	President Office-State House
PSRP	Public Service Reform Program
RCU	Reform Coordination Unit
SP	Strategic Plan
ToRs	Terms of Reference
TV	Television
TWG	Technical Working Group
UF	Kamati ya Uchumi na Fedha
UNDP	United Nations Development Program

SUMMARY

This document is a report of a capacity needs assessment (CNA) study, which was carried out under the auspices of POSH multi-year Policy Coherence, Reform Coordination and Monitoring and Evaluation Project (2013 – 2015). The project focuses on two key areas namely: (i) Enhancing systems capacity for effective policy development and management in government, and (ii) Strengthening human capacity for effective policy analysis and change management.

The CNA study aimed at providing input into the development of a capacity building programme that will contribute to strengthening institutional capacity of the Cabinet Secretariat in undertaking its function of policy management and RCU in areas of reforms coordination and change management. The objective of the study was to determine capacity gaps in terms of skills, knowledge and abilities required for effective performance of Cabinet Secretariat and RCU.

Capacity issues and gaps, ranging from institutional capacity, to infrastructure and facilities, to individual capacities, were identified. The major ones are:

- i. Although the CS and RCU have clear a strategic plan – the State House SP, this has not adequately been cascaded down to the two institutions. Furthermore, the SP does not have a robust/complete M&E framework. Completion of the lower level annual plans and M&E is an issue that needs to be supported.
- ii. The Client Service Charter (CSC), which is key in enhancing the performance assessment in CS and RCU, has not been finalized. It is recommended that CS and RCU should be supported to provide lead in the use of the CSC.
- iii. The effective functioning of the CS and RCU is constrained by shortage of office space, and office facilities such as Computers, laptops, printers, scanner, TV and channels connectivity to world news /satellite dish, as well as safe boxes/strong file cabinets. It is also constrained by sufficient number of vehicles to give the two institutions sufficient flexibility and mobility to interact with their clients. The total requirement is 9 vehicles.
- iv. The CS and RCU are understaffed as summarized in the next table. There are also skill gaps for which a costed program has been prepared and present as Appendix A1.

Committee/Unit	Required staffing level	Available	Gap
Economic and Finance (UF)	5	3	3
Foreign, Defense and Security (NUU)	3	2	1
Constitutional, Legal and Parliamentary Affairs (KB)	3	2	1
Community Development and Social Service (MJ)	5	5	0
Clerk to the Cabinet (CC)	2	2	0
Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E)	4	1	3
Environment (MZ)	2	0	2
Reforms Coordination Unit (RCU)	3	2	1

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background of the Study

The President's Office-State House (POSH) is currently undertaking efforts to enhance capacity of the government for effective policy development and management, including coordination of public sector reforms. The focus is to strengthen human capacity of POSH's two organs, namely the Cabinet Secretariat (CS) and Reform Coordination Unit (RCU).

The choice of the two organs under the current initiative is based on the strategic roles they play in the realm of policy development and management¹. In particular, the CS is a key department under the Chief Secretary Office as such, is at the center of the policy development processes. Moreover, the CS provides technical support to the Cabinet through the Chief Secretary as well as to the Inter-Ministerial Technical Committee (IMTC) as its secretariat. The Reform Coordination Unit (RCU), also under the Chief Secretary's Office, is mandated to coordinate and oversee core reforms. However, a recent study on policy coherence raised several capacity issues, which reduce the effectiveness of the two organs in carrying out their functions.

This study provide input into the development of a capacity building programme that will contribute to strengthening institutional capacity of the Cabinet Secretariat (CS) and Reforms Coordination Unit (RCU) in undertaking their functions of policy management and reforms coordination, respectively.

¹The initiative referred to here is the Policy Coherence, Reform Coordination and Monitoring and Evaluation Project (2013 – 2015) It is through the impact of the roles of these two organs on policy development and management as well as on the coordination of reforms that the POSH saw the need to undertake a capacity needs assessment study for the two organs.

1.2. Purpose and Objectives of the Study

As indicated in the Terms of Reference (ToRs), which is attached herewith in the Appendix A3, the purpose of the study is to conduct needs assessment to identify capacity gaps, which need to be addressed, through a capacity building programme in order to enhance the performance of CS and RCU. Therefore, the objective of this study is to determine capacity gaps in terms of skills, knowledge and abilities required for effective performance of Cabinet Secretariat and RCU.

A note on the interpretation of the objective of the study is in order. The team, which carried out the study, noted that while the terms “skills” and “knowledge” pertain to Human Resources (HR) of two organs, the term “abilities” should include the enabling environment for the HR to perform their duties. With this interpretation, the report therefore includes assessment of capacity aspects beyond the confine of HR.

1.3. Approach and Methodology

The methodology for this study was well outlined in the attached ToR. Given the nature of the two organs, an external expert could not readily access the required data to establish the capacity needs. Thus, teaming up as a facilitator (external to CS and RCU) with officials from CS and RCU in the form of a working session in collaboration with a Technical Working Group (TWG) was an ideal mode to operationalize the study.

The study used both the primary and secondary data obtained through review of various documents, discussion and interviews with relevant respondents from POSH, such as Clerk to the Cabinet, Cabinet Under Secretaries, and Cabinet Assistant Secretaries. The team first started with the review of documents, i.e. study reports and other relevant published work focusing in the Tanzania context as well as on countries with well performing system. The review set the base for subsequent activities, including tools to be used in capacity needs assessment.

The TWG, in a working session modality, familiarized with and reviewed Capacity Needs Assessment (CNA) approach and tools, which the lead facilitator proposed.² The TWG then used the proposed tools to establish the capacity needs at the individual level and organization level. It was agreed that, even with a broad interpretation of the term “abilities” to include the enabling environment, capacity in the area of institutional framework requires involvement of stakeholders beyond CS and RCU. Therefore, this report does attempt to incorporate the involvement of such stakeholders, particularly the Cabinet Liaison Officers (CLOs).

² The approach used is the UNDP approach for Capacity Needs Assessment, which was customized to suit the context of the CS and RCU.

2. ROLES AND FUNCTIONS OF CS AND RCU

In Section 1, it was argued that the two organs, i.e. CS and RCU, are covered under the Policy Coherence, Reform Coordination and Monitoring and Evaluation Project (2013 – 2015) because of the roles and functions they perform in relation to policy management and coordination of core reforms. This section reviews, in details, the roles and functions of CS and RCU in order to identify requisite skills, knowledge and abilities for effective performance of these institutions. The review of this section based on the assessment of organization and HR capacity of the two institutions in the Section 3. The UNDP’s Capacity Needs Assessment tool was customized based on the review presented hereunder. The review starts with the CS, and then followed by that of RCU.

2.1. Cabinet Secretariat: roles, functions, and structure

The Cabinet Secretariat is one among the three departments under the Chief Secretary Office. The other two departments are:

- The Directorate of Statehouse Services; and
- The Directorate of Communications and Press.

The CS was established in 1984 and it is organ of the Government, which is at the center of the policy development processes. Under the current set-up, the key role of the CS is to provide technical and secretariat support to the inter-ministerial technical committee (IMTC) and through the chief Secretary to the Cabinet and its Committees.

In order to undertake such role, the CS is mandated to perform the following specific duties:

- i. To advise Ministries in the early stages of preparing Cabinet memorandum.

- ii. To scrutinize various draft Cabinet memoranda by having consultations with experts/professionals in the concerned Ministries before presenting to the IMTC.
- iii. To give secretarial duties in the IMTC, Cabinet and its Committees.
- iv. To make follow-up of implementation of various decisions made by the Cabinet and its Committees.
- v. To discuss reports of implementation from Ministries on various Government decisions and subsequently forward the decisions to the Cabinet and its Committees.
- vi. To scrutinize various matters emanating from the President's visits in the regions and outside the country and make follow-up on their implementation.
- vii. To organize consultative meetings of the President with each Ministry.
- viii. To scrutinize Government draft bills
- ix. To make follow-up of the economy performance, political and social impacts of various policies passed by the Government.
- x. To make follow-up on parliamentary debates/discussions during the parliament sessions.

The CS organization structure reflects and conforms to the broad range of roles and functions it is mandated to perform. At present, the Cabinet Secretariat has six Committees, which are similar to the Cabinet Committees with the exception of the last committee:

- i. The Economic and Finance Committee,
- ii. The Foreign, Defense and Security Committee,
- iii. The Community Development and Social Service Committee,
- iv. The Constitutional, Legal and Parliamentary Affairs Committee, and;
- v. The Environment Committee;
- vi. Monitoring and Evaluation Committee

It is important to note that, the structure of the CS has remained relatively stable over time. However, new policy demands have emerged in the recent past and have necessitated the extension of the CS's structure by introducing last committee in the list above. The extension has bearing on capacity needs/gaps as this report indicates in the next section.

In terms of manning level, the current set-up of the CS is such that one Cabinet Under Secretary (CUS) heads each of the above CS Committees and reports directly to the Chief Secretary. As such, the CUS is the key assistant to the Chief Secretary on Cabinet Affairs. The Cabinet Under Secretary is assisted by one or several Cabinet Assistant Secretaries. And as will be shown shortly, this has implications on the HR requirements.

In terms of skills mix, it is apparent that several functions of the CS are policy design by nature, e.g. to advise Ministries in the early stages of preparing Cabinet Papers and scrutiny of the same. Such functions require strong policy design capacity within the CS as they involve critical and formative evaluation of the designed policies to ensure that they are free from contradictions while at the same time they maximize complementarity and synergies. At the technical level, the capacity needed should therefore embrace all sectors of the society as demonstrated by CS committees.

The other scope of the CS functions is monitoring and evaluation (M&E) of the implemented policies/decisions of the Cabinet. Such functions require capacity to closely follow-up the implementation of decisions made by the Cabinet and its Committees, critically discuss the MDAs implementation reports, and propose alternatives for implementation effectiveness. The M&E functions of the CS include evaluation of the national performance economically, politically, socially, etc. Technically, the capacity required in these aspects is also diverse and wide ranging.

2.2. RCU: roles, functions, and structure

The Reform Coordination Unit (RCU) was established in 2008 as one of the results of the implementation of the Public Service Reform Programme II (PSRPII). The functions of the RCU are stipulated as follows:

- i. To periodically review programme design and liaise with reform programme managers with a view to identifying overlaps, conflicts and possible areas for creating synergy;
- ii. To monitor and evaluate progress in programmes implementation and ensure they operate effectively and efficiently; and
- iii. To devise mechanisms for the overall coordination of public sector reforms.

The thinking that led to the establishment of the RCU envisioned a Unit, which would have been led by a Deputy Permanent Secretary (DPS) level officer and operate under the Chief Secretary. The location of the Unit in the Office of the Chief Secretary was intended to provide it leverage and clout in coordinating the various public sector reforms. A series of reviews has pointed to misalignment between its structure on one hand, and on the other, the rational/objectives for the establishment of RCU, its stated roles and functions and the dynamic nature of public sector reforms.

These reviews have recommended that the capacity aspect of RCU have to be addressed in conjunction with the readjustment of its roles and functions. The reviews call for interventions that aim at:

- Repositioning the RCU, in terms of structure, roles and responsibilities, to effectively respond to the dynamic nature of core reforms;

- Developing the capacity (i.e. human resource, facilities, and budget) of the repositioned RCU to effectively perform its responsibilities.

At the current set-up, the RCU is an establishment of three positions. However, one has not been filled to-date. The proposed (new) structure will certainly have significant implications on the manning level and skills mix. Looking at what RCU has attempted to achieve, the current study notes that RCU requires capacity to maintain a comprehensive database on reforms³. Furthermore, RCU requires capacity to undertake follow up on issues raised in the reform implementation reports submitted by MDAs. As a coordination unit, RCU also needs strong capacity to review institutional arrangements of the reforms that are not fully mainstreamed into MDA routines and fast track their mainstreaming.

³ What the RCU has done since its inception, includes (i) embarked on a process for developing tool kit on the core reform common operational procedures; (ii) mainstreamed reform programmes' resources into government budget system; (iii) created a platform (quarterly meetings) between the Chief Secretary and Permanent Secretaries of Ministries responsible for central reforms to share experience and information on progress of, and constraints being faced by implementing institutions at policy level; (iv) created a platform (quarterly meetings) for reform coordinators to share experience and information on progress of, and constraints being faced by implementing institutions at operational level; and (v) organized fora for different stakeholders (state and non-state actors) on progress and challenges in the implementation of central reforms.

3. CAPACITY NEEDS ASSESSMENT

After reviewing the role and functions of the CS and RCU in the previous sections, this section reports on the capacity needs of the two institutions. Although capacity could have been assessed in several aspects, such as institutional framework, organizational, and individual's capacity, the ToR for this study required that we focus on the individuals (HR) and organization aspects of capacity. However, consultations with stakeholders strongly recommended to the team that the study should bring up a big picture of the capacity needs beyond the HR area.

3.1. Capacity Area 1: Organizational Level

The objective of the assessment at this level was to obtain specific information on the tools, systems, processes, procedures etc., and check their quality in relation to the functions of the CS and RCU. The assessment also checked whether or not there is effective utilization of the organizational tools, systems, processes, procedures, and ultimately identify related capacity needs.

3.1.1 *Mission And Strategy*

This study noted that the CS and RCU have clear strategic plan (SP), derived from its vision and mission, to achieve its priority actions. The SP of the two institutions is an integral part/section of the State House's SP. The SP was reviewed in 2012/13, and is therefore expected to sufficiently being up-to-date. The strategic plan has been interlinked with a Medium Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF) since it this has been mainstreamed across the whole government. *However, it appears that the SP is not adequately cascaded down and does not have a robust/complete M&E framework. Completion of the lower level annual plans and M&E is an issue that needs to be*

supported. This recommendation is linked to a need for framework for skill development through collaboration discussed in concluding remarks.

It was noted that the smooth implementation of the SP of the CS and RCU is occasionally hampered by the procurement procedures and availability of financial resources. Although not within the fully mandate of the CS and RCU, there is a strong opinion on the urgent need to review the procurement procedures/ financial issues and make them facilitative instead of inhibitive.

3.1.2 CS and RCU Structure and Linkage with MDAs

The study reviewed the structure of the CS and RCU to assess the extent it facilitates the two institutions to deliver on their mandates (see also Section 2). As for the CS, the emerging view is that current organizational structure match with the mandate of the institution and facilitates delivery of policy priority actions. . However, there are instances of capacity gaps at the MDAs level and also instances where CS clients (MDAs) bypass the CS structure.

The current structure requires that policy proposals should pass through the normal way: from MDA, to the CS, to IMTC, and then to the Cabinet. Except in special cases, e.g. in the case of emergencies, the CS should continue to provide its critical review of the policy proposal in order to ensure policy coherency and weed out contradictions.

The issue raised here could be addressed through regular awareness raising seminars, e.g. *“semina elekezi”* on the ills of bypassing the policy scrutiny stage provided by the CS. Capacity gaps for preparing quality proposals could also be addressed through specific measures as an extension of the CS/RCU programme. *An internal review/study by CS to highlight on policy that short-circuited the process and subsequently failed can form strong evidence in such awareness seminars.*

The need to revisit the RCU structure has been strongly recommended in the recent study (see Section 2).

3.1.3. Systems, Working Tools and Facilities

Systems: The study noted that both CS and RCU have not formally installed/put in place the following: (a) robust M&E system; (b) Information, Education and Communication management (IEC) system; and (c) the Knowledge management system. The last two are particularly key for RCU in ensuring that coordination is effective and the coherent messages reach the general public.

However, several efforts were noted towards establishing such systems or related ones. In particular, the CS has initiated the process of developing the M&E framework, which will ultimately lead to the establishment of the M&E system. Also efforts to establish the information resource center (IRC) are underway, and once operational, it could cater for some aspects of Information, Education and Communication management (IEC) system and the Knowledge⁴. Furthermore, the government supports the 'tovuti ya wananchi' where the general public can submit their view on the performance of various areas/department of the government. *The team is of the view that these efforts will need to be supported and scaled up under the information resource center (IRC) initiative and M&E framework currently underway within the CS*

The Client Service Charter (CSC) is still considered key in enhancing the performance assessment in CS and RCU. The study noted that CSC has not been completed. Looking across government, the effectiveness of this CSC remains illusive. However, the CS views it as essential in going forward. *Thus, completion and use of the CSC, linked with performance assessment is considered to be essential in raising the*

⁴ It is important that capacity support should be extended to ensure that the IRC is /can be accessed by officers from their offices/desks (where applicable).

performance of the CS and RCU. It is recommended that CS and RCU should be supported to provide lead in the use of the CSC.

Infrastructure: The assessment noted critical deficiency in key infrastructure for effective functioning of the CS and RCU. In particular, the assessment noted the following:

Office Space:

Office space (in terms of number and quality) is inadequate. Likewise, the CS and RCU do not have special area for meeting with their visitors/clients. The lack of CS/RCU visitors meeting room threatens the confidentiality required in these offices given the nature of the information the two institutions handle. It was also noted that CS conference room has not been refurbished to the required standard to allow smooth and productive discussion of the policy proposals. *Addressing the concerns of office space requires clear investment program showing what can be achieved in the short term and those aspect, which could be phased to outer years. However, refurbishing the CS and RCU offices is recommended as one of the short term / immediate actions. This measure should go hand in hand with a check on the situation of key collaborators of these offices namely offices of Directors of Policy and Planning and Reform Programme Coordinators at MDA.*

Office and ICT Facilities:

The study noted that the CS and RCU have been using old models of most ICT requirement; updating them is necessary condition for performance effectiveness of the two institutions. The required tools include Computers, laptops, printers, scanner, TV and channels connectivity to world news /satellite dish. Reliable connectivity to Internet is also required. The CS also underscored the need to be vanished with safe boxes/strong file cabinets.

The assessment noted that envisaged M&E system in the CS as well as database under the RCU would require specialized/customized software for their effective operationalization. It is also expected that the IRC will also require some specialized software. However, the team is of the view that, the actual requirements are expected to appear in their respective proposals.

Transport: According to responsibilities vested to CS, it was established that each CS committee with more than two staff should have two vehicles to facilitate the officers to discharge their duties. Based on the experience, this ratio is optimal to provide CS staff with sufficient flexibility and mobility to interact with their clients. However, most of the vehicles are already run down and replacement is required. The total requirement is 9 vehicles detailed as follows:

- The Office of the Clerk to the Cabinet (CC) requires 3 vehicles.
- The MJ committee has 4 staff and therefore requires 2 vehicle;
- NUU has 4 staff and requires 2 vehicles
- The M&E is designed to have 4 staff, thus requires 2 vehicles

3.2 Capacity Area II: Human Resource

The objective of the assessment in this area is to obtain information on the manning levels, knowledge; experience, skills and attitudes of CS and RCU staff and identify related capacity needs.

Staffing Levels: As noted in Section 2, the agreed organization structure and the level of responsibility of each committee/unit drive the staffing level of the CS/RCU. The assessment shows that several committees have relatively large gaps while others don't. Specifically, the manning level and gaps are summarized in Table 3.1.

Table 3.1: The required manning level and gaps in CS and RCU

Committee/Unit	Required staffing level	Available	Gap
Economic and Finance (UF)	5	3	3
Foreign, Defense and Security (NUU)	3	2	1
Constitutional, Legal and Parliamentary Affairs (KB)	3	2	1
Community Development and Social Service (MJ)	5	5	0
Clerk to the Cabinet (CC)	2	2	0
Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E)	4	1	3
Environment (MZ)	2	0	2
Reforms Coordination Unit (RCU)	3	2	1

The extent to which the staff available for the policy priority action is deployed at the adequate level and implementation effectiveness (e.g. committees or sub-units in RCU) is considered to be medium. Since this is an internal assessment, there may be some underestimation of how the clients of the two organs feel about the effects of understaffing. *It is therefore important that the gaps are urgently filled for effective execution of CS and RCU mandates.*

Experience: The assessment shows that all CS and RCU staff has the required number of years of relevant work experience in line with their positions. Ideally, the entry point was set to be at the level of Assistant Director (from MDAs). However, due to inadequate succession plan caused by freeze of staff requirements in the early years of PSRP, staff of the CS has been drawn from the pool of Principle Officers, with strong background and excellent track records. So far this has not resulted into problems. An assessment was conducted on the extent to which the staff members are exposed to international experience, through attendance of seminars and conferences and the result is low, indicating that there is need for a clear plan on exposure to these events on an annual basis and with clear focus, objectivity and transparency.

Skills: The CS and RCU roles and functions require their staff to have diverse skills and to be “on-top” of the issues. They should be able to cope with current policy issues, which are raised in policy proposals and reform proposals. The staffs of the two organs also require strong managerial, coordination and executive communication skills.

The study noted that the current skill mix is considered satisfactory. However, early discussions with CS and RCU officials indicated that the following are the areas that needs further capacity building: (1) Basics of M&E; (2) Public Policy Analysis; (3) Result Based Management; (4) Executive Management Skill; (5) Negotiation skills; (6) Legal drafting skills; (7) Conflict management courses; (8) Executive Communication Skills and Public Speaking; (9) Public and National Policy Event management; (10) Computer skills; (11) Environmental Planning; (12) Change management; and (13) Coordination and Administrative Skills. *The training support, especially short-term courses, is one of the required interventions to acquire the above skills.*

After the initial scoping exercise, CS and RCU staffs were asked to rank the most important skill gaps, which they would like to be addressed in the near future. Plausibly, the ranking reflects what each staff considers to be a binding skill or skills, which will be needed soon in the near future. In that case, they assigned points according to their priorities and ranked them in the training program (Table 3.2). The analysis of the ranking results in the training program presented in Appendix A1. Surprisingly, change management did not feature as key, even for RCU staff.

Table 3.2. Ranking of skills areas by CS and RCU staff

		Rank1	Rank2	Rank3	Total Responses
1	Public Policy Analysis	7	3	0	10
2	Basics of M&E	2	3	1	6
3	Conflict management courses	2	0	3	5
4	Public and National Policy Event management	0	1	3	4

		Rank1	Rank2	Rank3	Total Responses
5	Executive Communication Skills and Public Speaking	0	1	3	4
6	Negotiation skills	0	2	1	3
7	Coordination and Administrative Skills	1	1	0	2
8	Executive Management Skill	0	1	1	2
9	Environmental Planning	1	0	0	1
10	Computer skills	0	0	1	1
11	Legal drafting skills	0	0	1	1
12	Result Based Management	0	0	1	1
13	Change management	0	0	0	0

Note: color change from green = high frequency to red = least frequent

Consultations with CS staff noted that additional skills could be acquired through skill exchange program between CS staff and MDAs' staff. In particular, the consultations discussed the option of skill exchange between CUS/CAS on one hand, and the PS/DPS, on the other. The study noted that this was not the first time the idea of CS-MDAs skills exchange is tabled. However, it was noted that there is no an effective mechanisms in place for skills and knowledge transfer, even though such ideas have been discussed internally. At present, the feasibility of this option seems remote since CS is not currently acting as a pool from which to draw PSs and DPSs. *However, there was consensus that the idea of CS staff attachment to countries with similar should be supported in order to acquire additional skills and experiences.*

Capacity of Cabinet Liaison Officers (CLOs): Despite the caveat in the above paragraph, assessment noted that the interactions and skill transfers to CLOs (and perhaps CLOs to share their experience with CS) are areas, which need to be strengthened. It is noted that, there is substantial CLOs turn over or attritions and new one are appointed. As expected, skills in handling policy/Cabinet papers among the newly appointed CLOs are limited. *It was noted that capacity building is required, e.g. in terms of orientation retreat/workshops of the CLOs to address issues of attrition. There is a need to support this suggestion on a regular basis as well as when needs arise.*

4. CONCLUSION AND FURTHER RECOMMENDATIONS

4.1. Concluding Remarks

This report raises many capacity development issues within the CS and RCU and across the major clients of the two organs, particularly the CLOs and Reform Coordinators (RCs). In many respects, the report corroborates past reviews of the performance of the two organs. For instance, past reviews have shown that the current organization arrangement is ideal given the roles and functions of CS. The structure of the RCU however needs realignment. This view is upheld in the current study noted, like in other studies, the following broad areas for capacity development support.

- i. The institutional arrangement in as far as CS, relates with policy and planning department of the MDAs/Ministries (down stream policy units in Government structure). This includes the institutional arrangements reflecting the interaction between CS on one hand, the POPC and PMO on the others in implementing their national level policy coordination functions.
- ii. Coordination platform, when CS engages with downstream policy units (e.g. coordination meetings).
- iii. HR capacities in terms of adequacy in skill mix to cater for the mandate of the CS/RCU. This aspect extends beyond the CS to viewing the cabinet liaison Officers (CLO) and Reform Coordinators (PCs).

Moving forward, specific issues for short-term interventions are pooled out to the Appendix A1 in the form of capacity building program. Issues that can be address over the medium to terms are presented as Appendix A2.

4.2. Capacity Areas for Further Consideration

We noted that the proposal to address skills related capacity focus on the traditional training approach, except the proposal that explores the feasibility of attachment of CS and RCU staff to other national systems of policy management.

The idea of attachment can be extended to include mentoring, coaching and collaborative approaches, such as CS and RCU's collaboration with local research institutions. This collaboration will extend CS analytic capacity, e.g. on scanning of past policies and preparation of an inventory of policies, evaluation of effectiveness of policies. Likewise, RCU could have a contractual framework of working together with, e.g. the departments of public administration in national research institutions on reform issues and mentoring. As a pilot case, this approach to capacity building could be packaged in a framework/agreement among parties over the three years of this project.

The CS and RCU should be support, to under the current program, to develop collaborative framework and developing annual plan and its m& e for both CS and RCU. While such a framework is integrated in the revised SP of the CS and RCU, it will also act as an instrument to attract further support (i.e. financial resources and Technical Assistance). The framework should be comprehensive to include the CLO and PCs, who in fact determine the effectiveness of CS and RCU.

Appendix A1: Three-Year Training Program for Skills Development and Upgrading among CS and RCU Staff

The team working on this assignment was required to address the following two areas:

- i. Develop a learning, training and mentorship programme to optimize and enhance existing capacities to ensure that they align with the mandates and roles of the Cabinet Secretariat and RCU;
- ii. Propose an affordable approach to implement the Training programme; and

To address the two issues, the skills ranking was done by staff of CS and RCU forms the basis of the proposed program. The individual rankings (one – to – three) are summarized in Table A1. It is apparent that policy analysis is overly subscribed and no one gave it the third rank. The revealed preference ordering in Table A1 reflects core functions of the CS. Based on expressed preferences, *it is recommended that all those who showed preference for policy analysis should be supported.*

There is also over subscription to the training on the basics of M&E, which reflects the growing needs for M&E and management for results. *It therefore recommended that all those showed or expressed preference on the basics of M&E should be supported.*

Other skills areas have not received many aspirants. However, those areas still remain very essential for effective functioning of the CS and RCU. *It is recommended that all who expressed interest in those areas should be supported to*

attend training in the respective areas. Moreover, upon returning, they should be required and supported to share their knowledge and impact skills to other staff in the form of workshop/in a retreat mode.

Table A1. Individual ranking (preference) of essential skills for CS and RCU

		A. Masawe	A. Tamayamali	H. Shebuga	T. Kikombele	G. Mdemu	A. Luoga	H. Mnyika	B. Kaijage	J. Nsubili	C. Kiwale	C. Mwankupili	J. Kilabuko	Number of staff to be trained
		Ranks												
1	Public Policy Analysis			1	2	1	2	1	2	1	1	1	1	10
2	Basics of M&E	2	1	3	1					2	2			6
3	Conflict management courses						1	3	1		3	3		5
4	Executive Communication Skills and Public Speaking		3			2	3						3	4
5	Negotiation skills		2							3		2		3
6	Executive Management Skill							2	3					2
7	Coordination and Administrative Skills	1		2										2
8	Result Based Management	3												1
9	Legal drafting skills					3								1
10	Computer skills				3									1
11	Environmental Planning												1	1

It is apparent Table A1 that there are 36 staff skills training courses. Given the job descriptions of the CS/RCU staff, the sought training courses are executive training programs, which usually last for about 2 weeks. After intensive reflection on the cost implications, the CS/RCU team proposes the following training program.

Tabla A2. PROPOSED THREE YEARS TRAINING PROGRAMME (2014 - 2016) FOR CS AND RCU STAFF UNDER SPONSORSHIP OF POLICY COHERENCE PROJECT

PROPOSED THREE YEARS TRAINING PROGRAMME (2014 - 2016) FOR CS AND RCU STAFF UNDER SPONSORSHIP OF POLICY COHERENCE PROJECT													
SN	FULL NAME	INTENDED COURSES IN THE ORDER OF THEIR PREFERENCES	PROPOSED COURSE	DURATION	TRAINING INSTITUTION	PROPOSED YEAR OF STUDY			Tuition Fees (\$)	Air Ticket (\$)	Sub. Allowance (\$)	Incidental (\$)	Total (\$)
						2014	2015	2016					
1	G. Mdemu	1. Executive Communication Skills & Public Speaking 2. Legal Drafting Skills	Translating Policy into Legislation	2 weeks	RIPA Internatinal - UK	08 - 19 SEPT 2014			6,545	2,097	6,300	1,260	16,202
2	S. Kagaigai	1. Executive Communication Skills & Public Speaking 2. Legal Drafting Skills 3. Conflict Management Skills	Policy formulation, Implementation and Evaluation	2 weeks	Institute for Capacity Development (ICD) - Pretoria, RSA	7 - 18 July			2,850	1,000	6,300	1,260	11,410
3	J. Majuva	1. Cinflict Management Skills 2. Public Policy Analysis 3. Executive Management Skills	Translating Policy into Legislation	2 weeks	RIPA Internatinal - UK			March	6,545	2,097	6,300	1,260	16,202
4	T. Kikombele	1. Basics of M&E 2. Public Policy Analysis 3. Computer Skills	Policy formulation, Implementation and Evaluation	2 weeks	Institute for Capacity Development (ICD) - Pretoria, RSA			Oct	2,850	1,960	6,300	1,260	12,370
5	G. Ntigiti	1. Public Policy Analysis 2. Basics of M&E 3. Negotiation Skills	Translating Policy into Legislation	2 weeks	RIPA Internatinal - UK	08 - 19 Sept			6,545	2,097	6,300	1,260	16,202
6	L. Nduhiye	1. Public Policy Analysis 2. Basics of M&E 3. Negotiation Skills	Translating Policy into Legislation	2 weeks	RIPA INTERNATIONA L - UK			May	6,545	2,097	6,300	1,260	16,202
7	J. Kilabuko	1. Public Policy Analysis 2.Environmental planning 3. Executive Communication Skills & Public Speaking	Environmental Monitoring in Energy Sector	2 weeks	Institute for Capacity Development (ICD) - Pretoria, RSA	03 -14 Nov			2,850	1,000	6,300	1,260	11,410

PROPOSED THREE YEARS TRAINING PROGRAMME (2014 - 2016) FOR CS AND RCU STAFF UNDER SPONSORSHIP OF POLICY COHERENCE PROJECT													
SN	FULL NAME	INTENDED COURSES IN THE ORDER OF THEIR PREFERENCES	PROPOSED COURSE	DURATION	TRAINING INSTITUTION	PROPOSED YEAR OF STUDY			Tuition Fees (\$)	Air Ticket (\$)	Sub. Allowance (\$)	Incidentals (\$)	Total (\$)
						2014	2015	2016					
8	J. Nsubili	1. Public Policy Analysis 2. Basics of M&E 3. Negotiation Skills	Translating Policy into Legislation	2 weeks	RIPA Internatinal - UK	08 - 19 Sept	Mar		6,545	2,097	6,300	1,260	16,202
9	C. Mwankupili	1. Public Policy Analysis 2. Negotiation Skills 3. Conflict Management Skills	Policy formulation, Implementation and Evaluation	2 weeks	Institute for Capacity Development (ICD) - Windhoek Namibia		June		3,000	1,232	6,300	1,260	11,792
10	A. Luoga	1. Conflict Management Skills 2. Public Policy Analysis 3. Executive Communication Skills & Public Speaking	Sustainable Mining Law and Policy Implementation	2 weeks	Institute for Capacity Development (ICD) - Windhoek Namibia			10 - 21 JULY	3,000	1,232	6,300	1,260	11,792
11	A. Msafiri	1. Conflict Management Skills 2. Public Policy Analysis 3. Executive Communication Skills & Public Speaking	Conflict and International Systems	2 weeks	GIMI - ISRAEL		March		3,000	1,970	8,400	1,680	15,050
12	C. Kiwale	1. Public Policy Analysis 2. Basics of M&E 3. Conflicts Management Skills	Translating Policy into Legislation	2 weeks	RIPA Internatinal - UK		March		6,545	2,097	6,300	1,260	16,202
13	H. Shebuge	1. Public Policy Analysis 2. Coordination & Administrative Skills 3. Basics of M & E	Public Sector Leadership in Africa: positioning for reforms	2 weeks	ESAMI - Kampala Uganda		May		2,000	900	6,300	1,260	10,460
14	H. Mnyikah	1. Public Policy Analysis 2. Executive Management Skills 3. Conflict Management Skills	Policy formulation, Implementation and Evaluation	2 weeks	Harare - Zimbabwe		April		1,150	858	6,300	1,260	9,568
15	A. Tamayamali	1. Basics of M & E 2. Negotiation Skills 3. Executive Communication Skills and Public Speaking	Leadership Innovation and Change Management	2 weeks	Harare - Zimbabwe	03 - 12 Dec			2,850	858	6,300	1,260	11,268
16	A. Massawe	1. Coordination & Administrative Skills 2. Basics of M & E 3. Results Based Management	Result Based Performance Management	2 weeks	Institute for Capacity Development (ICD) - Windhoek Namibia		Mar		3,000	1,232	6,300	1,260	11,792

PROPOSED THREE YEARS TRAINING PROGRAMME (2014 - 2016) FOR CS AND RCU STAFF UNDER SPONSORSHIP OF POLICY COHERENCE PROJECT													
SN	FULL NAME	INTENDED COURSES IN THE ORDER OF THEIR PREFERENCES	PROPOSED COURSE	DURATION	TRAINING INSTITUTION	PROPOSED YEAR OF STUDY			Tuition Fees (\$)	Air Ticket (\$)	Sub. Allowance (\$)	Incidenta 1 (\$)	Total (\$)
						2014	2015	2016					
											GRAND TOTAL	\$214,124	

Appendix A2. TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR CAPACITY NEEDS ASSESSMENT FOR CABINET SECRETARIAT AND REFORMS COORDINATION UNIT (excerpt)

1. Introduction

The President's Office–State House (POSH) in collaboration with UNDP has developed a multi-year Policy Coherence, Reform Coordination and Monitoring and Evaluation Project (2013 – 2015) that was jointly approved by both parties **UNDP** and **POSH** in June 2013. The project focuses on two key areas namely: (i) Enhancing systems capacity for effective policy development and management in government, and (ii) Strengthening human capacity for effective policy analysis and change management. Several outputs are expected to be realised in the implementation of the project. A strengthened Human Resource Capacity for Cabinet Secretariat (CS) and Reform Coordination Unit (RCU) for effective policy management and improved Reforms Coordination is one of the outputs. To that effect, **and** taking into consideration the key roles of the Cabinet Secretariat and Reforms Coordination Unit, the projects saw it prudent to Conduct Capacity Needs Assessment for CS and RCU and develop a specific capacity building programme for the same.

The proposed assessment will provide input into the development of a capacity building programme that will contribute to strengthening institutional capacity of the Cabinet Secretariat in undertaking its function of policy management and RCU in areas of reforms coordination and change management. Particularly, the programme intends to build capacity of the two institutions for effective Reforms Coordination, Policy Analysis and Management.

The Capacity Needs Assessment therefore, will not only identify skills and knowledge gaps but also will determine organization as well as individuals' competence level for effective performance of the two institutions. It is expected that, the assignment will result in a specific capacity building programme and recommend on measures to enhance performances of CS and RCU.

2. Purpose

The purpose of this assignment is to conduct needs assessment to identify capacity gaps which need to be addressed, through capacity Building programme, to enhance the performance of CS and RCU.

3. Objectives

The objective of this assignment is to determine capacity gaps in terms of skills, knowledge and abilities required for effective performance of Cabinet Secretariat and RCU

4. Assignments and Tasks

The assessment will be conducted by a Lead Facilitator in collaboration with a Technical Working Group (TWG) composed of Officers from the Cabinet Secretariat and RCU. The results of the assessment will be used to develop Capacity Building Training Programme for CS and RCU and propose on measures to address Capacity issues. Specifically, the Lead Facilitator will carry out the following tasks:

- iii. Conduct a familiarization working session to key stakeholders on overview of the approach⁵ to be used in this assessment;
- iv. Study the roles and functions of Cabinet Secretariat and RCU in order to identify requisite skills, knowledge and abilities for effective performance;
- v. Analyze and identify capacity gaps at Cabinet Secretariat and RCU in terms of skills, knowledge and abilities;

⁵ UNDP approach for Capacity Needs Assessment will be used in envisioned assessment.

- vi. Undertake an intensive search of best skills, knowledge and abilities in areas of policy analysis, monitoring and evaluation, and change management and recommend for training and experience sharing;
- vii. Develop a learning, training and mentorship programme to optimize and enhance existing capacities to ensure that they align with the mandates and roles of the Cabinet Secretariat and RCU;
- viii. Propose an affordable approach to implement the Training programme; and
- ix. Recommend on other measures to strengthen Capacity of the Cabinet Secretariat and RCU

5. Methodology

Capacity needs assessment will be undertaken by Lead Facilitator in collaboration with a TWG using primary and secondary data obtained through review of various documents, discussion and interviews with relevant respondents such as the Chief Secretary, Permanent Secretary (state House), Deputy Permanent Secretary (State House), Clerk to the Cabinet, Cabinet Under Secretaries, Coordinator (RCU), and Cabinet Assistant Secretaries.

6. Deliverables and timeline

The main output of the assignment is a capacity needs assessment report, which shall include a capacity building programme and recommendations on measures to be undertaken to improve performance of the Cabinet Secretariat and the RCU. The following deliverables are expected to be produced for realization of the main output:

- i. A draft capacity needs assessment report to be produced 10 days after the signing of contract; and
- ii. Capacity needs assessment report including capacity building programme produced 10 working days after receipt of stakeholders' comments on the draft report.

