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1. General Overview and Background

Within the UN’s multi-agency Private Sector Development Program (PSDP) and Local Area Development Program (LADP, bridging phase), ILO and UNOPS were responsible, among other things, for assisting the Governors’ Offices of seven Provinces toward the development of Provincial Economic Development Strategies (hereinafter Compacts). This intervention was carried out in Anbar, Basrah and Erbil (under PSDP) and Babel, Missan, Thi Qar and Sulaymaniah (under LADP).

To that purpose, the Governors of the mentioned Provinces have nominated a group of experts tasked of leading the Compact design process, under the technical guidance and with the training offered by ILO and UNOPS.

The focus of the capacity building has been on how to best carry out a diagnosis to identify strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats of the local economy, and to prioritize economic-development interventions. As part of the assistance, a first technical workshop was conducted in Amman (March 2011) to introduce the Local Economic Development (LED) approach to the participants and discuss about institutional/governance arrangements for LED. A second training workshop took place in Beirut (November, 2011) on how to produce a territorial diagnosis of the governorates; and another training workshop was delivered in Erbil (March 2012) on how to identify projects with stakeholders and prepare implementation plans. These capacity building events were complemented with technical support and guidance provided by the ILO Economic Recovery Specialist and three Consultants (one in Erbil, one in Anbar and one in Basrah).

The final, Lessons Learned workshop was held in Istanbul (27th-28th November 2012). Participants from targeted Provinces (including local authorities) presented their first Economic Development Compact (i.e. territorial diagnosis and project charters), shared their experiences and discussed the lessons learned throughout the first roll out of the economic development planning methodology proposed by ILO and UNOPS for Iraqi Provinces. Groups of Experts from the following seven Governorates have participated: Anbar, Babel, Basrah, Erbil, Missan, Thi Qar, and Sulaymaniah.
2. Workshop Objectives

2.1 Objective Statement

The objective of the workshop is for participants from targeted Provinces to:

1. Complete the first LERD planning cycle by:
   - Presenting their first Economic Development Compact (i.e. territorial diagnosis and project charters);
   - Sharing their experiences and discussing the lessons learned throughout the first roll out of the economic development planning methodology proposed by ILO and UNOPS for Iraqi Provinces;
   - Drawing conclusions in terms of does and don’ts, good practices, success factors, and shortcomings of the proposed planning methodology based on the positive and negative experiences.

2. Receive feedbacks from international experts on how to improve the quality of Provincial Development Plans by ensuring that:
   - They are based on a situation analysis and actual needs, not on available funding;
   - Address social and economic needs in a comprehensive and coordinated manner, in both urban and rural areas, through multisectoral projects;
   - Prioritize projects based on urgency and importance of needs, possible impact, and attainability based on available resources.

2.2 Expected Results

Through the workshop and related activities, the project team was expected to achieve the following:

- The Governorates share with each other their first Economic Development Compact and exchange experiences, highlighting challenges and coping methods;
- Comments and suggestions by international-level experts on the Economic Development Compacts presented by the Provinces of Anbar, Babel, Basrah, Erbil and Missan.
- Comments, feedback and recommendations on the LERD Guidelines, on the planning methodology and the capacity building process applied by ILO/UNOPS. Such comments would inform the revision of the Guidelines and the adaptation of the capacity building process and approach for future similar projects, such as LADP II.
- Worldwide examples of local economic development strategies and projects provided by the international experts invited as resource persons to the workshop.
- Lessons learned by the Provincial groups of experts and the project team, documented in a report and structured along the key sections tackled during the workshop.

2.3 Achieved Results

The workshop proved to be useful in several ways:

- Representatives from the five Governorates which completed the first economic development planning cycle all delivered presentations on the Economic Development Compacts they developed using the (LERD) Guidelines;
- Participants were introduced to successful international experiences of LER by the International Local Economic Development Experts who attended the workshop;
The Governorate of Thi Qar, which had not yet completed its Economic Development Compact, also gave a presentation on the work that has been achieved so far and demonstrated the main challenges faced by the team till date;

The Governorate of Anbar, from which the project team was not expecting any representative until two days before the workshop, delegated two Officials, i.e. the Technical Advisor of the Governor and the Assistant of the Deputy Governor. The Technical Advisor of the Governor, who headed the delegation from Anbar, appreciated quality of the Territorial Diagnosis and the project charters; it is to be noted that, differently from other Governorates, in Anbar the work was not carried out with a group of experts: ILO and UNOPS directly facilitated the process involving local stakeholders, because in August the Governor’s Office decided not to participate any longer to this activity. The Technical Advisor of the Governor expressed words of endorsement for the work and manifested the intention of the Governor’s Office to carefully review the documents and adjust them as appropriate, in view of a final and official adoption.

Each presentation was followed by lively discussions and interventions asking for additional information and clarifications in order to best benefit from the experiences of the different provinces;

The informative presentations of the groups of experts show-cased specific aspects of each experience, highlighted the similarities between the different Governorates in terms of weaknesses and strengths bringing up differences. This triggered interactive discussions and a series of interventions and questions by the participants asking for further clarification, details and suggesting recommendations each from his experience on the ground;

3. Participants

3.1 Participation

The workshop intended to gather 63 participants, but ended up having the total of 51 participants, mostly members of the Groups of Experts and some representatives of the Governors’ Offices and Provincial Councils from six Governorates in Iraq (Anbar, Babel, Erbil, Missan, Thi Qar, and Sulaymaniah). The full list of participants is in Annex II.

At the Ministerial level, two representatives from the KRG Ministries of Planning and Interior participated, while the Minister and the Deputy Minister of Planning from the central Government had to decline due to urgent commitments, after having initially confirmed their attendance.

None of the members of the Group of Experts from Basrah attended the workshop. It has been reported that the Governor of Basrah opted not to attend the workshop in Istanbul due to a recent statement made by the Turkish Government which he perceived as politically unacceptable. Hence why, the entire the delegation, including the members of the Group of Experts from Basrah abstained from flying to Turkey to attend the Workshop as an act of solidarity and maintenance of a consistent political position. Representation was rather low from Anbar Governorate with only three participants, two from the Governor’s Office and one from the Provincial Council.

The ILO was represented by the Deputy Regional Director for Arab states, the Director of the ILO Program for Crisis Response and Reconstruction, the Local Economic Recovery Specialist and three Compact Design consultants from Anbar, Basrah and Erbil. From UNOPS, three Local Economic Recovery Officers from Anbar, Basrah and Sulaymaniah. Also the UNDP Area Coordinator in the Kurdistan Region for LADP II (former ILO/UNOPS LADP Coordinator in the North) attended the workshop.

The Managing Director of Medal ltd. facilitated the sessions throughout the workshop. Last but not least, the Director of the UNDP Istanbul International Center for Private Sector in Development (IICPSD), hosting the workshop, joined the participants during the opening sessions of the first day.
4. Workshop Delivery

4.1 Overview of the workshop Agenda

The Workshop lasted for two days. The workshops sessions started every day at 9:00 am and finished at 3:30 pm. The first workshop day included opening speeches given by the Deputy Director of the ILO ROAS and the Director of the IICPSD and keynote speeches by the Director of the ILO Program for Crisis Response and Reconstruction and the Director of the Centre for Urban and Regional Development Studies in Newcastle University.

After the first coffee break, the sessions went on with a short presentation by the LER Specialist who presented the achievements of the local and the private sector development programmes.

The previously mentioned presentations were followed by a Q&A session. The following sessions of the day in addition to the first three sessions of the second day were dedicated to the presentation of the first Economic Development Compacts by the groups of experts from each province. Overall, six presentations were made by the groups of experts. After each presentation, the floor was open for questions and comments by the participants. Those sessions lasted for until the end of the first half of day two.

During the second half of day two, the participants carried out an interactive and participative group exercise, which was a variation on the standard “World café”. This activity, designed by the LER Specialist and the facilitator, aimed to bring the Groups of Experts to engage together in proposing recommendations for the revision of the economic planning methodology and the capacity building process.

The activity consisted of five rounds of consultations in groups on the following five topics: (1) the planning methodology proposed by ILO and UNOPS; (2) the capacity building process; (3) institutional arrangements/governance for economic development planning in the Provinces; (4) the composition of the Group of Experts; and (5) access to data. The recommendations were to be structured along the five themes mentioned above.

The World Café activity continued until after the second - and last - coffee break. The sessions ended with each of the table hosts presenting in plenary the ideas and recommendations of the groups for improving the planning process and the Guidelines based on their experiences and lessons learned throughout the first planning cycle.

At the end of the Lessons Learned Workshop, participants evaluated the overall workshop by filling out a pre-made questionnaire and a group picture was taken by a professional photographer.

4.2 Documents for Discussion

Documents used during the workshop were the following, in order of use:

1. The agendas of the the lessons learned workshop and the Writeshop in English and Arabic;
2. Workshop flyer in English and Arabic;
3. Opening speech by Mr. Frank Hagemann, Deputy Regional Director of ILO ROAS;
4. Presentation power point by the two resource persons, Alfredo Lazarte-Hoyle (ILO/CRISIS) and Prof. Pike (Newcastle University), and by Francesca Battistin (ILO Program in Iraq);
5. Reports on the Territorial Diagnosis of the Governorates of Anbar, Babel, Basrah, Erbil and Missan in Arabic and English;
6. Project Charters of the Governorate of Anbar in Arabic;
7. Problem, Objectives, Solutions tree in Arabic;
8. Power Point presentations of the Economic Development Compact in Arabic for five Governorates, in Arabic (Anbar, Babel, Basra, Erbil, Missan)
9. Power Point presentation of the Governorate of Thi Qar, in Arabic;
11. The final evaluation questionnaire in Arabic.

Documents 5-9 cited above were developed by the Group of Experts from the Provinces of Anbar, Babel, Basrah, Erbil and Missan under the technical guidance and with the training offered by ILO and UNOPS. The Governorate of Thi Qar, represented by its Group of Experts at the workshop, had not completed its Economic Development Compact and presented instead a report demonstrating the results of their analysis till date of the economic situation in the Governorate, the obstacles and restrictions that they faced and gave suggestions and ideas for local economic development and recovery in Thi Qar Governorate. As for the remaining documents, with exception of the opening speech and the presentations by the resource persons, they were developed by the ILO.

4.3 Delivery Methodology

Most of the workshop consisted of presentations delivered by representatives from the Governorates which completed the first economic development planning cycle using the “Planning for Economic Recovery and Development (LERD) at the Provincial Level in Iraq: Guidelines, Templates and Examples”. The presentations show-cased specific aspects of each case study and were followed by discussions to identify lessons and suggest recommendations. The workshop was opened by two Key-note speakers. The first speaker is an ILO Specialist from HQ with many years of experience in the domain of Local Economic Development; the second is a Professor of Local and Regional Development at the Newcastle University as well as Director of the Center for Urban and Regional Development. They were both selected based on their authoritative knowledge on the topic and their capacity to motivate the audience.

4.4 Overview of Workshop Activities

November 27, 2012

Opening remarks by Frank Hagemann, Deputy Director of the ILO Regional Office for Arab States: Mr. Hagemann stated that this event “marks the end of an important and challenging journey the ILO and UNOPS made with the participants”, reflected the belief of ILO that “decentralized and participatory planning for economic development is what will help Iraqis in finding relevant solutions for local needs” and finally stressed the importance of “remembering all lessons learned and experiences in order for the targeted provinces to be able to help themselves and also help other provinces getting it right from the start”.

First keynote speech: The second speech was scheduled to be given by Dr. Ali Shukri Yusuf Abdul-Nabi, H.E. the Minister of Planning of Iraq, but since he could not attend the workshop, the floor was given to Mr. Alfredo Lazarte-Hoyl, Director of the ILO Program for Crisis Response and Reconstruction (ILO/CRISIS) for his presentation on ILO’s LER-LED approach and interventions worldwide. Mr. Lazarte-Hoyl explained the difference between LED and LER, more precisely, where each of them is to be implemented. He then highlighted the link and point of intersection between the two phases. The ILO/CRISIS Director gave examples of successful experiences of LED and LER in other countries, such as Cambodia. He also summarized the phases of the planning work carried out by the project team in the six Iraqi provinces, which would eventually be displayed in the form of a logical framework matrix.
Second keynote speech: The subsequent presentation was made by the second keynote speaker, Professor Andy Pike, Director of the Centre for Urban and Regional Development Studies in Newcastle University, who identified some of the key issues in designing and delivering LED in an effective, inclusive and sustainable manner. He underlined the critical role of institutions, whether formal or informal, in the success or failure of LED. To better convey his idea, he introduced the “iceberg” of local development and recalled that the official private sector is the small portion we see on the submerged part of the iceberg, while the bigger part of economic activities and LED lies underneath the surface and therefore, is not clearly seen. He also spoke about decentralization, a very important and relevant topic to the Iraqi context. He finally emphasized the importance of decentralization and the need to pay attention to its different categories, based on the type and extent of responsibilities that are delegated to the local authorities. The presentation was concluded with a diagram explaining the long route ahead which requires persistence and constant follow-up to reach a sound decentralized local model in line with the central-level governance.

Welcome remarks by host: A fourth speech was conveyed by the Director of the IICPSD, Dr. Simona Marinescu, who welcomed the participants, shared a few words about the role of the Center in Istanbul and gave a brief about how this Center sees its role for the future of private sector development in Iraq after working for the last three years on implementing PSDP-I with Iraqi counterparts and colleagues, and on formulating the private sector development strategy. Since phase I of the project ends at the end of 2012, Dr. Marinescu stated that efforts would continue in the next stage of the project and hoped to have a plan for the second phase of the PSDP in Iraq before the end of December.

Following the speeches and presentations delivered in Session I, the facilitator opened the floor for a 30 minute Q&A session Questions by participants:

- The first intervention was made by a member of the Group of Experts from Missan who expressed concerns that the LED experience in Iraq is still little compared to the experiences in other countries and there is a lot that the experts in Iraq still do not know. The main challenge they had to deal with was linked to data collection and statistics. For this reason, it was stated that Iraq needs more than one or two years to carry out an analyses of the economic situation in order to achieve better LED results.

- A question was raised by a member of the Group of Experts from Babel who recalled that in the case of Iraq, 95% of the economy depends on oil, therefore if an oil crisis occurs, Iraq will endure social and economic crisis. The question therefore, is what measures can be taken at the Provincial and Central levels to avoid major losses.

- Another participant asked whether there are any experiences from Arab states with more similar context to the one in Iraq. The participant noted that the international examples demonstrated during the keynote presentations reflected experiences of countries with conditions specific and unique to them, making it impossible to adopt their solutions in the pursuit of LED in Iraq.

Specialist's answers:

- Regarding the point that was made about timing, Professor Pike explained that decentralization is a process that takes time and that could even take decades to work out. However, an important point to take into account is whether decentralization is regarded as a means or an end. Professor Pike emphasized that decentralization is a means to design more effective economic policies and improve the life and wellbeing of Iraqis.
With regards to the second question, Professor Pike affirmed that experiences of other countries are, indeed, particular to those countries. He emphasized, however, that the crucial thing is to be able to understand the context of the experiences of others and learn from them, with a view to adapt the learning to the local economic context in order to develop more effective policies.

As for the question on how to deal with countries that depend on one commodity, such as oil in the case of Iraq, Professor Pike’s answer was that when oil dominates the national economy, its revenues have to be used to find ways to prepare for a greener economy and the present resources are to be used for future development.

The objectives of the lessons learned workshop, the agenda and the working methodology were introduced to the participants by the facilitator after the first Q&A session. The participants were also informed that all the documents that would be used during the workshop are contained in the folders distributed to them.

Session 2: Overview of the work accomplished: The IER Specialist for the Iraq Programme at ILO, Ms. Francesca Battistin, presented a chronological overview of the work accomplished till date through PSDP-I and LADP. She started by giving some background information on the roles and goals of ILO and UNOPS with the PSDP-I and LADP which were summarized under two main headings: (a) the institutionalization of local-level planning for economic development and (b) the provision of support to local-level planning for economic development. The Specialist evoked the key events that marked the ILO-UNOPS interventions within this initiative, starting from the proposal of establishment of the Economic Development Units, the development of planning Guidelines and the delivery of training workshops until the production and submission of the project charters in November 2012 and the workshop presently taking place to look into the substance of those efforts.

In the sessions which followed (Sessions 3 to 9), a member from each Group of Experts carried out a presentation demonstrating the results of the diagnosis of the economic situation in his respective Governorate, the prevailing issues and available opportunities for development in line with the territorial diagnosis findings and the economic development objectives. The presentations opened the door for productive questions and lively discussions.

Session 3: Economic Development Compact of Missan

The first Group of Experts to present its Economic Development Compact was from Missan Governorate. The presentation was delivered by Dr. Helmi Ibrahim Manshad, member of the Group of Experts.

The representative of the Missan Group of Experts started his presentation by introducing the Economic Development Compact, the Territorial Diagnosis and all the actors who contributed to the process of developing this compact. He presented the economic development goals for the Governorate of Missan and its districts and the main economic issue to be tackled at the governorate and the district levels. He cited the identified priority sub-sectors and justified the criteria on which the identification was based. He identified the Stakeholders and explained why and how the stakeholders were analyzed and how each of them should be mobilized. He then introduced and explained the findings of the SWOT analysis, the problems and their analysis and finally enumerated the objectives and outcomes of the compact. The presenter concluded the presentation by going through the Lessons learned throughout the first roll out of the economic development planning methodology.

The following points constitute the main lessons learned and suggestions for improving the planning process and the guidelines, as per Missan’s experience:

- The methodology proposed by ILO/UNOPS is detailed and contains modern concepts. Its content was made clear through the conducting of the training workshops and the help of the local advisor.
- Constant communication, discussions and participation were the most important reasons for the success of the capacity building process.
- The mechanisms put in place to monitor and evaluate learning (tests) were objective and transparent and linked between the need and the level of learning achieved after each training workshop.
- It should be noted that the draft Territorial Diagnosis for Missan Governorate has been used in the development of the economic development strategy for Missan for the years 2013 – 2017

- The Group of Missan recommended to:
  - Enhance the Guidelines by adding realistic examples drawn from previous experiences of countries;
  - Carry out the work with coherent and sequential steps;
  - Empower the units in charge of economic planning. The fear of a sagging career and that these entities would operate in the same old-fashioned and inefficient way of other Government units is one of the major challenges facing its establishment. However, giving these units adequate entitlements and power and ability to work with relevant international organizations will contribute a lot to their success and to the achievement of the intended goals from their establishment.
  - Improve communication with the Governor. The Group of Experts was constantly in touch with the Governor. However, to improve communication with the Governor, a detailed monthly report on the work progress should be addressed to him.
  - Assign full-time staff. The Economic Development Unit should be supported by a number of full-time staff to work in the field on data collection and analysis and carry out the administrative work of the Group.
  - The preparation of the territorial diagnosis requires a previously planned for work schedule where all the steps and the timeframe are set through, otherwise the process will be delayed which may lead to its complete failure.

- Participants’ questions:
  - The first question to the Group of Missan was about project identification. The Group was requested to provide some clarification on the project selection criteria, especially that it was noticed that the priority sectors identified, namely the construction, trade and agricultural sectors, were not all reflected in the list of prioritized projects.
  - Another question was about the unemployment rate mentioned by the presenter. The participants wanted to know about the types of unemployment reflected in the mentioned unemployment rate.
  - A third question was about the reason why data collection was carried out by the Economic Development Unit not by the Planning Unit, knowing that every Province has a planning Unit responsible for data collection.

- Answers:
  - In response to the first question, the group member from Missan clarified that three priority sub-sectors were identified according to the used indicators and SWOT analysis. At first a long projects list was drafted including all the priority sectors, then this list was shortened to only ten projects. He emphasized that the selection of certain projects does not mean that those are better than other projects, but many steps were to be applied for the selection process. For example, there was elimination for each project that is not consistent with the main goals set forth, and for projects that do not help the Governorate, such as re-empowering schools. These selected projects are all beneficial for economic development and can be used to serve and help all the sectors grow.
  - The presenter acknowledged the existence of Planning Units at the Provincial level, but argued that those Units lack the necessary resources and are small in number to be able to carry out the collection of all the needed data.
  - It was recommended that Planning Units responsible for data collection be established at the districts level. Henceforth, they could collect the data in a narrower space which they are already familiar with and the data collected in all the districts of a Province would later be put all together.
Regarding the question about unemployment, the Expert from Missan clarified that he was only referring to the rate of unemployment in the labour market which is 19.6% in Missan, which is greater than the national unemployment rate of 18%. He then noted that if he counted hidden unemployment in the Province, the unemployment rate might reach 60%.

**Conclusive remarks by resource person(s)**
- A last intervention was made by the the Director of the Program for Crisis Response and Reconstruction at ILO who congratulated the Group of expert from Missan for the comprehensive presentation. He debated the presented processes, by asking if the plans are actually all applicable, what role should the Unit play and whether it should simply capture data regardless of whether it was reliable or not.
- He also commented on the criteria used for the selection of the priority projects noting that the presentation shows their strong reliance on social criteria whereas what economic development plans principally need in a post – conflict environment is to reach legitimacy.
- A second remark he gave is that a more extensive analysis needs to be made which covers different geographical positions in order to achieve strategic change that leads to a long term economic change.
- He drew the attention of the participants that sometimes confusion between unemployment and underemployment occurs. And described trade is an important activity sector, but it is a home based activity in many places, and in order to provide support to such groups there is a need to make them more eminent. This could be achieved when the people acknowledge that they are doing something from their homes. In conclusion, he expressed that the presentation was rich enough to present an important problematic that raised a lot of discussion.

**Session 4: Economic Development Compact of Anbar**

- The second Group of Experts to present its Economic Development Compact was from Anbar Governorate.
- The presenter, Dr. Thaer Shaker Mahmoud al-Hiti (ILO Consultant), identified the same points tackled by the previous presentation by introducing the findings of the Economic Development Compact for the Province of Anbar.
- The main lessons learned as per the Group of Anbar were the following:
  - Capacity building needs to be done in a center or an institute. Universities also can have a basic role in this regard by hosting specialists from the public and private sectors.
  - Economic development groups should be formed at the Provincial level.
  - Advisory boards for development and planning should be formed at the level of Provincial Councils.
  - In accordance with the directions and policy of the Ministry of Planning; the group should have a consultative role in the identification and analysis of economic reality at the local level; capacity building and training should be carried out for personnel engaged in planning work; Groups working at the district level should receive training in order to be able to develop urban and regional plans with the participation of local communities.
  - In coordination with the Ministry of Planning and its planning institutions, it is recommended to: introduce the concept of modeling within the economic development planning process and examine different future scenarios; adjust the existing local economic analysis methodology to make it more suitable to the reality at the Provincial level; develop a clear methodology for spatial analysis of cities and regions and identify appropriate projects accordingly; the economic development units should be linked with the committees at the district level; the time to give feedback should coincide with the preparation of the plans by the Ministries; the team should have representatives from both the public and private sectors; the members of the Group of Experts should possess advanced graduate degrees in strategic planning, economics and sociology as a requirement in the terms of reference.
Participants’ questions:
- What is the reason for the lack of reliance on the Provincial-level stakeholders and the engagement of the stakeholders at the district level instead? Why among the identified stakeholders there are not figures from the public sector, the office of the Governorate and the Provincial Council?
- Why weren’t any projects proposed for the agricultural sector, despite the fact that this sector was identified among the priority sectors?
- Was spatial balance taken into consideration while planning for the development projects since it was noticed in the presentation that all the proposed projects were focused in the city of Al-Ratba?

Answers:
- In response to the first question, the presenter acknowledged that the proposed projects are not perfect and stated that those projects were boycotted by all the public sector. This is why they concentrated on the private sector and specialists. The presenter recalled the lack of participation from the government and described it as a main obstacle.
- Regarding the absence of agricultural projects, he affirmed that four among the ten shortlisted projects are related to the development of the agricultural sector.
- As for the last question, it was pointed out that Al-Ratba constitutes 90% of Al-Anbar Governorate with an unpopulated distance of 450 Km from Al-Ramady city. In relation to that, the Technical Advisor of the Anbar Governor stated that Al-Ratba is an economically neglected city and shared that the Governor’s Office is considering to change it into a Free Zone Area in order to promote its economic development.

Session 5: Economic Development Compact of Babel

- The identified lessons learned as per the Group from Babel were as follows:
  - The capacity building process of the members of the Groups of Experts on economic development has achieved its goals through the Group's ability to maintain the performance of the tasks required of it more efficiently and effectively.
  - Among the most important factors that contributed to the success of the capacity building process are the following:
    - Gaining knowledge on international experiences of recovery and economic development by competent experts;
    - Participatory and diverse exchange of experiences between members of groups in different provinces;
    - The training tools contained a lot of explanations and clarifications of how to conduct the various steps, in carrying out the territorial diagnostics or identifying projects. They also included many of websites addresses related to the necessary information and therefore making these tools, self-learning tools as well.
    - The territorial diagnosis process was a new step adopted in local planning. The adoption of such a planning process will lead to making transparent and unbiased decisions.
    - The extensive experience of the International Labour Organization representative and her continued assistance to the members of the group and provision of guidance with regards to the proposed plans.
- The Group identified the following areas in need of improvement:
- Developing a communication mechanism between the groups in the different provinces to share results, discuss the obstacles and work on ways to address them by conducting regular meetings between groups or attend activities carried out by a group in one of the provinces.

- The scientific and cognitive contents of the tools were clear and comprehensive. However, there was sometimes a lack of clarity with regard to the correct meaning of some terms as a result of the translation from English to Arabic. The terminology should be revised and adapted to be understandable.

- The establishment of the economic development unit in the structure of the Province is necessary and beneficial for the economic recovery and development process, which would ensure consistency with the current Provincial planning process. However, this must occur in coordination with the Ministry of Planning and the Ministry of Provincial Affairs to ensure that the various parties are on the same page and ensure their acceptance of the results presented by the unit.

- The selection of the members of the economic development Group of Experts was not fully successful, not just in terms of the extent of experience and knowledge the members had, but also in terms of their desire and motivation to work well.

- Planning for economic recovery was not given adequate space in the Provincial plans which tend to focus on the development of infrastructure and the provision of basic services, and neglect the economic sector and the needs of the private sector.

- Knowing that the used analysis tools adopted the principle of data collection, some of the results of the territorial diagnosis were subject to the unreliability of data that has been collected, and the lack of provided data had a relative impact on the accuracy of the results.

- Participants' questions:
  - What products factories would produce since there is a problem in packaging and canning?
  - How would the packaging and canning of agricultural products be funded and managed?
  - Does the mentioned center respond to the Central Government or the Province? Who is responsible for managing it? Is it for the private sector specifically or can the public sector contribute as well?
  - The proposed projects suggest that the Unit's view is towards improving medium and small scale enterprises. What about the goals that should be SMART?
  - Why was the tourism sector neglected?

- Answers:
  - The growing of dates in Babel is a pioneering sector. However, marketing, packaging, and canning of products were brought up because in the production of dates in Babel, most of the products were wasted. It was noticed, however, that most products that reach Babel are well packed and canned and therefore, it was deduced that the same should be done.
  - Regarding the funding, the budget of the Province will not be considered. The funding would be provided through investments of the private sector. The private sector would lead the projects.
  - The business development center would provide training and marketing services, among which to the agricultural sector. It would be managed and the training would be administered by the chamber of commerce and industry, for example. Also, the Ministry of Social Affairs and Labour opened many training centers in many Provinces and there are several agreements with ILO on vocational training. There is also a training center in Babel that could open the door to training.
The agricultural sector was regarded as a sub-sector in Babel. Objectives identification should indeed be SMART. This might be one of the challenges where SMART does not fully apply.

With respect to the question on tourism, it is not possible to work on projects that are out of reach and capacities. There is still a problem with UNESCO that considered the sites in Babel as historical sites, not archeological sites, in addition to the fact that this sector needs hotels and capabilities that are currently not affordable.

On the same note, the Director of the Program for Crisis Response and Reconstruction intervened saying that the role of the private sector, in many times, is to create complementary investment that could attract further investments enabling the discussion of some of the previously-mentioned obstacles to make the conditions more favorable for further investments, such as agreeing on the point whether a site is historic or archeological. This could be something very strategic for the future, but not feasible right now.

Session 6: Wrap up of Day 1

At the end of day one, the facilitator thanked all the participants and summarized the main questions and remarks made on the presentations which revolved, according to her, around the following three main domains:

- Governance: is local economic development the responsibility of the local authority or the central authority? What are the bases for composition of the Groups of Experts? How would their relation be with the different planning teams?
- Methodology: on what basis are sub-sectors selected? What are the indicators and matrix used to identify subsectors and priority projects?
- List of projects: Where are these heading towards? Who is responsible for implementing them? Who will fund them?
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Session 7: Economic Development Compact of Erbil

- The main lessons learned as per the experience of the Group of experts:
  - The capacity building process was beneficial in the process of understanding local economic development.
  - Success factors included: the conduction of several training workshops for the team, the exchange of experiences with other Provinces, participatory workshops with stakeholders, the financial and moral support provided by the Governorate and the continuous communication between the team and the organization through the Focal Point.
- For the purpose of establishing the economic development unit, the following steps were taken:
  - The tasks of the team were not very clear for the Governor. As the work progressed, the tasks of the unit became clearer after the ILO drafted the unit’s terms of reference.
  - Following the legal and administrative review, the terms of reference of the unit were amended in a way that it would be part of the Directorate of Planning of the Governor’s Office and follow-up within the Provincial structure of Erbil.
  - The Ministry of Interior gave its approval.
- Areas in need of improvement:
There is a need to look into the experience of countries which have practices corresponding to the program.

To divide the project into several distinct and sequential stages and give an opportunity for the exchange of roles between the team members according to their expertise and specialization in each stage, taking into account the time required to complete each stage.

The official establishment of the unit and full-time commitment by the members.

The appropriate distribution of roles and development of terms of reference for the members.

It is possible to effectively use the tools and references as self-learning tools in the event that the person has the economic background and experience relevant to the contents of the project because the tools mainly look at economic issues.

The tools were comprehensive, but some of the paragraphs need additional clarification.

Give realistic examples through which the translation of the contents of the project can be more understandable.

Adapt the learning tools with the context and the reality of the Province taking into consideration the fact that the mechanism and methodology were developed for post-conflict countries where the infrastructure and economy are damaged or destroyed.

Since the goal from the establishment of the unit would be to achieve development at the Provincial level, it is preferable that this unit be established within the organizational structure of the Province.

There is a need to provide brochures and clarifications and to conduct participatory meetings in order to further clarify the tasks of the unit.

The best composition for the team is that it be constituted of multidisciplinary experts including members specialized in economics, statistical research and development to be conforming to the functions of the unit. It is also important that members of the team have administrative and accounting skills.

**Constraints facing this step of establishing the unit include:**

Legal constraint: such a step requires approvals from the concerned authorities as the establishment of units falls outside the jurisdiction of the Governor's Office.

Technical constraint: the unit's work might overlap with the work of the General Directorate for Development and Planning at the Ministry of Planning.

Administrative constraint: The challenge lies in the procuring of the approval of the Ministry of Finance in order to monitor the required financial allocations and make the arrangements for the transition and appointment of staff.

**Participants’ questions:**

Five priority sectors were counted, isn’t it better to choose less sectors, because it might be very difficult to build five sectors during the allocated timeframe?

Aren’t some of the projects, already existing projects?

There are positive points, such as the increase of the GDP, but among the problems cited was the decreased in the level of productivity. Why wasn’t there in the list of projects a project which reflected any solution for low productivity?

How can development be achieved while there is low funding in the budget?

Since it was mentioned that Erbil is candidate to be elected as a capital of tourism in 2014, why weren’t there any touristic projects?

**Answers:**

The response to the first question was that five sectors were selected as priority sectors because each district is different. Among 10 districts, the scope of sectors was broadened in order to distribute economic development benefits in a way to achieve spatial development among all the districts and especially among the districts in need.

Regarding the question on duplication of projects, the Expert from Erbil denied this statement saying that a comparison was made with the projects that have been in place for the last three years in Erbil. Some old projects were no longer effective; it was better to lose them and adopt new procedures and methodologies.

Concerning the third question on the absence of a solution for the problem of low productivity, the Expert responded that solving a problem in one sector can help solve problems in other sectors.

As for the funding, large funding of projects is currently being planned and is well supported by other stakeholders.
As for the last question, it was said that skillfulness is low in the tourism sector. This is why the Group suggested a change in the education syllabus in order to build the knowledge and capacities in this particular domain.

Session 8: Presentation by Thi Qar

- Although the Group of Experts from Thi Qar Governorate had not completed the Economic Development Compact, they presented nonetheless the findings of their work so far. The Thi Qar group member, Dr. Ali Zghair Thajeel, presented a detailed history of the districts of Thi Qar, introduced the economic strengths and weaknesses in the Governorate, went through the difficulties which hindered the progress of their work and prevented them from having the Compact ready by the time of the Workshop and finally presented solutions and suggestions as per their experience. Below are the main points that were emphasized on in their presentation.

  - The Group encountered the following challenges and difficulties while conducting the work:
    - The role of the group was not clear to their interlocutors from other institutions, who feared interference of the group in their work;
    - Lack of data and difficulty in collecting it;
    - The lack of legitimacy of the Group (which has not been legally institutionalized) which hinders the group’s ability to advocate for its ideas and obtain information;
    - Recurring financial disbursements because of the remoteness of the area and repeated field visits;
    - The insufficient commitment of the members of the group to the work of this unit due to other duties.

  - The Group identified the following priority sub-sectors:
    - First sector: retail and wholesale trade;
    - Second: Agricultural sector and livestock production
    - Third: The construction sector

  - An amendment to be taken into consideration is to give legal recognition to the unit as being a distinct entity to which financial, administrative and functional support are to be provided.

Participants’ questions:
- It is known that people between 15 and 21 years of age are to be pursuing their education exclusively, therefore, why were they considered, as shown in the presentation, among the people who are economically active?
- How was data collection carried out?
- What are the priority economic sectors and where is the list of proposed projects?

Answers:
- With respect to the first question, the member from Thi Qar Group of Experts clarified that the age 15 to 64 is the internationally recommended standard for defining the economically active population. He acknowledged the fact that the mentioned years are dedicated to education, but also affirmed that a lot of people between 15 and 21 years of age work during the summer and hence why, they were considered while determining the percentage of economically active people.
- Regarding the question on data collection, the Expert considered that having a specialized group doing this is indeed important. However this needs funding and experts which were lacking. A group of youth from each district was constituted to can collect the data in a space they are already familiar with in addition to the fact that this methodology allows for the reduction of transportation costs.
The answer to the last question was that the Group did not carry out a participatory workshop; this is why the mentioned points were not identified.

Finally, the Expert thanked the ILO and UNOPS for their support and guidance and said that this meeting and the sharing of experiences and lessons learned would help them in improving the work in their Governorate as other groups showed them the way and the starting point towards reaching their goal.

Session 9: Economic Development Compact of Basrah

- Since the Economic Development Compact of Basrah was designed by the same ILO Consultant who designed the Compact for the Governorate of Missan, there were similar points in terms of the lessons learned mentioned in the presentation. As shown below, the main lessons learned were as follows:
  - The currently adopted methodology is a new participatory methodology that differs from the traditional approach which based on unilateral decision making.
  - Constant communication, discussions and participation were the most important reasons for the success of the capacity building process.
  - The mechanisms put in place to monitor and evaluate learning (tests) were objective and transparent and linked between the need and the level of learning achieved after each training workshop.

- Recommendations:
  - To enhance the Guidelines by adding realistic examples drawn from previous experiences of countries.
  - To carry out the work with coherent and sequential steps.
  - The function of the economic development group should be restricted to consultancy and work orientation. The Development Unit should be supported by a number of full-time staff. A full-time staff should work with the group in the field on data collection and analysis and carry out the administrative work of the group.
  - The process of planning for local economic recovery and development should be included in the annual sectoral plans.
  - Until date, the planning process for local economic recovery and development process was not integrated into the annual sectoral plans. The committee hopes that after the conclusion of the Compact, it will be submitted to the Governor’s office and that it be integrated into the Provincial Plan for the year 2013.

- Participants’ questions:
  - What is the advantage of adopting a project to plant 1 million palm trees? How would this solve the identified problems, create employment opportunities and eventually contribute in achieving economic development?
  - Where is the feasibility study that shows if a sector is important to economic development?
  - The Guidelines suggest that service-oriented projects should not be considered and that aim of the projects should be to improve economic sectors that create job opportunities. However, the extension of electricity to other areas is a service-orient project. Was this choice SMART?

- Answers:
  - Regarding the question on the feasibility studies, the ten selected projects are just ideas at this stage and would later be subject to such studies.
  - The reason behind planting one million palm trees is that Basrah always had the first place in planting palms in Iraq. There is even a goal to have five million palm trees planted. This has social and emotional impact on the Province of Basrah, since the palm tree is one of the symbols of Basrah.
As for the proposed project to extend electricity to industrial cities, the Experts' response was that improving this type of infrastructure would eventually lead to an improvement and development of the industrial sector.

Session 10: World Café on the lessons learned

After the presentations, session 10 was dedicated to summarizing all the lessons learned by the provinces in a matrix form through an interactive group exercise called "World café". This group activity was administered in a different meeting room due to the different organization of the seating area.

For this activity, the members in the Groups of Experts were divided into five working groups who took turns in discussing and drawing recommendations structured along the following key topics: (1) the planning methodology proposed by ILO and UNOPS; (2) the capacity building process; (3) institutional arrangements/governance for economic development planning in the Provinces; (4) composition of the Group of Experts; and (5) access to data.

For the establishment of the groups, the participants were randomly given blank cards of five different colours during the previous session; each colour representing one of the key topics. The participants who had similarly coloured cards were joined together to constitute a group. Each group included about six participants from different provinces.

A host was assigned to each table; s/he was tasked to facilitate the discussion making sure that it would stick to the topic, take notes of the main points and recommendations raised by participants, and report back to the plenary at the end of the session. The hosts were staying in the same table throughout the whole exercise, while the other participants would turn around the table at the end of each round of discussion, which would last around 15 minutes.

With regards to the first topic, the groups discussed the methodology adopted by ILO in drafting the regional diagnosis report and suggest the following improvements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Planning Methodology</th>
<th>Suggestions for improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The formulation of development objectives of the Charter</td>
<td>The objectives of the Charter should be complementary to the strategic objectives at the Provincial and National levels</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The objectives should be specific, clear, quantitative and SMART

- Broaden the base of activity to all stakeholders
- Involve stakeholders as much as possible
- Determine a methodology specific to media activity
- Granting more time for stakeholders to look into the territorial diagnosis’ results and list of projects when conducting workshops
- Conduct an extensive introductory seminar

### Selection of projects

- The Charter must end with the short list of projects
- The task of preparing and initial feasibility study would not be the responsibility of the committee
- Include projects that are of service nature
- Include the projects that are capable of substituting imports among the selection criteria

### The multiplicity, complexity and length of the stages of preparation of the Charter

- Divide the Charter into scheduled stages
- Conduct an evaluation after each stage

Regarding the capacity building process, the groups discussed the needed cognitive skills based on the experiences of each of the provinces and identified the following needs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capacity building process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allocate more time to intensive training courses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conduct training courses on how to determine the economic feasibility
Conduct a special training course to promote teamwork
The capacity building process should include case studies
The team should examine realistic successful experiences, not only theories

The groups exchanged views on the composition of the Group of Experts and, based on their experiences and contact with public institutions, proposed the adoption of the steps shown below in order to have the ideal composition.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composition of the Group of Experts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Form a project team that brings together experts from different relevant disciplines (economics, planning, statistics, etc....)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have a clear job description for the team members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have full engagement by the essential team members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resort to outsourcing (external expertise)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take into consideration the presence of the female element in the team and ensure adequate participation from women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The team members should remain the same along the whole planning cycle, as any replacement would lead to confusion in the work and a drain of efforts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table below shows the needed data and the stakeholders who could provide such data as identified by the groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Access to data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Needed data:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population, standard of living, natural resources, labour (skilled/unskilled), population density, stability and security, per capita income, the market needs, poverty, demography, infrastructure, the number of small and medium-sized enterprises, the ratio of males to females...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross sub-sectoral economic indicators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data providers:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Bureau of Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurdistan Region Reform Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The World Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The International Monetary Fund (IMF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International organizations such as UNDP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialized civil society organizations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The group members discussed the ideal institutional/governance arrangements for local economic in terms of distribution of roles, the responsibility and authority of the relevant stakeholders and departments in achieving LED.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Governance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Link the group to decision makers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Link the Group as a permanent independent body within the organizational structure of the Province</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Link the Group to the Provincial Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This entity should be an independent body linked to the Council of Ministers or the Ministry of State for Provincial Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Group should have direct liaison with the Governor or his Technical Advisor/Deputy Governor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powers of the group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To approve the plan as a member of the Provincial Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibilities of the group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To prepare economic development plans at the Provincial level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To engage the members of the Committee in the teams working on Provincial development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To have access to all the needed data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To enjoy full independence in decision-making</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suggestions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To prepare the economic analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To identify economic development projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To assist in the supervision and follow-up on the implementation of the proposed projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To establish urban observatories on the district level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To conduct surveys that are in line with international standards simultaneously and for various sectors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To use the GIS system for all projects in the province</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Feedback on the group exercise by the resource persons:

- Professor Pike expressed his admiration for the level of commitment, effort and skills demonstrated by the groups, their strong analyses of the economic situation in the Governorates and their pertinent recommendations towards improving the situation and achieving economic development.
- He made several comments on key points tackled during this workshop. Starting by the issue of governance, Professor Pike emphasized the importance of having a clear division of tasks and labour in terms of authority and entitlements to determine what the designated entity for Provincial-level economic development planning is actually going to do.
- The second point made by Professor Pike was about stakeholders. In this regard, he said that he was impressed with how the Groups planned to bring a whole range of appropriate stakeholders from different levels at the government, civil societies and labour unions and supported their ideas about the establishment of public-private partnerships. He advised the Groups to get more value from the engagement with stakeholders beyond the steps of designing a plan, consulting and validating to make them become allies which would give the planning team more weight when trying to make a case.
- With regards to the question of access to data, Professor Pike acknowledged that the guidelines create a big demand for data and that there are clear limitations in direct access to data. For this purpose, he encouraged the
economic development groups not to work alone on this, since they are relatively small teams and to consider outsourcing as an important thing to be done.

- Lastly, Professor Pike encouraged what he called 'cross-boundary working' by trying to bring Governors to work together and for the teams to aspire for a type of economic development of longer than 5 years in time.

5. Participants’ Feedback

5.1 Participants’ Evaluation Questionnaire

At the end of the workshop, participants were requested to fill out an evaluation questionnaire to assess their satisfaction and gather opinions about the overall usefulness of the initiative, the contents, the delivery modalities, the facilitators and the logistical arrangements.

The questionnaire contained 17 multiple-option questions, two open-ended questions and space where to add further comments. The questions were designed based on a standard questionnaire used in previous workshops conducted within PSDP-I; some were adapted and some were removed, as they did not apply to this type of initiative, not being a training. To some extent, it is possible to compare the performance of this workshop with respect to the previous ones, as the audience was almost identical.

Through the multiple-option questions, participants were asked to score the assessed aspects from 1 to 5, or to mark a 0 where they had no specific opinion. The “0” option was new with respect to the questionnaires administered in previous workshops, in order to give an option to those that would otherwise leave the answer blank. However, some participants still opted for leaving some fields blank, in three questions; most of blanks were left for the question “To what extent was time keeping successful?”; it cannot be said whether this happened because participants did not understand the questions or because they simply did not have any opinion but refrained from using the “0” score.

The scores given to the 17 assessment items were examined in an excel sheet and complemented by a narrative analysis, which is reported in section 5.2. All answers were taken into consideration. Finally, participants’ views expressed in the last open-ended question have been translated into recommendations for future similar initiatives.

5.2 Summary of the Evaluation Results

The results of participants’ evaluation of the workshop have been summarized and represented through three charts. Error! Reference source not found. represents the average scores assigned by participants to each of the seventeen items that were assessed; to ease the understanding of the findings, scores from 1 to 5 were converted into 100-scale; blanks and the “no opinion” answers have not been considered in the calculation of the average. Chart 2 is based on the number of times each of the five options was chosen by participants, per each question. Chart 3 shows the percentage of participants who thought that the workshop succeeded to a “great extent” (score 4) or to a “very great extent” (score 5) in achieving the assessed items; it is to be noted that the blanks and the “no opinion” answers have been excluded from the count.

Overall, participants thought that the activity was useful: the average score was 75% for the overall satisfaction and the expected possibility to apply the learning acquired during the workshop. For these two assessment items, 63% of the answers were either 4 or 5. Most of the remaining answers indicated that participants were satisfied to a certain extent, with only one or even no participants being not satisfied at all or satisfied only to a little extent.

1 1 = not at all; 2 = to a small extent; 3 = to a certain extent; 4 = to a great extent; 5 = to a very great extent.
Objectives: As it can be seen in Error! Reference source not found. below, the clarity of the objectives of the workshop was rather high before the workshop itself, with a rate of 73/100; for more than half of the participants, as shown in Chart 2, objectives were either clear to a great extent or to a very great extent. This result is due to the fact that the agenda and the flyer, both in Arabic, were distributed to participants in advance and that the ILO/UNOPS Focal Points informed invitees from their areas through previous meetings. The agenda was also distributed at the hotel, in each room, upon arrival of participants. Objectives became clearer after the workshop with a rate of 79/100; cumulatively, the frequency of 4 and 5 reached 68% and the frequency of 3 went down from 37% to 26% (see Chart 2). For two participants the objectives were not clear at all before the workshop and became clear to a great extent after it. Interestingly, for two participants who had the objectives clear to a very great extent before the workshop, these objectives became completely unclear after it. Finally, according to half of the participants the objectives of the workshop were achieved either to a great extent or to a very great extent. Comparatively to a previous training workshop held in Erbil in March, where 73% of the respondents answered either 4 or 5 to this question, this lesson-learned workshop seemed less successful; unfortunately it is not possible to conclude which were the reasons.

Facilitation and presenters: The three highest average scores were given to the quality of the facilitation, namely to the clarity of presentations by the facilitators (84/100), the opportunities given to participants to clarify topics (85/100), and the extent to which these opportunities were fairly distributed among participants (88/100). These three assessment items also obtained the highest cumulated frequency of 4s and 5s, with respectively 84%, 87% and 89%, reflecting a significant level of satisfaction of participants for the clarity of the presentations and the smoothness of facilitation. The clarity of the facilitators' presentations is also the assessment topic that, among all, was rated “5” by the highest number of participants (see Chart 3). Half of the participants were highly satisfied about time keeping, while more than 40% of them considered that it had been successful to a certain extent. There was a slight deterioration with respect to the previous workshop in Erbil, where the cumulative portion of 4s and 5s for the “time keeping” aspect was of around 55%, and the average score was of 73%. Organization of the activity: in average the four organizational aspects were rated around 75/100. The lowest among the score of the assessment items related to organizational aspects was obtained by the catering, with a 71/100. Conversations with participants revealed that the snacks provided during the two coffee breaks were of poor quality and that the variety was not satisfactory. In addition, the meal at the designated restaurant was fixed and similar every day; the participants would have preferred a buffet, rather than a fixed meal. Fifty-five per cent of the participants were satisfied about the catering to a great extent or to a very great extent; 11% were either not satisfied at all or to a little extent; and 34% were averagely satisfied.

---

2 The venue-provider purchased seven Kg of cookies, which were used during the whole workshop, including on the last two days.
Chart 1: Average scores

Chart 2: Frequencies
6. Lessons Learnt and Remarks

6.1 Recommendations for the Replication/Continuation of the Activity

Participants made the following suggestions, which have been grouped in five categories: general comments; comments on the coordination with and among authorities and stakeholders; composition and tasks of the Groups tasked to lead the economic development planning; training of the planning teams; capacity building and support.

General comments
- Focus on economic development activities that contribute to unemployment
- Offer more elaborative programmes in the area of planning and economics
- Ensure more participation of women the project activities
- Ensure gender is mainstreamed in the identification of the economic development projects by the governorates
- Follow-up the results of the workshop to ensure sustainability of attained results
- Continue the efforts in pushing for the economic development unit establishment

Coordination with and among authorities and stakeholders, and networking among groups in different Provinces
- Better coordination with related stakeholders in the governorate
- Coordinate with the Ministry of planning
• Involve Provincial Councils in the project
• To encourage continuous networking and collaboration between the EDU/G members in partner governorates using emails and periodic meetings inside Iraq, in addition to some follow up workshops outside Iraq
• Establish a multi-governorate collaboration mechanism in the area of economic development. This collaboration focuses on identifying economic development projects which benefit more than one governorate

Composition and tasks of the Groups in charge of planning
• Revisit the committee formulation

Training of the planning teams
• Plan for more workshops
• Increase the number of days of the workshop (repeated in 2 forms)
• Decrease the duration of the training day and increase number of days
• Increase the practical part in the workshop by adding more exercises
• In collaboration with the government, identify a training College/Institute in Iraq to implement capacity building to selected EDU/G team members/potential members in the subject for a duration no less than 2 months
• Build a pool of International experts in economics and planning
• Train local teams by the identified pool of international experts

Capacity building and support
• Allocate economic development specialists and experts who have worked abroad to be part of the LERD team in the field in Iraq
• Offer coaching and mentoring support to the EDU/G members
• Provide technical support in the subject area when needed
• Provide logistical and administrative support to the EDU
• Upload the activities of the EDU/G on the internet either through ILO or UNOPS website and to provide the possibility of evaluating the implementation of the methodology continuously through the website
• Continue the communication between ILO and the EDU/Gs to share feedback on implementation challenges/bottlenecks facing the teams and get advice from ILO
• Continue offering the support by the UN agencies to more than one cycle until the learning is fully embedded and transformed to a sustainable change

From the suggestions above we can draw the following conclusions:

There are expectations for the ILO to continue supporting the economic development planning at the Provincial level. It was rightly pointed out, that it is necessary to practice the methodology for several subsequent planning cycles in order to refine it and to achieve proficiency in its field-based application. Continuing to work in this area would allow for capitalizing on the efforts and investments made so far in the pilot phase, which indeed cannot be expected to produce fruits in the short run. The change proposed in the planning methodology at the Provincial level is radical and triggers other similarly radical institutional changes, whose difficulty shall not be ignored and which have clearly emerged across the implementation of this project. It is clear that ILO will be able to continue providing support only if funding is made available/mobilized for this purpose, and if Central and Regional authorities support the participation of the ILO in LADP II.

If the ILO intends to continue providing this type of support, for instance within the framework of LADP II, the delivery modality should be revised and enhanced in light of the challenges experienced in the bridging phase of LADP. The participants have suggested a few interesting upgrades to the capacity building process and instruments, which can be further elaborated. In first place, it appears evident that the members of the Groups who participated in this project appreciated the exposure to international expertise and experiences, asking for increasing and systematizing the opportunities to be guided and advised by International Experts. In this regard, they requested that
International Experts are deployed to the field to support the planning teams for an on-the-job type of training. Training on-the-job is particularly required to strengthen the introduction of this new methodology; it is indispensable to complement training delivery through workshops.

In line with participants’ recommendation, future applications of the methodology could be carried out in partnership with accredited institutes/universities with a recognized expertise in the LED domain; in this way their learning could also be certified and recognized. The involvement of the University of Newcastle in this lessons learned exercise as well as in the review of the LERD Guidelines, was indeed aimed at reaching out to a well-established and reputed institution with a three-fold purpose: provide the Iraqi counterpart with the opportunity to get access to high-level advice on their work; expose the Iraqi counterpart to worldwide experiences; raise the profile and credibility of the approach, by getting it evaluated by an international expert, not linked to the ILO.

Another important aspect raised by participants is the one related to cross-boundaries and peer-to-peer collaboration among groups involved in economic development planning in different Provinces. This could be done through more occasions to interact (e.g. dedicated seminars); study tours to other Provinces; dedicated planning activities targeting inter-Provincial issues and involving the Governors of neighboring Provinces; a web-based platform on local economic development for Provincial planners, where to find learning and reading materials as well as examples from other regions/countries, and where to have a space for interacting with other users and tutors. With respect to the web-based platform, despite sounding innovative and useful, its feasibility should be studied, as it appears that web-based tools are not very popular and used in Iraq.

7. Follow-up activities

7.1 Revision of the “Planning for Economic Recovery and Development (LERD) at the Provincial Level in Iraq: Guidelines, Templates and Examples”.

Final integration of the modifications and additions suggested by the participants during the Writeshop into the LER Guidelines in both the Arabic and English versions.

Below are the points to be taken into consideration while revising the Guidelines:

- To improve the terminology used in the Arabic version in a localized way that it is better understandable;
- To add “inception among the first steps to be taken in the Guidelines;
- In the part related to stakeholders' analysis, to simplify the process of identification and analysis of stakeholders by reducing the number of stakeholders categories into three categories; namely stakeholders who are: "in favour", "neutral" and "against" the project and take into consideration their power of influence and importance while carrying out the analysis. The stakeholders' categories are also to be added in the form of a flowchart;
- To add a step that encourages the holding of a general endorsement meeting with the stakeholders, through which the working groups could easily get the “by-in”. And mention the favourability that the meeting ends with the signature of an "endorsement letter" that could be used as a guarantee that the work would not be stopped due to a stakeholder change of mind or his replacement by another stakeholder;
- To provide examples on the indicators describing the role and impact of each one of them impact on economic development;
- To add an explanatory paragraph that contains examples on how to put quantitatively and qualitatively SMART objectives;
- To clarify the process of conducting a SWOT analyses by describing the two proposed ways to do it, namely using SPSS and formal scoring system and to give examples on each of them, giving the option for the EDUs to choose among them;
• To revise the section on cost estimation of the projects, by summarizing this section and adding guidelines giving the choice to the working groups to use the tools provided for and explained in the Guidelines in carrying out the cost estimation or to resort to external expertise in case the members of the Unit were unable to carry out this task by themselves;
• The length of upcoming participatory workshops with stakeholders should be shortened to one day; because of the difficulty for the stakeholders to commute and attend more than one day due to other commitments they might have. A one day workshop would guarantee higher participation and its output would be more practical since it will engage all stakeholders together in giving input related to the relevant sectors and respective locations. This workshop should be directly followed by a Focus Group Discussion to work on the content of the Guidelines.
• Drafting by the Facilitator and the LER Specialist of a comprehensive case study drawn from examples extracted from the Governorates Territorial Analysis to be later sent to the ILO/UNOPS Project team and Consultants for final validation before integrating it into the LER Guidelines.

7.2 Other Follow-up Activities

Once all reporting activities are concluded, the following documents shall be officially sent to the Governors:

• The Compact of the Province, in both Arabic and English;
• The section of the “Lessons Learned Report” that concern the Province;
• The report of the workshop. A version for external use should be produced.
• The pictures of the workshop.

The project team should revise of the Terms of Reference of the five members of the supposed entity for economic development planning identified during the Writeshop. The TORs are to be in line with the recommendations and suggestions given by the Participants in terms of needed skills and qualifications.
# Annexes

## I. Workshop Agenda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Day 1</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Day 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:30 - 9:00</td>
<td>Registration of participants</td>
<td>8:30 - 10:30</td>
<td>Session 7: Economic Development Compact of Erbil. Presentation, feedbacks by resource persons and Q&amp;A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 9:00 - 10:45 | Welcome and opening remarks  
*Frank Hagemann, Deputy Director of the ILO Regional Office for Arab States*  
*Dr. Ali Shukri Yusuf Abdul-Nabi, H.E. the Minister of Planning of Iraq*  
*Key-note Speeches*  
*Prof. Andy Pike, Director of the Centre for Urban and Regional Development Studies, Newcastle University (UK)*  
*Alfredo Lazarte-Hoyte, Director of the ILO Program for Crisis Response and Reconstruction (ILO/CRISIS), Geneva (Switzerland) (tbc)*  
*Session 1: Presentation of the facilitator, resource persons, workshop agenda and workshop objectives* | 10:30 - 10:45 Coffee Break | 10:30 - 10:45 Coffee Break |
| 15min | 10:45 - 11:00 Coffee Break | 10:45 - 12:30 | Session 9: Economic Development Compact of Thi Qar. Presentation, feedbacks by resource persons and Q&A |
| 11:00 - 12:45 | Session 2: Overview of the work accomplished through PSDP-I and LADP  
Session 3: Economic Development Compact of Missan. Presentation, feedbacks by resource persons and Q&A | 12:30 - 13:00 Lunch | Session 10: World café: recommendations for the revision of the economic planning methodology and the capacity building process |
| 13:15 - 15:30 | Session 4: Economic Development Compact of Anbar. Presentation, feedbacks by resource persons and Q&A  
Session 5: Economic Development Compact of Babel. Presentation, feedbacks by resource persons and Q&A | 13:00 - 15:30 | Session 10: Continuation |
| 15:30 | Session 6: Wrap-up | 15:30 | Session 11: Wrap-up and next steps |
| 15:30 | Lunch | | Workshop Evaluation and Closure |
II. Participants List

Participants from the Kurdistan Regional Government

- Eng. Kamaran Abdulrahman, Representative of KRG Minister of Interior
- Mr. Hoshiyar Tahseen Aziz, Director Private Sector, KRG Ministry of Planning

Participants from the Province of Erbil

- Mr. Asaad Ahmed Asaad, Head of planning unit of Governorate
- Aram Yaseen Faraj, Assistant- Group of Experts
- Kanbe Hamdameen, Head of Engineering and Planning Department
- Rushdi Azeez Abduallah, Legal adviser for the Economic Development Unit
- Tayib Kazbo Ali, Head of Group of Experts
- Susan Abdullah, Member of Group of Experts
- Faeq Hanna poules, Member of Group of Experts
- Shelan Jameel, Member of Group of Experts
- Ismael Othman, Member of Group of Experts

Participants from the Province of Sulaymaniah

- Mr. Ahmad Hama Rasheed Ahmad, Head of Economic Committee of the Provincial Council
- AbdulKhaleq Mohammed Abdulraheem (Representing Governor), Head of Group of Experts
- Narmen Maerof Gafor, Member of Group of Experts
- Mohammed Jabar Shamsaddin, Member of Group of Experts
- Bakhtyar Ahmed Ali Kutak , Member of Group of Experts

Participants from the Province of Anbar

- Mr. Hemid Abbod Hathot Al Janabi , Chief Technical Advisor of the Governor
- Walid Jasem, Secretary of Provincial Council
- Mr. Mohammed Khudhier Sabah, Head of Group of Experts

Participants from the Province of Babel

- Mohammed Hamood Mohammed Al-Amshawey, Head of Group of Experts
- Ahmed Khaleel Hasan Al-Husseini, Member of Group of Experts
- Kanaan Khalaf Abd Ali Watifi, Member of Group of Experts
- Nabeel Abdallah Hassani Al-Athari, Member of Group of Experts

Participants from the Province of Missan

- Jaafar Shaker Hussein (Representing the Governor), Governor's Deputy (Administrative affairs)
- Kamil Hatem Challub, Head of Group of Experts
- Dr. Helmi Ibrahem Manshad, Member of Group of Experts
- Muslim Rabeea Taher Al-Jaberi, Member of Group of Experts
- Sabah Ghlaim Mahdi, Member of Group of Experts
III. Workshop Evaluation Questionnaire

Overall Evaluation Form
Regional Office for Arab States – ILO Iraq Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title of Event:</th>
<th>Lessons Learned Workshop on Economic Development Planning at the Provincial Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Venue and Date:</td>
<td>Istanbul (Turkey), 27th-28th November 2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please complete the questionnaire below. This will help us to improve our events. Please be totally frank, we are interested in your opinion, whether it is positive or negative, and we shall take it into account in planning future activities.

Please give each aspect of the event set out below a mark from 1 to 5, with 1 being the minimum and 5 being the maximum. On this scale, the average mark is 3.

If you think that a question does not apply to you, or that you do not have the information needed to answer it, check the “no opinion” option. You can give only one answer to each question.

Please indicate:

GENDER ☐ Female ☐ Male
## TYPE OF ORGANIZATION
(Please indicate only one response. If you are involved in more than one type of organization, please select the one you are representing during this activity)

- Government/public institution
- Non-governmental organization
- Training/academic institution
- Other, specify __________________________
- Trade Union organization
- Employer organization
- Ministry of Labour

1 = not at all  2 = to a small extent  3 = to a certain extent  4 = to a great extent  5 = to a very great extent  0 = no opinion

## INFORMATION RECEIVED BEFORE THE ACTIVITY
1. Before participating in this activity, how clear were you about its objectives, contents and methods?

## THE WAY THE ACTIVITY WAS DELIVERED

### 1. Objectives
2. Having participated in the activity, to what extent are you now clear regarding the objectives of the activity?
3. To what extent were the activity’s objectives achieved?

### 2. Workshop contents
4. How would you assess the quality of information provided through this training?
5. Were the participants with whom you attended the activity helpful in contributing to your learning?

### 3. The facilitators and trainers
6. Did the team of facilitators present the topics in a clear and understandable manner?
7. Did the team provide adequate information and guidance for the preparation of the presentations?
8. Did the team provide the participants with adequate opportunity to clarify topics when necessary?
9. Did the team ensure that all participants were given equal and adequate opportunity to participate?
10. To what extent was time keeping successful?
11. To what extent was the interpretation clear and smooth?

## USEFULNESS OF THE ACTIVITY
12. How would you assess your overall satisfaction with the quality of the activity (content, clarity, sequence)?
13. How likely is it that you will apply the learning you have acquired during the activity? Please indicate in the box below if you can specify examples on how you intend to apply the learning from this activity in your work.

1 = not satisfied at all, not likely at all satisfied, not likely satisfied/likely /likely satisfied/likely  2 = not very satisfied, not likely satisfied/likely  3 = somewhat satisfied/likely  4 = satisfied  5 = very satisfied/likely  0 = no opinion
14. Examples related to question 13

### IV. ORGANIZATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Rating Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15. How would you assess the overall organization of the activity?</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5  6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. How would you rate the venue of the event?</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5  6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. How would you rate the catering?</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5  6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. How efficient was the secretarial/administrative support?</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5  6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please indicate any follow up activity that you would consider useful for future plans.

1. ..............................................................................................................................................................................
   ....
2. ..............................................................................................................................................................................
   ....
3. ..............................................................................................................................................................................
   ....

Please use the grid below if you wish to comment on a particular question:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question number</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IV. Findings of Participants' Evaluation

Returned Questionnaires (number and percentage): 39

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Frequencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>num</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### I. INFORMATION RECEIVED BEFORE THE ACTIVITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Before participating in the activity, how clear were you about the objectives, content and methods?</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>How would you assess the quality of information provided through this training?</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Were you provided adequate information to clarify topics where necessary?</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Did the team create adequate opportunities for the preparation of the presentations?</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Did you assure that the participants were given equal and adequate opportunity to participate?</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>To what extent was the interpretation clear and smooth?</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>To what extent was the learning successful?</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### II. THE WAY THE ACTIVITY WAS DELIVERED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>How efficiently was the secretarial/administrative support?</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Did the team provide adequate information and guidance for the preparation of the presentations?</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>How would you assess your overall satisfaction with the quality of the activity (content, clarity, sequence)?</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>How likely is it that you will apply the learning you have acquired during the activity? (Please indicate in the box below. If you can specify examples on how you intend to apply the learning from this activity in your work)</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### III. USEFULNESS OF THE ACTIVITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>How satisfied are you with the overall organization of the activity?</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>How would you rate the venue of the event?</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>How would you rate the catering?</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>To what extent was the administrative support?</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### IV. ORGANIZATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>How likely is it that you will apply the learning you have acquired during the activity? (Please indicate in the box below. If you can specify examples on how you intend to apply the learning from this activity in your work)</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>