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Executive Summary

This report is the result of a collaborative project between the United Nations Development Program’s Regional Bureau for Europe and the CIS in New York and the School of International and Public Affairs (SIPA) at Columbia University. UNDP approached SIPA in November 2002 with a request to facilitate participatory workshops that would create awareness and ownership of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). The project’s overall goal was to determine how community benchmarking workshops could be used to realize this goal by translating the global MDGs into the local context. A team of graduate students conducted two pilot benchmarking workshops in the Republic of Altai, Russian Federation and in Plovdiv, Bulgaria in March 2003.

These workshops serve as the first step in the process of localizing MDGs. They facilitate a dialogue among various community actors and help them to agree on realistic short and long-term targets (benchmarks). These benchmarks serve as useful indicators of progress towards commonly defined local development priorities. Without developing this type of local ownership of the MDGs, it will be difficult to sustain strategies to meet the MDGs in different countries. Establishing broad-based ownership and building inclusive partnerships paved the way for joint action that can be gradually scaled up from the local to the national level in order to achieve sustainable changes.

Community benchmarking is innovative because its overarching approach focuses on the community’s resources and assets in order to draw on existing possibilities, rather than concentrating on problems, constraints or lack of resources. Benchmarking workshops also have proven to be an effective tool for accomplishing the difficult dual task of translating global goals into concrete plans of action while simultaneously fostering local initiative and commitment.

Participatory benchmarking workshops per se will not guarantee implementation of policies and achievement of the MDGs. However, they can encourage cooperation among central and local governments and various groups within society. This is vital in helping the community commit to the MDGs and to agree on the implementation of policies necessary to achieving them.

Recommendations for Country Offices:

- Community Benchmarking Workshops must be part of a larger process.
- Conduct extensive preliminary research.
- Collect local baseline data.
- Make sure the process incorporates all relevant stakeholders.
- Accepting Mismatches between Local and National Benchmarks

Recommendations for UNDP Headquarters

- Regional benchmarking should feed into the MDG national process.
- Work with Country Office to plan community benchmarking as a process.
- Cluster community benchmarking workshops.
- Trainer of trainers is essential to spread community benchmarking
I. Introduction

1. Project Framework and Objectives

The United Nations Development Program’s (UNDP) Regional Bureau for Europe and the CIS (RBEC) in New York asked the School of International and Public Affairs (SIPA) at Columbia University to develop a process of community benchmarking to localize the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). The Bureau was concerned that local knowledge and ownership of the MDGs was not widespread in the region. Beginning in November 2002, a team of graduate students began work on this project under the auspices of the Applied Workshop in Economic and Political Development.

The overall goal of the project was to determine how participatory benchmarking workshops could be used to create local ownership of the MDGs by translating them into a local context. The SIPA team sees participatory workshops as the first step in the process of localizing MDGs. Facilitators listen and learn from the assembled community actors about their local development priorities and facilitate a dialogue among them to agree on realistic short and long-term targets (benchmarks), based on differing viewpoints, beliefs, knowledge and experience. The benchmarks can be used to monitor progress toward the local goals and create a sense of community ownership over their own future.

The SIPA team held two pilot workshops in the Altai Republic of the Russian Federation and the Municipality of Plovdiv in Bulgaria to apply the techniques of participatory benchmarking workshops within the overall process of localizing the MDGs. Throughout the process the SIPA team consulted with RBEC in New York and the UNDP Country offices in Bulgaria and in Russia. All were instrumental in guiding the direction of the project, while the UNDP Country Teams also provided invaluable logistical support.

2. Overview of the Report

This report describes the community benchmarking workshops as a replicable tool that can be used to localize and create ownership of the MDGs. First, it introduces the concept of community benchmarking, provides historical background and discusses its relevance to the MDGs. Second, it discusses the methodology of these workshops, their purpose and their relevance for advancing the MDGs. The actual experiences of the community benchmarking workshops that the SIPA team conducted in the Altai Republic and in Plovdiv in March 2003 are the focus of the third part of the report. The report concludes with recommendations for using community benchmarking in the process of localizing MDGs. The workshop agendas, materials, information sheets, facilitator’s guide and list of participants are attached in the report’s appendices.

3. Background Information on the Millennium Development Goals

3.1. The Millennium Development Goals

The Millennium Development Goals are an ambitious agenda for reducing poverty and improving lives that world leaders formulated at the United Nations Millennium
Summit in September 2000. Each goal contains one or more targets to be reached by 2015, using 1990 as a base year. The goals and some of the targets are in the box below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Global MDGs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Eradicate extreme poverty and hunger.  
**Target for 2015:** Halve the proportion of people living on less than a dollar a day. |
| 2. Achieve universal primary education.  
**Target for 2015:** Ensure that all boys and girls complete primary school. |
| 3. Promote gender equality and empower women.  
**Target for 2015:** Eliminate gender disparities at all levels by 2015. |
| 4. Reduce child mortality.  
**Target for 2015:** Reduce by 2/3 the mortality rate among children under 5. |
| 5. Improve maternal health.  
**Target for 2015:** Reduce by 3/4 the ratio of women dying in childbirth. |
**Target for 2015:** Halt and begin to reverse the spread of HIV/AIDS and the incidence of malaria and other major diseases. |
| 7. Ensure environmental sustainability.  
**Target for 2015:** Reduce by half the proportion of people without access to safe drinking water. |
| 8. Develop a global partnership for development. |

3.2. MDGs in Russia

Each country faces its own particular challenges in reaching the MDGs. In some countries the spirit of some of the goals is more important than the specific framework of world targets. For example, the latest Human Development Report indicated that Russia has either achieved or is on track with such tasks as halving the proportion of people suffering from hunger, ensuring that all children complete primary education, eliminating gender disparity at all levels of education, and halving the proportion of people without access to safe water sources. However, based on the analysis of recent trends in the country’s economic and social development, several priorities have been identified. They include poverty reduction, combating HIV/AIDS, ensuring environmental sustainability, improving access, equity and quality of secondary education, and supporting public health programs.¹

While the process of localizing the MDGs has just started, several initiatives toward this end have already taken place in the Russian Federation. UNDP has conducted two roundtable discussions on MDGs in St. Petersburg and Moscow in conjunction with UN Country Team events. In cooperation with Moscow State University, UNDP has carried out a pilot project on localizing MDGs in the Samara region. The report that this project produced is entitled “Disaggregating the MDGs in the Russian Federation” and is written with a focus on translating the MDGs into appropriate indicators for development in Samara.

This project was conducted on the basis of statistical research rather than participatory appraisal methods. The author’s findings indicate that some global targets for MDGs are not appropriate to Russia’s current level of development. For example, universal primary education already exists in Russia. It also found that some of the MDGs are measured in terms that do not accurately reflect the challenge that they are trying to measure. For example, measuring poverty in terms of the number of people living on less than $1 per day is less useful than measuring in terms of people living below the poverty line established by the Ministry of Social Development.
1.3. MDGs in Bulgaria

By contrast, in Bulgaria the MDG process began in January 2003 and proceeded simultaneously with the SIPA team’s project. The launching of the first MDG report for Bulgaria took place only two days after the completion of the workshop in Plovdiv. In Bulgaria, the MDGs were adapted to suit a country in transition scheduled to join the European Union (EU) in 2007. Therefore, in the process of MDG adaptation, the UNDP and the Bulgarian government used the values of the corresponding EU indicators as guidelines.

The overarching problem of poverty is the main focus of the MDG process in Bulgaria. The educational and healthcare targets are aimed at recovering or improving the levels that existed at the beginning of the 1989 transition. The MDGs for Bulgaria and some of the adapted targets are shown in the box to the right.2

---

MDGs for Bulgaria

1. Halve extreme poverty and malnutrition.
   **Target for 2015:** Increase average monthly income to €280.

2. Improve primary and secondary education
   **Target for 2015:** Increase the net enrollment rate in secondary school from 68.3% in 2002 to 86% and the net completion rate from 85.1% to 90%.

3. Promote gender equality and empower women
   **Target for 2015:** Increase the percentage of the pay of women to percentage of the pay of men from 72% in 2002 to 80% in 2015.

4. Reduce child mortality
   **Target for 2015:** Reduce the child mortality for the 0-5 age group from 17 per 1000 live births to 9.5 per 1000 live births.

5. Improve maternal health
   **Target for 2015:** Reduce the maternal mortality from 19.1 per 100,000 live births to 12 per 100,000 live births.

6. Limit the spread of HIV/AIDS, syphilis and tuberculosis
   **Target for 2015:** Prevent the epidemic spread of HIV/AIDS by limiting prevalence among people aged 15-24 from under 0.01% to under 1%.

7. Ensure environmental sustainability
   **Target for 2015:** Reverse the loss of environmental resources by increasing the proportion of protected territories from 4.8% to 12%.

8. Develop a partnership for development.

---

II. The Concept of Community Benchmarking

Community benchmarking is a technique used for collective strategic planning through participatory processes3. In the most basic version of the benchmarking process, the community analyzes where it stands in the present and where it would like to be in the near and distant future. The community sets a number of goals and identifies indicators through which it could monitor its progress. Each indicator is then assigned benchmarks (targets) that measure this progress.

These benchmarks are based on output performance indicators that foster development by breaking challenges into manageable subsets of addressable issues and by focusing on results rather than on specific inputs. The overarching approach is to focus not on the lack of resources but to draw form the community’s available resources, assets and specificities. Because the community and local leaders work together to set benchmarks,
there is significant local ownership of the goals and priorities for progress. Furthermore, the focus on results allows disparate groups to work toward the community’s common goals instead of focusing their efforts on the competition for scarce resources that often results from single agency targets or input-defined strategies.

The benchmarking process distributes the responsibility for success across the entire community, given that the stakeholders firmly commit to achieve the adopted goals. Furthermore, since all sectors participate in the benchmarking process, it allows the community to hold accountable all stakeholders, including the state, the NGOs, or the private sector. The guiding principle is that the community along with the public, the private and NGO sectors should find ways to work in synergy toward achieving the collective goals.

Community-based strategic planning is not a new initiative. Setting collective goals to rally support and legitimacy for joint government and civil society action is quite common. Moreover, benchmarks and performance indicators have been used by public and private organizations to assess policy progress for decades. The community benchmarking process is innovative because it attaches concrete short and long-term targets (benchmarks) to the community vision.

1. **Historical Background**

   Private companies pioneered the tool and have used benchmarking for strategic planning for many years. Recent public sector uses include security and social policy initiatives, as well as local economic strategy. However, the concept of community benchmarking took root in the late 1980’s. A benchmarking campaign was launched at the community level in Oregon4, USA in 1988 to create a strategic development plan for the state over the next 20 years that included 259 benchmarks adopted by the state legislature. Based on the technique of the Oregon Benchmarks, a Columbia University team developed a community-benchmarking workshop in 1997 for a small town in the Philippines. The present project has applied and further developed some of the methodologies used in the above-mentioned experiences.

2. **Relevance of Community Benchmarking to Advance the MDGs**

   World leaders’ agreement to a set of time-bound and measurable development goals requires thorough work at the country level in order to localize these general commitments. This makes community benchmarking a particularly appropriate tool for successfully implementing the MDGs.

   MDGs provide a vision for development, but it is necessary to identify how MDGs translate into specific local contexts. If the MDGs remain abstract and inaccessible so that governments and communities cannot relate them to their daily lives, they will remain on paper because there will be no local commitment to pursue them. This is a complex process on the national level alone. However, there are also significant differences in the economic and social development among regions in a country. There are myriad reasons for this phenomenon ranging from different levels of industrialization to the specific problems of different ethnic groups. Thus, the priorities and targets may also differ from region to region.
In this context, community benchmarking is an important tool because it helps communities to define, own and attain their own development priorities. Benchmarking is especially relevant to this process because it provides a tool that community members can use to think about the future of their region in concrete terms. Ownership of MDGs as relevant visions is the first step toward their realization, but a true benchmarking process provides measurable indicators of progress. Community benchmarking enables all of the parties involved to better understand community needs, problems and the obstacles they face regarding progress on the MDGs. Locally based knowledge and perceptions allow government and civil society organizations to plan effective strategies to address contextual obstacles and to assist stakeholders in pursuing development goals. Establishing broad-based ownership and building inclusive partnerships paves the way for joint action that can be scaled up gradually from the local to the national level in order to achieve sustainable changes.

3. Benchmarking Workshops and the Process of Localizing MDGs

This section of the report will outline a methodology to design and conduct a benchmarking workshop. It will explain the purpose of the benchmarking workshop and demonstrate its relevance for advancing the MDGs.

3.1. Collection of Information and Baseline Data

The team in charge of carrying out the benchmarking process must understand the economic and political environment of the community with which it will be working. It should become familiar with the main development problems, the relations among local stakeholders, and the development work being done in the community. This research should inform the design of the workshop methodology. This initial research would also help determine whether the workshop should focus on one or more MDGs. The team should gather information from reliable sources such as representative statistical or sociological surveys, as well as data collected by institutions (for example hospitals or schools). The team should conduct literature reviews, in-depth interviews and participatory appraisals with representatives of the community, the local government, the private sector, NGOs, or academic experts.

3.2. Holding a Participatory Workshop

Participatory workshops are the most appropriate tool for community benchmarking. The purpose of these workshops is to initiate and sustain collaborative decision-making among stakeholders. All of the relevant parties - local government representatives, NGO leaders, members of the professional and academic communities – should be engaged in learning how the MDGs can be relevant to their development needs and how could MDGs help in creating development strategies. Ideally, all stakeholders would be engaged in a dialogue prior to the workshop, by preparing information and data to be used during the workshop.

The principle of a learning experience that can create new partnerships among stakeholders guides the central goals of the benchmarking workshops. Many organizations
and institutions work separately toward development objectives. The benchmarking workshop is an attempt to create synergy and consensus among all those already involved in community development efforts and those who have not been given a voice for their concerns and perspectives.

### Workshop objectives in Altai & Plovdiv

1. To achieve MDG ownership by different stakeholders.
2. To increase the awareness of the need to work locally towards the MDGs.
3. To achieve stakeholder consensus on problems and priorities by including different members of society in an open dialogue.
4. To communicate the community’s perception of the MDGs to decision-makers in order to adapt them into meaningful regional goals.
5. To bring together government, civil society and other stakeholders around agreed upon benchmarks to build coalitions for action towards MDG progress.
6. In Plovdiv one of the objectives was to contribute towards Plovdiv municipality’s Integrated Strategy for the Development of Minority Neighborhoods by developing not only local goals and targets but also by proposing strategies for their achievement.

### 3.3. Establishing Where the Community is Today

At the beginning of the workshop, participants brainstorm on the current problems that the community faces in the specific field(s) of the MDG(s) considered in the workshop (health, education, environment, etc.). Participants share information about perceived problems as their perspectives and understanding of the problems differ, especially if their specific work is not related to all MDGs addressed in the workshop. For example, someone working in the regional maternity ward could be less familiar with local causes of tuberculosis than someone working at the local health clinic. The group develops a list of concrete problems for reference during the rest of the workshop.

### 3.4. Setting a vision and goals

A vision statement represents a worthwhile, attainable goal that gives a community hope for the future. The vision focuses on one or two issues that the participants consider the most relevant toward the community’s development. The participants discuss and agree on vision statements such as:

1. We have a responsive local government attentive to our needs;
2. We live in a peaceful environment among the different ethnic groups;
3. We have effective and efficient delivery of social services for all community members;
4. Everyone has access to high-quality education.

Participants then discuss a set of strategic goals for each of the visions they develop. They could use as guidelines the national or the global MDGs but they are allowed to develop and prioritize a goal-set that addresses their own problems.

### 3.5. Establishing Benchmarks

Once goals have been agreed upon and prioritized, participants work on identifying indicators to monitor the progress toward their visions. Once these are agreed each indicator is assigned a benchmark (target) value for 2015. If deemed realistic the
participants could use the national benchmark (target). The next step is to determine benchmarks (targets) for the certain years preceding 2015. The time horizon should be suited to the planning feasibility in each community. In some communities the years, to which benchmarks are assigned, might coincide with the local elections cycle, with EU accession / negotiations, any other event that will influence local development, or even the old-type five-year planning cycle.

At this point, relevant baseline data that the team had collected could be of help and could be shared with the participants. The participants could also use as guidelines the benchmarks and the statistics from the national MDGs. Ideally they would already be familiar with the relevant data before the workshop, or would have prepared data that they consider reliable (as explained in 3.1 above).

Useful indicators represent results and focus on outputs rather than funds or other inputs. For example they would measure not the number of teachers (input) but the number of students completing high school. They should be comparable with indicators used in the rest of the country and should be relatively easy to collect. Finally, the benchmarks should be realistic to the time period they capture and the resources available.

4. Next Steps in the Process of Localizing MDGs

The benchmarks established during the workshop are the first step in creating a set of realistic community targets that can be meaningfully pursued as part of a local MDG campaign. If progress from the workshop is to be sustainable, this trend must be continued. Subsequent workshops to monitor or refine the benchmarks should be conducted. Local organizers or participants from the workshop could form an initiative group that would work with government officials across ministries to gain support for the visions developed during the workshop. Furthermore, technical assistance to a local university or research institute could generate real statistical research around the goals developed to assess the accuracy of the baseline data used and the feasibility of meeting the workshop participants’ targets. Subsequent workshops with both the initiative group and high-level government officials could review the researchers’ work and refine targets accordingly.

The ultimate success of this process would be the integration of the localized MDGs and the corresponding benchmarks into the local government’s or the region’s development policy. Once the benchmarks are refined and incorporated into local development plans, the community can hold local government accountable. This also paves the way for important public policy debates about the use of local resources and opens the door for cooperation between civil society and government to work toward the same goals. If such local development programs do not exist, then the benchmarking process could become the first step towards developing such a program.
I. Community Workshop Experiences in Altai Republic and Plovdiv

1. Overview of the Workshop in Altai Republic, Russian Federation

UNDP Moscow identified two regions in Russia where there was sufficient logistical support to carry out the workshop successfully, given the team’s restricted travel time. These were Rostov-on-Don and the Altai Republic. The team chose the Altai Republic because the small size of the community made it appropriate to begin the benchmarking process with a single workshop addressing several MDGs. Rostov is a much larger community, which would have required several workshops to begin localizing MDGs with an acceptable level of community inclusion.

1.1. Background for Altai Republic

The Altai Republic is located in southern Siberia in the triangle formed by the borders of China, Kazakhstan and Mongolia. It has a population of 205,500 people, of whom 50% reside in the regions around the capital and only city - Gorno-Altaisk. Ethnically, the Republic is quite diverse with over 100 nationalities represented. Russians are in the majority (60%) followed by the Altaic peoples (30%), Kazakhs (6%) and migrants from the western part of the CIS (3%). The Altaic peoples include several groups of Turkic peoples who practice an animist religion. The official languages of the Republic are Russian and Altaï. The type of open hostilities between the different ethnic groups that erupted in neighboring Tuva has never been a problem in Altai. However, economic development is perceived to favor non-Altaic ethnic groups (like Russians or Kazakhs in the south) and outsiders.

The economic and social indicators for the Republic paint a bleak picture. According to official sources, unemployment in the region reached 20% in 2002. The average income is 14,000 rubles ($467) per annum and as many as 50% of ethnic Altai people live below the poverty line. GDP per capita is $3,781. The life expectancy is 63.3 years. Altai ranked 71st out of 89 sub-units of the Russian Federation in 1999, according to the UN Human Development Report.

Agriculture is the most important economic sector with animal husbandry being the main activity. The Republic has gold deposits, but most of them have been exhausted through long-term use. The unique natural beauty and the presence of significant historical and archaeological monuments create great potential for the development of tourism in Altai. However, this is also one of the Republic’s most serious challenges. Each year approximately 400,000 tourists (twice the local population) visit the Altai and bring with
them the dangers of environmental degradation. There is also tension over the tourism development, as the Altai religion includes several prime resort spots in its holy sites.

Altai also suffers energy shortages and environmental degradation. Despite rich water resources and the potential for hydroelectric power generation, most energy is generated from wood of local origin, imported oil products and coal, and electric power received from outside. The resulting problems of smog in town, loss of timber and improper waste utilization were repeatedly mentioned during local interviews. In addition, radiation from Soviet-era nuclear testing in Kazakhstan also affects Altai.

1.2. Preparing for the Workshop

The SIPA team began collecting information on the Republic of Altai as soon as it was identified as a target region in December 2002. A member of the team traveled to Moscow during the week of January 12, 2003 to meet with the UNDP office in Moscow and to conduct preliminary research on projects taking place in the Altai Republic. During the course of this visit, the team gathered information from a variety of international organizations and NGOs working in Siberia and conducted a focus group with students from the Altai Republic who were studying at the Patrice Lumumba University of Peoples’ Friendship.

In addition to research in Moscow, the team also conducted telephone interviews with community leaders and government officials in Altai, as well as with members of the academic community conducting research on the region. This proved to be very valuable in forming an initial understanding of the development challenges in Altai. Statistical data for baseline information on MDG related issues would have proven very difficult to locate had the Representative of the Republic of Altai in Moscow not provided the team with the Altai Development Report⁶, which the Republic submitted to the Ministry of the Economy.

1.3. Conducting the Workshop

The Columbia University team held a participatory workshop to benchmark the MDGs in Gorno-Altaisk for the three days from March 19th to March 21st. Approximately 25 community leaders attended, including NGO leaders, civil servants, representatives of the academic community and students. The final objectives of the workshop were to familiarize participants with the MDGs and to help translate these goals into local terms as well as to use the tool of benchmarking as a guide for community action toward local goals.

During the workshop, participants were divided into three groups by sector of interest. The general themes were environmental issues, the social sector and economic development; each group chose the MDGs that it would address at the beginning of the workshop. The groups worked well together. Many of the participants already knew each
other and had worked together in the past, as Gorno-Altaisk is a small city. Therefore, the preliminary activities were completed more quickly than the facilitator had anticipated.

The benchmarking portion of the workshop was conceptually difficult for some of the participants, particularly if they lacked experience with strategic planning. However, with some extra time and explanation, the group produced concrete benchmarks closely linked to the MDGs that they had chosen. In retrospect, the exercise to evaluate the preliminary benchmarks at the beginning of the second day was extremely valuable. It was the most difficult for the participants and required the most active facilitation, but it yielded good results and gave the group a much firmer understanding of the concept of benchmarking.

The third day of the workshop included a roundtable discussion for government officials and the academic community. A representative from each of the three groups presented the results of their work, and a lively discussion ensued both about the technical aspects of benchmarking and the specific benchmarks that participants had formulated. This was followed by a press conference that generated at least one article in the local newspaper. In addition, Marina Olshanskaya of UNDP/Moscow met with the Ministry of Economics for the Republic of Altai to present the results of the workshop.

1.4. Outcomes and Evaluation of the Workshop

Examples of the results of the workshop in Altai are presented below. For complete results and transcripts of workshop materials, please refer to Appendix 2B.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Millennium Development Goal</th>
<th>2003 (baseline)</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Eradicate global poverty and hunger</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce the number of people living on incomes below the</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>survival minimum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Improve maternal health</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase the percentage of healthy pregnant women</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ensure environmental sustainability</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase recycling and appropriate disposal of solid waste</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase the proportion of the population participating in</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conservation activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most of the outcomes of the workshop made sense in light of the background research that the team conducted on Altai. However, the health sector presented a particularly surprising benchmark. The social sector group decided to work with the MDG concerning HIV/AIDS, malaria and other diseases. The group immediately discarded malaria as irrelevant to the region. However, they did not focus at all on tuberculosis. This was unexpected because research shows the TB infection rate in Altai to be 1.6 times the Russian Federation level. Instead, the group identified hepatitis as a significant public health threat.
The participants also discarded some of the measurement frameworks used in global MDG targets. For example, the group working on poverty reduction decided that measuring poverty in terms of people living on less than $1 per day was inappropriate because of the higher purchasing power of that sum in Altai than in surrounding regions. Instead the group focused on the number of people living below the survival minimum, which is the cost of a minimum basket of goods compiled for each region.

The social sector group also took issue with the use of the number of women dying in childbirth as an appropriate measure of progress toward improved maternal health. The group felt that this measure missed the point of the MDG and chose to focus instead on the percentage of healthy pregnant women, following the logic that healthy women do not die in childbirth and good prenatal care is essential to the long-term health of both mother and child. This reflects the fact that many women in Altai suffer health problems during pregnancy and afterwards, even though the statistic for women dying in childbirth is relatively low. Health problems include anemia, consequences of previous abortions and poor nutrition.

Although the workshop included participants with vastly differing levels of experience with strategic planning, it achieved its objectives. Participants left with a clear understanding of the MDGs and the philosophy behind them and felt ownership of the benchmarks that they had formulated. One of the participants, an NGO leader from the organization Guardians of the Lake, commented that he would include materials on the ecological benchmarks developed at the workshop in a regional conference that will take place in Irkutsk later this year. In addition, the workshop organizers also intend to incorporate MDG benchmarking in their strategic planning with village/district initiative groups throughout the Republic.

The workshop also accomplished the broader UNDP objective of publicizing the MDGs. The press conference that closed the workshop was well attended and resulted in an article in the local newspaper with substantial information about the MDGs. See Appendix 2B for a copy of the article in Russian.

1.5. Next Steps

The UNDP Country Office in Russia has already begun localizing MDGs with support from researchers in the Economics Faculty at Moscow State University. This Faculty offers a graduate course in Human Development using curriculum developed in cooperation with UNDP. Therefore, there are ample resources in place to conduct thorough community benchmarking. A short training-of-trainers workshop could prepare students, lecturers and researchers to facilitate participatory workshops. Together with the ability to conduct statistical research, as in the Samara MDG project, these constitute the fundamental elements of the community benchmarking process.

Research alone can help to identify trends in social indicators, uncover the types of data that are already collected and provide important baseline information. However, it does not provide adequate information about local priorities and perceptions of social trends. Nor does it create ownership of the MDGs or local targets identified in their context. In this way, the model of community benchmarking using both participatory workshops and academic research has the potential to make Russia’s efforts toward localizing the MDGs both sustainable and realistic.
2. Overview of the Workshop in Plovdiv, Bulgaria

The UNDP country office in Bulgaria indicated that community benchmarking would be appropriate for Bulgaria because it could be incorporated within the larger MDG process, which had already started. In November 2002 the Municipality of Plovdiv had asked UNDP to design an Integrated Strategy for the Development of Plovdiv’s Ethnic Minority Neighborhoods. UNDP decided that the benchmarking workshop would be a precursor to the development of this strategy. In addition, the country office was in the process of adapting the MDGs to Bulgaria.

2.1. Background for Plovdiv

Located in the southern central part of Bulgaria, the ancient city of Plovdiv is the second largest city in the country, with a population of 340,000 people. Plovdiv is an industrial and commercial hub with 62 enterprises of national importance. The city is also an educational center with 74 schools, 6 universities, and more than 50 other scientific and academic institutes.8

With an average life expectancy of 78 years and a 98% literacy rate, the city is in the “highly developed” category of Bulgaria’s 2002 Human Development Index.9 The city also has a diverse ethnic map that includes Bulgarians, Turks, Roma, Jews, and Armenians who have lived together peacefully for centuries. Turks and Roma number around 40,000 or over 10% of the city’s population. Ethnic identities among these groups are fluid and exact numbers are not available.

2.2. Ethnic groups in Plovdiv

Almost all of the Turks and Roma are concentrated in four neighborhoods, but the great majority, about 30,000, lives in the neighborhood of “Izgrev”, popularly known as “Stolipinovo”.10 Except for the centrally located Turkish neighborhood of “Hadji Asan”, all three other minority neighborhoods are markedly less developed than the rest of the city. In all three neighborhoods, commonly referred to as “ghettos”, Roma and Turks live in extreme poverty, walled off from the rest of society.

The people outside the neighborhoods openly dislike, discriminate against, or ignore the inhabitants of these neighborhoods. The identification of all the Roma and Turks living in
the four neighborhoods as “Roma” (“Tzygany”) is done externally by the Bulgarian majority, based on social characteristics – poor, uneducated, living in large households, etc. There are many problems in the three ghettos \(^{11}\): lack of basic infrastructure (electricity, sewerage, paved roads), lack of adequate housing, overcrowding, and unstable property rights. Unemployment estimates vary between 50-80\(^{12}\). The labor force is very low skilled. The illiteracy rates and school dropout rates are several-fold the city average. The neighborhoods are far from or do not have adequate healthcare facilities. The health condition of the inhabitants is significantly worse than the rest of the city. There are high rates of disability, chronic and seasonal diseases and infections. Stereotypes and language differences create additional barriers to access to health and education services.

2.3. Preparing for the Workshop

Preparatory work began months before the actual workshop was conducted. In December 2002, the SIPA team conducted baseline research on Roma and minority issues in Bulgaria. The main sources of information included recent NGO studies, UNDP publications, publications by other agencies, government documents, as well as other available relevant statistics. As a follow up to this initial research, the team conducted a one-week field visit in early January 2003 to collect baseline information and conduct preliminary interviews with stakeholders. The team had a chance to meet with the UNDP country office. The team members also traveled to Plovdiv and met with community members, NGO leaders, and experts on Roma issues.

A second field visit, immediately preceding the workshop, allowed the team to conduct more interviews and to generate an overall asset assessment. The team interviewed many of the potential workshop participants at relevant health and education facilities and institutions in Plovdiv. The second field visit helped prepare participants for the workshop.

The most significant challenge that the team encountered during this preparation phase was the access to MDG-relevant statistics. Since the National Statistical Institute does not collect ethnic-based or neighborhood based data, it was difficult to go beyond the anecdotal evidence gathered from the interviews. The team initially had to rely on baseline data collected through polls and sociological surveys conducted by NGOs. During field visits the team was able to obtain additional data, which is regularly collected for internal use by the local branches of the Ministry of Health or the Ministry of Education and Science.

2.4. Conducting the Workshop

The workshop took place on Monday, March 24, 2003 and was attended by 20 participants. Coming from the sphere of health and education, the participants represented a mix of varying perspectives and experiences. In the field of education, the participants included teachers, assistant Roma/Turkish teachers, school principals, the head of the regional Ministry of Education branch, a municipality education expert, NGO representatives, and a university professor in pedagogy. In the area of health the participants included a doctor, a representative from the municipality health department, the head of the regional Ministry of Health branch, and NGO representatives working on health projects.
During most of the day the participants worked in three work groups: two on education issues and one on health issues. First, the participants were introduced to the national MDGs and the benchmarking method. They spent the morning developing a vision and a set of goals in the area of minority health and education. They also outlined output indicators and benchmarks to monitor progress toward achieving the goals. The benchmark years were set at 2007, 2011, and 2015 to coincide with local election mandates. A full list of goals, indicators, and benchmarks is provided in Appendix 2A. In the afternoon, the participants brainstormed strategies for reaching target goals.

2.5. Outcomes and Evaluation of the Workshop

The workshop met its objectives. At the end of the workshop, the participants had a good understanding of the education and health MDGs. Building on the national goals, the participants identified and prioritized goals important and relevant to them. Not surprisingly, many of these goals coincided with the national goals. An example is provided in Box 1.

The participants developed an understanding of benchmarking as a process that could be used to initiate and monitor development initiatives. On some occasions, the lack of relevant baseline data proved to be a challenge in developing output indicators. In many instances, however, the participants were able to get around that challenge by relying on the wealth of their experience. They were able to come up with statistics from information and data their institutions regularly collected.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Box 1</th>
<th>Indicators for health goal No1:</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Children covered by immunizations</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Incidents of socially significant diseases monitored and attended by qualified medical personnel</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Children monitored and attended by medical personnel</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although the local goals that the participants prioritized and the national goals coincided on many occasions, some 2015 benchmarks differed significantly. This was mainly due to the much lower development levels of minority neighborhoods. In the opinion of the participants, the achievement of certain national targets was completely unrealistic, and they did not deem it appropriate to adopt these. Some examples in Box 2 illustrate this point.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. % of children completing high-school (net completion rate of the net enrollment rate)</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>≈10%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The workshop was able to attract a fair amount of media coverage. The UNDP representative gave an interview to the local radio station half an hour before starting the workshop. Some Roma activists were attracted by it and stopped by in the course of the morning to observe the discussions. A journalist from the city’s main newspaper spent some time at the workshop and wrote an article. Representatives of the SIPA team also gave a 30 minute long interview for a nationally broadcasted radio-show on minority issues.

2.6. Next steps

Experience from the workshop shows that such a benchmarking exercise cannot stand on its own. It must be carried out in the context of a more general strategy. In that sense, it was extremely valuable that it coincided with the translation of the MDGs to the Bulgarian national level and that it was presented as a primary component of the municipality’s Integrated Development Strategy for Minority Neighborhoods in Plovdiv. The workshop provided the municipal representatives with a wealth of information and ideas for the further development of their strategy. However, there was considerable mistrust among the Roma regarding development initiatives pursued for electoral reasons and past negative experiences of such cases involving the municipality. Municipal elections will take place in the fall of 2003. Therefore, it would have improved the level of participation and the workshop’s credibility if the latter had been embedded in the Integrated Strategy when this strategy had reached a higher level of maturity.

In any case, it is important for UNDP to seek continued commitment of the municipality to the Integrated Development Strategy for Minority Neighborhoods in Plovdiv. This is instrumental in two senses: renewed community disappointment has to be avoided while it would do harm to UNDP’s name and reputation if it were to be associated with a development initiative that turned out to be election-motivated.

********

II. Recommendations for Localizing MDGs through the Community Benchmarking Process

1. Recommendations for UNDP Country Offices

- **Community Benchmarking Workshops must be part of a larger process.**
  Analysis of the workshops conducted in both target regions shows that such an exercise cannot stand on its own. The workshop would have had more weight both to the participants, as well as the local authorities, if it had been tied to an on-going process. Making the workshop part of a larger process, with clearly defined follow-up steps, provides a focus to its objectives, and allows the participants to work within a clearly defined context.
Conduct extensive preliminary research.

It is imperative that extensive preliminary research be conducted ahead of time, about the local context. Our experience shows the particularities on the ground could best be assessed through direct interviews with participants, government authorities, and community members. For the process of benchmarking, it is fundamentally important to have accurate preliminary data to serve as a baseline against which progress can be measured.

Collect local baseline data.

Every effort should be made to collect local baseline data, especially when working with municipalities with ethnic minorities. In some cases national or even regional data could be misleading about local realities. There are at least three alternatives to formal statistical data. First, data can be obtained directly from local institutions, like hospitals and schools, or local government. Second, the data of a comparable region/locality can be used as point of reference. Third, instead of relating the benchmarks to baseline data, they can be formulated as output oriented indicators. For example: instead of improving primary school enrolment by 15%, it can be improved by enrolling an additional 200 children at the primary level.

Make sure the process incorporates all relevant stakeholders.

Developing a strategy for the selection of participants early in the process is crucial to the success of the workshop. Such a strategy should take into account the relevant authorities, as well as all the actors from every sphere of community life with vested interests in the process. Bringing together a truly diverse group of stakeholders provides for multiple points of view and ensures that the adopted benchmarks take the needs of the entire community into account.

Accepting Mismatches between Local and National Benchmarks

Lastly, special attention should be paid to the tension that might arise between national and local goals and benchmarks. Localities are asked to develop targets based on their own baseline situation and a realistic assessment of what can be achieved in the time frame considered. However, these local indicators might differ from and seem insufficient compared to national indicators. This might lead the national implementation organizations (national government, UNDP) to force local leaders to commit to goals that are closer to national goals, resulting in a false acceptance and emptying the process of ownership. A careful assessment and discussion between local and national authorities about the extent to which national targets are appropriate in form and content to local realities is crucial to establish realistic goals that do not strain ownership and genuine commitment at the local level.

2. Recommendations for UNDP Headquarters

Regional benchmarking should feed into the MDG national process.

Based on the experience of the two workshops, community benchmarking is an effective tool for localizing the MDGs. This process generates local ownership and helps to define national goals. However, if national goals are predefined, regional benchmarking
can create tension between local priorities and national goals. This is essentially the same problem that faces the global MDGs – goals are too abstract to be locally owned and targets may be framed in inappropriate terms.

- **Work with Country Office to plan community benchmarking as a process.**
  
  If national initiatives are to be effective, they must be carefully planned to take local priorities into account. A series of participatory workshops without follow-up or connection to the regional or national process may increase local awareness of the MDGs, but it will not increase ownership or guide development.

- **Cluster community benchmarking workshops.**
  
  If the benchmarking process cannot be implemented in every locality, workshops should be clustered in areas with connections to one another. This ensures that the positive results from each workshop will spillover into neighboring communities in a ripple effect. Holding single workshops in isolated regions will not have the same effect and may ultimately decrease motivation within the community, as people feel a lack of support and solidarity from other regions.

- **Training of trainers is essential to spread community benchmarking.**
  
  Countries that lack the resources to conduct participatory workshops and fully institute the community benchmarking process should target community groups to implement the process. By transferring the technology of benchmarking to local organizations, country offices also can achieve a ripple effect. For a very low initial investment of a training workshop and perhaps a small grant for participants to start the benchmarking process at home, UNDP can carry the process of localizing the MDGs throughout the region, not just to capital cities.

3. Assessment of Benchmarking as a Tool to Advance MDGs

3.1. Overall Effectiveness

Community benchmarking can be a powerful tool for creating local ownership of the MDGs by translating them into a local context. Workshops facilitate a dialogue among various community actors and help them to agree on realistic short and long-term targets (benchmarks) for their communities, based on differing perspectives and experiences related to the development issues at stake. The success of the MDGs worldwide relies on their adoption and pursuit as part of each country’s development initiatives. Benchmarking workshops have proven to be an effective tool to accomplish the difficult dual task of translating global goals into locally relevant ones and simultaneously fostering local initiative and commitment.

Complex development problems are usually characterized in terms of lacking material and human resources. This approach reinforces the perception of deprivation, powerlessness and vulnerability of the people suffering from the web of constraints poverty imposes. Participatory benchmarking workshops propose a radically different perspective to this deficit-centered approach. Working to set benchmarks that gauge
progress toward a collectively agreed vision places the emphasis on assets, possibilities, results, and concrete strategies.

Participatory benchmarking workshops per se will not guarantee implementation of policies and achievement of the MDGs. However, advancing the MDGs does demand as a pre-requisite the improvement of governance, the strengthening of civil society and the creation of partnerships between these two sectors. Stronger partnerships will enable stakeholders to agree on the efforts needed to implement policies as well as build legitimacy and commitment around them. Participatory benchmarking workshops can be a first step toward building positive synergies among central and local governments and civil society. They can break the cycles described above through:

- Enabling dialogue between actors at different levels who might never listen to each other otherwise;
- Developing trust and cooperative relationships among NGOs, officials and citizens;
- Ensuring a public commitment from stakeholders to advance the goals agreed;
- Increasing awareness of civil society about their responsibility to demand accountability from their local and national governments.

3.2. The Tool Becomes Local

Benchmarking workshop methodology should be tailored to fit each local situation, taking into account the relevant stakeholders, the main development issues and the situation in the locality regarding the national level for each MDG. If these factors are considered, benchmarking workshops can be a powerful tool. Contrarily, if this technique is implemented without enough knowledge of the local dynamics or commitment to people’s needs and concerns, it can just as well become a laborious, superficial exercise that does not lead to concrete initiatives.

3.3. Expanding the Commitment

Ideally, the potential of participatory workshops to create ownership and commitment toward advancing the MDGs, relies on the occurrence of several of these experiences, in different localities. One workshop alone is insufficient for participants to understand, accept and own the MDGs, as well as to develop strategies of how to achieve them. The MDGs will only become a part of domestic policy if the local population understands them on their own terms and feels significant ownership of both the goals and the process through which they are realized. Carrying out workshops in different municipalities can strengthen this process. This could give municipalities or regions the possibility to compare benchmarks, exchange ideas about how to advance goals and even to compete with each other. Public-minded mayors, held accountable for their performance, can use their progress toward MDGs as a political tool to gain constituents’ support. It is essential that UNDP work closely with government officials and legislative bodies to create support for the process.

Depending on the size of the community, workshops should be convened around specific MDGs. For example, in a large region where there are several hospitals, clinics and NGOs concerned about health issues, a workshop focused on the health MDGs could bring together a broad cross-section of knowledge and interests within this specific
community. In addition, if the MDGs are to be for a whole region, it is important to hold workshops in major cities as well as smaller towns. Central cities are not always in touch with outlying villages and their challenges.

Localizing MDGs implies reaching out to as many communities as possible to ensure that priority issues are representative. Realistic forecasting and accountability can represent a concrete tool in the hands of small territorial units to champion their own progress toward the MDGs. Otherwise, establishing national MDGs and indicators that are not based on localities’ realistic evaluations might lead to national indicators that are really only feasible and appropriate for the capital and not the whole of the country.

3.4. Making Localized MDGs Real

Localizing the MDGs in a meaningful way requires a significant commitment of time and resources. This need not mean financial resources only, but it does mean that UNDP must work extensively with both local communities and local governments to give continuity to the efforts that will make these commitments a reality.

Community benchmarking workshops then become just the first step toward building the required ownership, local suitability of goals and commitment necessary for the long-term process. Being realistic about the possibility of locally advancing common goals implies acknowledging the importance of respecting and supporting localities in pursuing the benchmarks they have defined according to their capabilities. Simply asking a group of people during a workshop to formulate benchmarks is only a small part of the process. Workshops can be valuable in and of themselves by providing a space of dialogue for people from different parts of the community to discuss their development priorities. Additionally, workshops serve to publicize the MDGs as part of the UN’s mission. However, a single benchmarking workshop cannot stand alone if the MDGs are to be incorporated into effective public policy.
Endnotes

1 For statistics on the MDGs in Russia see http://millenniumindicators.un.org/unsd/mi/mi.asp
2 The full list of the targets could be found at http://www.undp.bg/en/homepage_files/mdg/report.php
3 Various literature on participatory planning methodologies was consulted in order to develop the conceptual framework and methodological components of the Community benchmarking workshops. Literature came from the subject areas of participatory workshops, social capital assessment, asset mapping, and community benchmarking:
   - Building Bridges between Citizens and Local Governments to work more effectively together through Participatory Planning, Training manuals, UNCHS (Habitat)
   http://www.unhabitat.org/programmes/tcbb/
   - Empowering People - A Guide to Participation, CSOPP Documents, UNDP.
   - Social Capital Assessment Tool and Community Profile and Asset Mapping. Community Driven Development. World Bank
   03AD76?OpenDocument
   http://pcs.aed.org/empowering.htm
   - Global Vision, Sustainable Dublin, 2002
   http://sustainabledublin.com/strategy.html
7 UNDP Project Desegregating Millenium Development Goals for the Russian Federation, Moscow 2002
10 The enclosed picture of Stolipinovo is from a CEGA
11 These problems listed are identified by the residents of Stolipinovo but are common to the other neighborhoods. They come from a sociological survey conducted by CEGA, “Way Of Living Of The Communities In Stolipinovo Neighbourhood, Plovdiv”, Sofia: May 2001, http://www.cega.bg/download_docs/Stolipinovo_Survey-Eng-28_06_01.doc.
12 There were no reliable statistics on the issue as the neighborhood does not constitute a separate administrative district. According to the CEGA survey, 53% of the respondents were unemployed for over 2 years. During our interviews respondents estimated unemployment to be as high as 80%. The problem is that many consider themselves unemployed because they do not have a permanent job although many get temporary jobs.
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Introduction

The United Nations Development Program’s Regional Bureau for Europe and the CIS in New York approached the School of International and Public Affairs at Columbia University (SIPA) to develop a process to localize the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs).

The overall goal of the project was to determine how participatory benchmarking workshops could be used to create local ownership of the MDGs by translating them into a local context. The workshops facilitate a dialogue among various community actors and help them to agree on realistic short and long-term targets (benchmarks) for their communities, based on differing viewpoints and experiences.

This guidebook includes all the workshop components that the Columbia University’s team found to have worked well in the two pilot workshops conducted in Plovdiv, Bulgaria and Gornoaltaisk, The Republic of Altai, Russia. The report that accompanies this guidebook contains explanations and references to the methodology and the rationale that underlies the material presented in the guidebook.

Preparing for the workshop

This section is not a general guide on how to prepare a participatory workshop. Instead it suggests solutions to problems and approaches that are specific to the process of localizing the MDGs, as well as preparing and conducting an MDG benchmarking workshop.

1) Deciding on MDG to be benchmarked: You could determine which MDG to focus in the workshop after you get to know the community better. Keep in mind though, that your baseline research will be much more fruitful and focused if you choose your goals in advance. We suggest that you consider the following issues when deciding whether to have a workshop on one, two, or all MDGs. You might decide to have eight workshops – one on each MDG.

   a) The level of specialization within community: In a big community, like the city of Plovdiv, one could easily find a number of stakeholders who are professionally devoted to the issues of one specific MDG (for example maternal health). In a smaller community you might not have such a choice, the participants in the workshop might be willing and knowledgeable about more than one MDG.

   b) Resources: Ideally, the more focused the workshops on fewer MDGs, the more professional and detailed the outcomes. On the other hand, be aware that the participants will gain only limited exposure to the MDGs not considered in the workshop.
c) **Time constraints:** The issues that fall under certain MDGs might be too difficult to tackle and could require a serious debate. A two-day workshop might not give you enough time.

2) **Conducting baseline research:** This might seem like common sense, but we are including some tips that we think are relevant for Eastern Europe and the CIS.

   a) **Statistics:**
      
      **Why is it important?** Most of the output indicators that could be benchmarked should be readily available and easy to measure. It is crucial that the facilitators have an understanding of the kinds of data and statistical information collected from reliable sources such as government offices.

      **What are the difficulties?** The main problem is that statistical information often is not collected for territorial units smaller than the municipality level. Government statistical agencies often would not have local data for the kind of indicators the participants might want to benchmark. There might be other reliable sources.

      **Where to get them?** For Eastern Europe and the CIS we would suggest the following sources:

      - **National statistical institutes / agency:** Contact the local office (district or municipality office of the national agency).

      - **Municipality / local government:** the municipality often collects data for internal usage.

      - **Ministries:** local branches of the national government often collect education, health, and economic data, which are not presented to the public.

      - **Institutions:** schools, hospitals, local employment agencies maintain their own records and statistics. These are usually available for internal use only but you can request them while you are conducting interviews at the institution. Alternatively, you could work through the relevant ministry.

   b) **Asset mapping:** Although a complete asset mapping process might be impossible due to time and resource constraints, it is essential that the facilitators have a good understanding of the available resources and infrastructure. Some examples could be:

      - Visit and interview officials and patients at hospitals, clinics, the local Ministry of Health, and maternity wards.

      - Visit and interview officials (and students) at schools, kindergartens, the local Ministry of Education, municipality, and NGOs.
c) **Helping participants prepare:** This is one of the big lessons from our pilot projects. In order to ensure ownership and have the participants commit to working towards the benchmarks, they should spend some time preparing.

- **Send materials beforehand:** In our experience it would have been very helpful to participants if they had been informed in advance about the nature of the workshop and the expectations for their participation. This could be done during the preliminary interviews. The agreement to participate should commit the participants to a degree of involvement and preparation. You could send:
  - Materials about the MDGs,
  - Materials on the benchmarking process
  - A list of materials or data that the invitee should bring to the workshop.

- Contact key government participants: Participants from government agencies or the municipality should come prepared with some data and some idea about the MDG localization process and the expectations from the workshop.

- Contact key civil society leaders: Key NGOs often have good ideas and have their own data that was collected for their projects. NGO representatives should also have expectations about the workshop and come prepared with data for past or current trends on the relevant issue.

3) **Identifying participants:** This process will depend on the community where you would like to conduct the workshop. Most towns and cities in Eastern Europe and the CIS have a fairly comprehensive institutional framework. Therefore it is easy to identify the relevant state and local government agencies and institutions, and NGOs, whose representatives should be included in the workshop. For an example of the kind of participants to invite, you can refer to Appendix 2C, or to the description of the workshops, pp.12 & 16 of the report.

  a) **Interviewing the participants beforehand:** We found this particularly helpful, as not only did it help the participants feel more comfortable with us, but also helped us to elicit responses and opinions that we have heard and from which we thought that all participants could benefit.

  b) **Ensuring good group dynamics:** It is inevitable that some workshop participants will have different social status: some from ministries, while others work at schools, hospitals, NGOs, employment agencies, etc. In our experience this did not pose any problem. It is useful to emphasize during the workshop that the value of having everyone together is that they could draw on specific experiences and views of everyone. However, it is also important to be aware of differences in status so that participants with vastly different levels of authority are not forced to work together. For example, including the Minister of Education in a workshop with several school directors may stifle the school directors’ participation and make the Minister feel as though his/her time is being wasted. Similarly, when the participants break into focus groups, facilitators should try to ensure that participants with direct reporting
relationships are not in the same groups. For example, a school director might work in a focus group with teachers, but ideally these teachers would work at different schools.

c) **Deciding on the number of participants:** Finally, there should be a manageable number of participants – 20-25 people. A workshop could be organized with more participants but this will require a greater number of facilitators, space, reduction of non-small group activities. In our experience small groups of 5-7 participants allowed for efficient and productive workshop.

1. **Deciding on the workshop length:** We recommend that this workshop be conducted in no less than two days. We believe that if the organizers succeed in conveying to the participants the importance of the workshop and the process of localizing the MDGs, and ensure the commitment of some key participants, they should be successful. The enclosed guide assumes a two-day workshop. Our experience showed that this might not be always possible. Local conditions and levels of “workshop fatigue” must be taken into account. For example, in Bulgaria, the conduct of a longer workshop would have required the selection of a different location, outside the participant’s area of work, as well as a different logistical approach, and much more financial resources.

4) **Organizing the workshop under the right auspices:** It is essential that the entity that invites participants to the workshop is credible to the participants. Governments in Eastern Europe are generally distrusted and considered corrupted. For example, there was considerable mistrust among the minorities in Plovdiv regarding development initiatives pursued for electoral reasons and past negative experiences of such cases involving the Municipality. Municipal elections will take place in the fall of 2003. Moreover, the municipality was viewed as inefficient and lacking capacity to solve the minorities’ problems. On the other hand government participation is key. One way to avoid the above troubles would be to organize the workshop as a joint initiative of the public and NGO sector with equal commitment from all participants.

5) **Designing the workshop and preparing materials:** It is essential that facilitators give careful thought to the design and the organization of the workshop. The activities that follow can be easily adapted to different venues with different levels of technological support. If projectors are not available, activities can be guided with prepared flipcharts just as easily as with slides or overhead transparencies.

a) **Organizing participants into small groups:** It is easier to facilitate most of these activities if participants work in small groups of five to seven people. To avoid wasting time at the beginning of the workshop, facilitators should group participants beforehand. The nature of your workshop determines specific groupings. For example, if you are working with several MDGs, participants could be grouped by sector. If you are working with one MDG, participants should be grouped so that each subgroup includes a variety of stakeholders. For example, if you are holding a workshop on maternal health, each subgroup should contain hospital staff, NGO representatives and public health officials.
instead of putting all of the hospital staff in one group, all of the NGO representatives in another group, etc.

Color-coding participant nametags is an easy, efficient way to accomplish this goal:
- Divide the participant list into small groups based on the type of workshop conducted.
- Create a nametag for each participant with his/her name and institutional affiliation and place a colored sticker or a number on each nametag.
- During the workshop, explain that everyone with a certain color sticker or a certain number on his/her nametag will work together.
- If the facilitator suspects that there may be competition among the groups, particularly in workshops where participants are working with several MDGs, the colored sticker method is preferable to numbering nametags.

b) **Breaking the ice:** If participants do not know each other or previously have not worked together, you should plan a brief ice breaker before group activities begin. This exercise should be tailored to the cultural context so that it does not make anyone uncomfortable and should be lighthearted. Some examples are included below.

- **Participant interviews:** Ask participants to break into their subgroups. Everyone should choose one person whom they have never met and find out information about their partner. Facilitators may distribute a list of questions or post questions on a flipchart at the front of the room. Questions can range from simple professional questions to general personal questions (like how long you have lived in the area, what is your favorite ice cream) but should be simple enough to be answered quickly and general enough not to make participants uncomfortable. At the end of the exercise, each participant summarizes the information gleaned from interviewing for the subgroup. Approximate time: 25 minutes.

- **Think outside the box:** Participants receive a handout with nine dots arranged in a 3 x 3 box. They are given 5-10 minutes to connect all the dots using only four straight lines without lifting the pen from the paper. Most people try to connect the dots without drawing outside the confines of the box, which is impossible. The idea of the exercise is to convey the importance of thinking unconventionally during the workshop. This is better suited to a group where participants are somewhat acquainted with each other but need to be loosed up before the workshop.
Sample Agenda

UNDP Community Benchmarking Workshop

Day 1

10:00  Registration

10:30  Welcoming Remarks

10:40  Discussion of Workshop Objectives and Format
Objective: Introduce participants to each other, introduce the participatory approach of the workshop and agree on ground rules.
Note: More experienced groups may need less time

11:20  Coffee Break

11:40  Introductory Presentations
Presentation of MDGs and UNDP’s role
Objective: Familiarize participants with MDGs and UNDP work

Introduction to Benchmarking from the Oregon Process
Objective: Introduce the concept of benchmarking

Summary of the National Benchmarking Strategy
Objective: Give a concrete example of MDG strategy in local context

12:40  Choosing your MDGs (optional)

13:00  Where Is the Community Today?
Objective: Gather information about perceived problems and priorities

13:30  Lunch

14:30  Vision for the Community
Objective: Introduce the concept of a vision statement and develop a broad set of strategic goals for each of the issues identified in the previous exercise.

15:30  Group Presentations

16:00  Coffee Break

16:15  Establishing Benchmarks
Objective: Identify intermediate steps to be taken and benchmarks to measure progress toward the visions from the previous exercise.

17:00  Group Presentations
Day 2

10:00 Recap of Day 1

10:30 Evaluating Benchmarks
Objectives: Participants use a feasibility matrix to evaluate the benchmarks that they developed the day before.

11:30 Group Presentation

12:15 Coffee Break

12:30 Relating Benchmarks to the MDGs
Objectives: Participants relate their benchmarks to the national MDGs that they chose in the beginning of the workshop.

13:15 Group Presentations

14:00 Lunch

15:00 Challenge Matrix
Objectives: Divide priority issues into component causes and determine the level of influence that the community can exert over each issue.

15:30 Group Presentations

16:15 Evaluation

Day 3 (optional)

10:00 Presentation to local officials
Objectives: Familiarize participants with MDGs and UNDP work, introduce the concept of benchmarking

10:30 Group Presentations and Roundtable Discussion
Objectives: Familiarize local officials and community leaders with the results of the workshop. These new participants should have received materials for the entire workshop earlier.

12:00 Press Conference


**Conducting the workshop**

The rest of this guide will give you a list of all activities that we found useful in conducting of the benchmarking workshop.

******************************************************************************

**Day 1**

******************************************************************************

### Activity 1.1  Registration and Welcoming Remarks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time:</th>
<th>40 minutes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objectives:</strong></td>
<td>Gather a final list of participants, distribute materials for the day, introduce the facilitators and the presenters for the next exercise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Materials:</strong></td>
<td>Name tags, welcome packets (including statistical information on Altai and background information on benchmarking and MDGs)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Method:** | 1. Provide a sign-in area for participants and distribute name tags.  
2. Distribute a welcome packet that contains an agenda, background information on the Millennium Development Goals and the region where the workshop is being held.  
3. Someone from the UNDP team may make a few remarks.  
4. The facilitators introduce themselves to the group. |

**Facilitator Notes:**
- The welcoming remarks could be from a government official or a prominent community leader who shows commitment to the MDGs.  
- Registration can be shortened if the participants arrive late.  
- Be sure to review the registration process with local staff.
Activity 1.2 Discussion of Workshop Objectives and Format

Time: 30 - 60 minutes

Objectives: Introduce participants to each other, introduce the participatory approach of the workshop and agree on ground rules.

Materials: Flip chart paper, markers, transparencies of the agenda

Method:
1. Participants will state their name and profession. (15 minutes)
2. Participants will divide into groups to discuss their expectations for the workshop. One member of each small group will report on the expectations brainstormed. A facilitator will record their responses on flip chart paper. (20 minutes)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop Objectives</th>
<th>Facilitator Expectations</th>
<th>Participant Expectations</th>
<th>What do you hope to achieve?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

3. A facilitator will briefly summarize the expectations voiced and will summarize the objectives of the workshop from their point of view. The workshop objective is to convey the philosophy of the MDGs and the tool of benchmarking as community development mechanisms. (5 minutes)
4. A facilitator will help the group establish ground rules for the workshop that will help meet the objectives/expectations of the entire group. Ground rules should be listed quickly on flip chart paper. Then one of the facilitators can copy them neatly on a piece of paper to be displayed at the front of the room for the duration of the workshop. If communication begins to breakdown during the workshop, the facilitator should stop and refer to the ground rules. (20 minutes)

Facilitator Notes:
- Prior preparation of participants is essential for this exercise to work.
- The exercise will provide valuable information about any misunderstandings of the preparation material.
- Connect the activities for Days 1 and 2 to eliminate confusion.
- Groups experienced with workshops may not need to spend the full 60 minutes establishing ground rules.

Examples of ground rules:
- Respect others’ opinions
- Try to limit your statements to not more than 5 minutes.
- Do not interrupt the statements of other participants
### Activity 1.3 Introductory presentations on MDGs & benchmarking

**Time:** 60 minutes  

**Objectives:** Familiarize participants with MDGs and UNDP work in the country or the community, Introduce the concept of benchmarking, give a concrete example of MDG benchmarking in the country.

**Materials:** Overhead transparencies & projector, presentation slides

**Facilitator Notes:**

- This session should include discussion of issues related to the MDGs and benchmarks as output focused indicators. Emphasis should be on the global acceptance of the MDG philosophy through the United Nations and the adaptability of individual goals to local settings.
- If the UNDP country office has already adapted the global to national MDGs goals – focus the presentation on the national MDGs. Explain how the process of national adaptation.
- If the workshop is on a specific MDG (for example “education”), then, make sure to expand on the education issue.
- Facilitators should be aware of the community’s experience with UNDP and strategic planning. This will help to determine the audience’s level of knowledge so that facilitators can tailor the materials to their audience.
- If the group has many questions about the MDGs, the benchmarking presentation can be shortened here, but will then require more time before the benchmarking exercise.

The group in Altai had some workshop experience, and some participants were trainers/facilitators themselves. It was helpful to present the MDGs and benchmarking as tools that could be used for strategic planning within their own organizations.
What is Benchmarking?
• A way to understand where a community stands now and where it would like to go
• Measures outputs instead of inputs
• An opportunity for a community to define its own goals
• An instrument to track progress toward a community’s goal

What can Benchmarking Achieve?
• Distribute responsibility for success across the entire community
• Encourage cooperation among government, private and nonprofit organizations
• Evaluate the effectiveness of institutions and projects
• An instrument to track progress toward a community’s goal

Historical Background
• Oregon, USA launched a benchmarking campaign at the community level in 1988 to create a strategic development plan for the state over the next 20 years.
• A working group conducted participatory meetings to establish current socio-economic levels and agree on goals.
• This extensive process took several years and produced 259 benchmarks that the state legislature has approved.

Innovation of Benchmarks
• Combines community participation and vision with indicators that can be monitored.
• Creates community ownership of goals that holds leaders accountable.
• Shifts the focus from what we lack to what we have and what we can do.
• Breaks challenges into manageable subsets.

What do Benchmarks Measure?
• What a community needs to do better, like increasing workers’ income or improving air quality.
• Whether everyone is taking part in a community’s success.
• How we know when we have reached our goals.

What Makes a Good Benchmark?
• Results – focus on outputs rather than the funds or other inputs spent so that everyone can think creatively about reaching goals.
• Comparability – the rest of the country uses similar measures.
• Accessibility – information should be easy to gather over time.
• Feasibility – goals should be appropriate for the time period.

Oregon Example
• Oregon decided that they wanted a world-class workforce by 2010.
• Education is a primary component that can be divided into literacy, general skills and field-specific skills.
Adult Literacy
1990: 78% of adults can read and understand basic texts.
2010: 99% of adults should be able to read and understand basic texts.

Goal: Economic Growth
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>1995</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oregon’s per capita income as a % of US per capita income</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>110%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Activity 1.4  Choosing your MDGs

This exercise is relevant for smaller communities where the participants are competent to discuss a variety of MDGs.

Time:          20 minutes

Objectives:   Establish group ownership of the process from the beginning by letting participants choose the MDGs they wish to focus on throughout the workshop

Materials:     Flip chart paper, markers

Outcomes:      A list of MDGs for the group to work with

Method:
1. Divide participants by sphere of interest.
2. Ask each group to review the MDG handout in their welcome packet and choose as a group 1-3 MDGs.
3. Post the chosen MDGs on a flipchart at the front of the room.

Facilitator’s Notes:

- Since this is one of the first group exercises, facilitators should observe how different participants work together. If there seems to be a personality conflict or one person seems to be dominating a group, participants may be rotated for the next exercise.
- The number of MDGs identified depends on the level of experience within each small group. A group with no prior strategic planning experience should choose only one goal, while a more experienced group may choose 2-3 MDGs.
- The Altai workshop participants divided into three groups based on their professional interests: environmental conservation, economic development, and health and family issues. Local facilitators were extremely helpful in formulating these initial groupings.
Activity 1.5  Brainstorming on community problems

Time: 30 minutes

Objectives: Gather information about perceived problems and priorities

Materials: Flip chart paper, markers, sticky notes, colored stickers

Outcomes: A list of concrete issues for the group to work with

Method:
1. Group brainstorming within the context of the MDGs followed by quick prioritization. Participants will call out ideas and a facilitator will write them on a flipchart.
2. This activity should have two facilitators so that participant ideas can be recorded as quickly as they are called out.

Facilitator’s Notes:

- Since this is one of the first group exercises, facilitators should observe how different participants work together. If there seems to be a personality conflict or one person seems to be dominating a group, participants may be rotated for the next exercise.
- This exercise brings out issues that all participants may not be familiar with.
### Activity 1.6 Vision and component goals for the community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time:</th>
<th><strong>60 minutes</strong> (followed by 30 minutes of group presentations)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Objectives:</td>
<td>Introduce the concept of a vision statement and develop a broad set of strategic goals for each of the issues identified in the previous exercise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials:</td>
<td>Transparencies, handouts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes:</td>
<td>A table for each issue that shows where the community is now compared to where it would like to be in 2005, 2010.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Methodology: | 1. A facilitator gives a brief presentation of the concept of vision statements using examples based on local realities. The issue selected should be one not set as a priority in 1.5.  
2. If participants work on multiple MDGs, they should break into groups according to their own MDGs and come up with a vision for it.  
3. If participants work on one MDG, they should break into working group, come up with competitive visions, and vote the best one. These will be recorded by the participants on a transparency that can be presented in a plenary session.  
5. One after the vision(s) has been determined the participants will go into the next step - breaking the vision for their sector into 3-5 component goals. Facilitators will provide outline form and guidance. |

**Facilitator’s Notes:**

- In communities where there is no previous experience in community development or strategic planning, this activity could require more time. In the Philippines workshop, this activity was divided into two separate sessions and took 75 minutes. Understanding the community’s context will help facilitators decide whether more time should be allotted.
- Facilitators should be prepared to help groups brainstorm goals and provide examples.
- It is helpful to remind groups of the MDGs that they have chosen so that they can frame their vision in appropriate terms.
- Break the activity into separate parts for inexperienced groups so that they derive the vision first and then receive instructions for breaking the vision into component goals.
- In our experience at some workshops, the participants might feel comfortable with the idea of vision and the exercise could take 30 minutes.
A Vision is:
- A picture of the life that we want to have in the future.
- A simple statement that engages a wide audience.
- A worthwhile, attainable goal that gives a community hope for the future.

For example:

Altai Republic, Russian Federation:
- Vision 1: Ensure ecological sustainability
- Vision 2: Diversify the economy based on comparative advantage

Plovdiv, Bulgaria:
- Vision 1: Educated youth with readiness for professional realization
- Vision 2: Healthy and productive workforce/population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>Vision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There is high unemployment.</td>
<td>We have a qualified workforce with a growing number of jobs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.5.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vision</th>
<th>Component Goals (targets)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Educated youth with readiness for professional realization</td>
<td>85% of students to complete secondary education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100% of students to complete primary education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Activity 1.7   Establishing Benchmarks

Time:  45 minutes (including 30 minutes of group presentations)

Objectives: Identify intermediate steps to be taken and benchmarks to measure progress toward the visions from the previous exercise.

Materials: Flip chart paper, markers, transparencies, vision tables, problem trees

Outcomes: A table for each issue that shows benchmarks at 5 year intervals for where the community is now compared to where it would like to be in 2015.

Method:
1. A facilitator chooses one of the issues not set as a priority and uses it to provide an example of benchmarking.
2. Participants break into groups and choose one of the issues/visions developed during the previous activities.
3. Participants will develop a set of specific benchmarks for each issue with help from the facilitators. These will be recorded by the participants and presented in a plenary session.

Facilitator’s Script:

- In Oregon, 259 benchmarks have been developed and the State Legislature has adopted them. They have become a tool for focusing the resources and performance evaluations of state agencies. In a community they can be used the same way – to guide local organizations in their planning. In Oregon, local governments and other institutions are making program and budget decisions in reference to their benchmarks.
- An example from the Oregon benchmarking process is the vision of creating a world class workforce. One of the goals that people decided would help reach this vision was making sure that the workforce was well educated. Benchmarks can measure progress toward this goal by measuring the educational skills of children at various stages of their school careers or by measuring the level of adult literacy.
- Based on survey information, the adult literacy level in Oregon in 1990 was 78%. In order to achieve the goal of 99% adult literacy by 2010, more efforts had to be made in adult education. The adoption of this benchmark encouraged the relevant public and private institutions to organize their work in order to meet this goal. In this case, the benchmark also helps to link organizations working on this issue with a common goal.
- Remember that benchmarks measure results, not resources committed to a challenge. For example, the number of high school graduates qualified to attend university is a better benchmark than the number of schools in a region.

Facilitator’s Notes:

- Baseline data: If there is no baseline data for the region or the community, participants could use either data for national level, other regions, etc.
- If the participants are addressing an issue that does not have exact data, participants
- The facilitator should guide participants to develop benchmarks rather than propose solutions to problems. This may be challenging, especially if participants work in professions that require them to measure challenges in terms of resources committed.
- The benchmarking portion of the workshop is conceptually difficult for participants that lack experience with strategic planning. However, with some extra time and explanation, the group can produce concrete benchmarks closely linked to the MDGs that they have chosen.
### Vision: Educated youth with readiness for professional realization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal No. 1</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Benchmark 1</th>
<th>Benchmark 2</th>
<th>Benchmark 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Where are we going?”</td>
<td>How do we measure progress? “Where are we now?”</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A significant % of students to complete secondary education</td>
<td>% of students completing secondary education</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>average GPA of students completing 12th grade 3 (on a 6-point scale)</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Day 2

Activity 2.1  Recap of Day 1

Time: 30 minutes

Objectives: Bring participants back to the workshop, review results of Day 1

Materials: Aggregated issues, benchmarks and visions from Day 1

Method: Presentation to summarize Day 1 and review the agenda. Review the important concepts from the previous day.

Facilitator’s Notes:

• This session is very important to bring the participants back to the workshop from their daily lives and to review any administrative questions about the agenda, lunch, etc.
• Use this session to connect the activities from Day 1 and Day 2.
• At the end of Day 1, the benchmarks and challenge matrix should be typed up as handouts for Day 2. This will help the participants work with outputs from both days without having to shuffle too many pieces of flipchart paper.

Activity 2.2  Evaluating Benchmarks

Time: 60 minutes (followed by 45 minutes of group presentations)

Objective: Participants use a feasibility matrix to evaluate the benchmarks that they developed the day before.

Materials: prepared flipcharts, markers.

Method: 1. Groups select 3-4 benchmarks per MDG that they developed during Day 1.
2. Each benchmark is scored on a feasibility matrix for comparison.
3. Participants should use these scores to prioritize their benchmarks, refine some benchmarks or discard benchmarks in favor of new ideas.

Facilitator Notes:

• In retrospect, the exercise to evaluate the preliminary benchmarks at the beginning of the second day is extremely valuable. It is the most difficult for the participants and requires the most active facilitation, but it yields good results and gives the group a much firmer understanding of the concept of benchmarking, while also focusing the discussion on appropriate implementation
strategies. Many participants were upset when their benchmarks received low scores, therefore, scoring systems should be kept as far as possible from coincidence with local grading scales. For example, in Russia a 1-5 scale is inappropriate, just as an A-F scale would be inappropriate in the United States.

Feasibility Matrix

The feasibility matrix is scored on a scale of 1 to 3, with 3 being the highest score. Categories that negatively influence the value of an indicator or benchmark are indicated with a minus sign. For these categories, the score is subtracted from the total rather than added.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vision: We have created a network of legally protected nature reserves with a functioning informational infrastructure.</th>
<th>Ratio of registered to unregistered tourists increases from 30/70 to 50/50 in 2015</th>
<th>Appropriate utilization of solid waste increases from 5% to 25% in 2005 and 100% in 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>Relation to vision</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Related to current initiatives</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Related to MDGs</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Availability of data</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comparable to other regions</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost of monitoring</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Score</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vision: We have created a network of legally protected nature reserves with a functioning informational infrastructure.</th>
<th>Ratio of registered to unregistered tourists increases from 30/70 to 50/50 in 2015</th>
<th>Appropriate utilization of solid waste increases from 5% to 25% in 2005 and 100% in 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benchmark</td>
<td>Realistic timeframe proposed</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Related to previous trends</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comparable to national level</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Score</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Activity 2.3  
**Relating Benchmarks to the MDGs**

**Time:** 45 minutes (followed by 45 minutes of group presentation)

**Objective:** Participants relate their benchmarks to the national MDGs that they chose in the beginning of the workshop.

**Materials:** Prepared flipchart, markers.

**Method:**
1. Participants receive a flipchart with the original MDG and associated target that they chose.
2. They review the global targets and discuss whether they are appropriate in form and content to local realities.
3. Participants select benchmarks from their own work that also measure progress toward the selected MDG.

**Facilitator’s Notes:**
- The facilitator might not use this exercise if the participants seem not to have lost the focus on MDGs during the workshop.

---

**MDG: Eradicate global poverty and hunger**

**Global Targets:**
Halve the number of people living on less than $1 dollar per day.

**Local Benchmarks:**
Reduce the percentage of people living below the survival minimum from 49% today to 45% in 2005 and 25% in 2015.
Dear Colleagues:

Thank you very much for your active participation in this workshop. Since this is a model that UNDP will use throughout the region, I am asking you to take a few minutes to evaluate your experience. Your comments, both positive and negative, will help us make this workshop more useful and interesting for future participants. If you do not feel comfortable writing your comments, you are welcome to approach me or my co-facilitators in person.

On behalf of the United Nations Development Program and Columbia University’s School of International and Public Affairs, I wish you success in your future endeavors.

Best regards,

Workshop Facilitator

Please rate the following sessions on a scale of 1-5, where 1 = very poor, 3 = satisfactory and 5 = excellent:

**Introductory Presentations: Presentation of MDGs, Introduction to Benchmarking**

1  2  3  4  5

Comments:

**Where Is the Community Today?**

1  2  3  4  5

Comments:

**Vision for the Community**

1  2  3  4  5

Comments:
Establishing Benchmarks

1  2  3  4  5
Comments:

Evaluating Benchmarks

1  2  3  4  5
Comments:

Relating Benchmarks to the MDGs

1  2  3  4  5
Comments:

How would you rate the organization of the Workshop?

1  2  3  4  5
Comments:

How would you rate the facilitators?

1  2  3  4  5
Comments:

Did you feel that the facilitators genuinely cared about the work that you were accomplishing?
What would you have improved about the workshop?

Which session was the most useful/interesting? Why?

Which session was the least interesting? Why?

Will you be able to apply this approach to problem solving in your future work? Why?
### Activity 3.1  
**Presentation to Local Officials**

**Time:** 30 minutes  
**Objectives:** Familiarize participants with MDGs and UNDP work in Russia, introduce the concept of benchmarking  
**Materials:** Overhead transparencies & projector  
**Facilitator’s Notes:**  
- This session should include discussion of issues related to the MDGs and benchmarks as output focused indicators. Emphasis should be on the global acceptance of the MDG philosophy through the United Nations and the adaptability of individual goals to local settings.  
- Facilitators should be aware of the community’s experience with UNDP and strategic planning. This will help to determine the audience’s level of knowledge so that facilitators can tailor the materials to their audience.

### Activity 3.2  
**Group Presentations and Roundtable Discussion**

**Time:** 75 minutes  
**Objectives:** Familiarize local officials and community leaders with the results of the workshop and create ownership of the benchmarks and provide an opportunity for questions and discussion.  
**Materials:** Outcomes from the first to days  
**Method:**  
1. Each small working group will present the vision, goals, challenges and solutions that they have developed over the course of the workshop.  
2. Facilitators will introduce and guide presentations.  
**Facilitator’s Notes:**  
- This portion of the program must be discussed ahead of time with participants so that they will have time to prepare and feel comfortable.  
- These local officials should have received materials for the entire workshop earlier.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity 3.3</th>
<th>Press Conference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time:</strong></td>
<td>90 minutes (with Q/A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective:</strong></td>
<td>Provide positive publicity for UNDP and Capacity 21, create commitment to the issues discussed during the workshop.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Materials:</strong></td>
<td>Press release</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Method:</strong></td>
<td>Local officials, UNDP representatives and (if desired) the facilitators meet with members of the press. Short presentations of the workshop and benchmarks developed should be discussed with a Q/A session to follow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vision:</td>
<td>Benchmark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Benchmark 1</th>
<th>Benchmark 2</th>
<th>Benchmark 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Where are we going?”</td>
<td>How do we measure progress?</td>
<td>“Where are we now?”</td>
<td>“Where will we be in 2005?”</td>
<td>“Where will we be in 2010?”</td>
<td>“Where will we be in 2015?”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Priorotizing goals
#### Workshop results from Plovdiv, Bulgaria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Problems</th>
<th>Responsibilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Socio</td>
<td>Econ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Influence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Group 1 (education) - facilitator Philip Gounev

| Goal 1: A significant % of students complete secondary education (15 votes) | V | V | V | V | V | V |
| Goal 2: Desegregation - following a debate around terminology, the goal was established to read "the effective abolition of high schools where 100% of the students are of minority origin" (9 votes) | V | V | V | V | V | V |
| Goal 3: Tolerance and mutual understanding between the students of Bulgarian and ethnic minority origins (11 votes) | V | V | V | V | V | V |
| Goal 4: High degree of motivation (for obtaining an education) among the parents and students (11 votes) | V | V | V | V | V | V |
| Goal 5: Creating further opportunities for students completing secondary education (15 votes) | V | V | V | V |

### Group 2 (education) - facilitator Oktai Sheriff

| Goal 1: 100% attendance of primary education and kindergarten (10 votes) | V | V | V | V | V | V | V | V |
| Goal 2: Parallel learning of both - the native language and the state official language (8 votes) | V | V | V | V | V | V | V | V |
| Goal 3: To ensure competitiveness of students completing 8th grade (3 votes) | V | V | V | V | V | V | V | V |
| Goal 4: Creating social motivation for students to pursue professional qualifications or "knowledge is a value" (11 votes) | V | V | V | V | V | V | V | V |
| Goal 5: Higher attendance by minority students in the general city high schools (9 votes) | V | V | V | V | V | V | V | V |

### Group 3 (health) - facilitator Rada Noeva

| Goal 1: Improvement in the provision of medical services and health monitoring of the population (12 votes) | V | V | V | V | V | V | V |
| Goal 2: Modernization and improvement in the provision of health care services in minority neighborhoods (8 votes) | V | V | V | V | V | V | V | V |
| Goal 3: Improvement in the standard of living to ensure improved health of the population (10 votes) | V | V | V | V | V | V | V | V |
| Goal 4: Development of programs targeting the problems of the youth in minority neighborhoods (9 votes) | V | V | V | V | V | V | V | V |
## Appendix 2A

### Indicators and Benchmarks

**Workshop results from Plovdiv, Bulgaria**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group 1 (education) - facilitator Philip Gouvev</strong>&lt;br&gt;Vision: Educated youth ready for professional success</td>
<td></td>
<td>% of students completing 8th grade</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 1: A significant % of students complete secondary education</td>
<td></td>
<td>% of students completing secondary education</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>average GPA of students completing 8th grade</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>average GPA of students completing secondary education</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 5: Creating further opportunities for students who complete secondary education</td>
<td></td>
<td>% of students continuing their education in a university</td>
<td>&gt;1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% of students enrolled in professional school programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% of students completing 4th grade</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% of students completing secondary education</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>average GPA of students completing 8th grade</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>average GPA of students completing secondary education</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Indicators and Benchmarks
#### Workshop results from Plovdiv, Bulgaria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group 2 (education) - facilitator Oktai Sherif</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vision:</strong> Educated youth ready for professional success</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 1: 100% attendance of primary education and kindergarten</td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of children as estimated by teachers, NGOs, community</td>
<td>70%-80%</td>
<td>75%-80%</td>
<td>80%-90%</td>
<td>85%-95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% of children completing kindergarten</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>75-80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% of children contacted at home by teachers and NGOs attending school</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Actual number of children attending preparatory classes</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% of children completing kindergarten</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>75-80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% of children contacted at home by teachers and NGOs attending school</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Actual number of children attending preparatory classes</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion of 4th grade</td>
<td></td>
<td>% of students completing 8th grade</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% of students completing secondary education</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High % of children completing 4th grade</td>
<td></td>
<td>average GPA of students completing 8th grade</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>average GPA of students completing secondary education</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Goal 4: Creating social motivation for students to pursue professional qualifications.
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### Indicators and Benchmarks

**Workshop results from Plovdiv, Bulgaria**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group 3 (health) - facilitator Rada Noeva</strong>&lt;br&gt;Vision: Healthy and productive workforce/population</td>
<td></td>
<td>% of children immunized</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 1: Improvement in the provision of medical services and health monitoring of the population</td>
<td></td>
<td>% of socially significant diseases (TB, diabetis, cardio-vascular, cancerogenic) monitored and attended by qualified medical personnel</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% of children (0 to 5) monitored and attended by qualified medical personnel</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal 3: Improvement in the standard of living to ensure improved health of the population</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>child mortality per 1,000 live births</td>
<td>32/1000</td>
<td>20/1000</td>
<td>15/1000</td>
<td>8/1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% of cardio-vascular diseases</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>increase in the average life expectancy</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>decrease in the number of early pregnancies (under 16 years of age)</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Strategies to reach MDGs**  
**Workshop results from Plovdiv, Bulgaria**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>Implementation - depends on?</th>
<th>Budget - depends on?</th>
<th>Timeframe for implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group 1 (education) - facilitator Philip Gounev</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 1: A significant % of students complete secondary education</td>
<td>Development of courses geared toward teaching Bulgarian teachers some of the minority languages</td>
<td>Ministry of Education / Permanent Commission with the Parliament / partnership with the municipality.</td>
<td>Ministry of Education</td>
<td>To introduce officially could take up to 5 years; NGO projects could start right away</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assistant teachers - 1st to 4th grades</td>
<td>Ministry of Education / Ministry of Social and Labor Policy</td>
<td>Ministry of Education</td>
<td>Sept 2003 - must continue while the need continues to exist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Older brother / Older sister</td>
<td>NGOs</td>
<td>External donors</td>
<td>Must run for multiple number of years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improvement in the legal framework</td>
<td>Ministry of Education / upon proposals by the NGO sector / municipality.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Depends on the type of changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Initiatives / courses working with parents, Sunday schools for parents</td>
<td>NGOs</td>
<td>External donors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Partnering with Plovdiv University, to develop programs sending students from the pedagogical department to intern / work in schools with students from ethnic minority origins</td>
<td>Plovdiv University / NGOs / municipality</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal 5: Creating further opportunities for students completing secondary education</strong></td>
<td>Developing partnerships with companies to employ students graduating with high GPAs</td>
<td>Municipality / based on an NGO initiative</td>
<td>Ministry of Education</td>
<td>1 year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Development of special classes (ex. arts, sports, crafts, tourism industry skills). The goal is to cover disciplines that would be popular among children from the minority groups.</td>
<td>Ministry of Education, NGOs</td>
<td>Donors (as some of the activities (ex. crafts) require special and expensive equipments</td>
<td>1 year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preparatory classes for children from minority groups to study abroad</td>
<td>NGOs</td>
<td>Donors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Strategies to reach MDGs**

**Workshop results from Plovdiv, Bulgaria**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>Implementation - depends on?</th>
<th>Budget - depends on?</th>
<th>Timeframe for implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal 1: 100% attendance of primary education and kinder garden</strong></td>
<td>Regular check-up of school attendance</td>
<td>Teachers, School Boards, NGOs</td>
<td>Donors, municipality</td>
<td>Always/on-going</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Visits to the homes of students not regularly attending schools</td>
<td>Assistant teachers/teachers</td>
<td>Municipality</td>
<td>On-going</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work with /influence parents</td>
<td>Teachers, assistant teachers, media, NGOs, Plovdiv University</td>
<td>Donors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) courses for parents</td>
<td>NGOs</td>
<td></td>
<td>Periodically</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) person-to-person talks</td>
<td>Homeroom teachers, pedagogical advisors</td>
<td></td>
<td>periodically</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) thank-you letters to the employees of parents of &quot;A&quot; students</td>
<td>School boards</td>
<td></td>
<td>Once/twice year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d) prizes for &quot;A&quot; students (free summer camps, stipends, etc.)</td>
<td>School boards, school administrations, NGOs</td>
<td></td>
<td>During school breaks, as per donor guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Development of extracurricular activities</td>
<td>Schools/NGOs</td>
<td>Donors</td>
<td>In the beginning of school year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) exhibits, competitions, concerts, sales carried out by the children</td>
<td>Schools/NGOs/ Plovdiv University experts</td>
<td>Cultural groups</td>
<td>Periodically</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) establishment of clubs, groups to engage in international intercultural dialogues</td>
<td>NGOs</td>
<td>Donors</td>
<td>In the beginning of school year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal</td>
<td>Strategies</td>
<td>Implementation - depends on?</td>
<td>Budget - depends on?</td>
<td>Timeframe for implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 4: Creating social motivation for students to pursue professional qualifications or &quot;knowledge is a value&quot;</td>
<td>Informing the community about &quot;success stories&quot; of people from their community who have pursued with their education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) through the media</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>Municipality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) through public meetings with them</td>
<td>NGOs</td>
<td>Donors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) put up bulletin boards with their pictures in the schools they have graduated from</td>
<td>Pedagogical advisors</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d) to invite them to school celebrations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Using IT, and computer labs in schools</td>
<td>Min of Education/ NGOs/ donors</td>
<td>National budget, municipality, donors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Creating educational opportunities for the elderly and children who have missed the regular school curriculum</td>
<td>Ministry of Education/ NGOs/ municipality</td>
<td>National budget, local budget, donors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Informational meetings with parents about the dangerous impact of idleness in children -- children who are not engaged in school are more inclined to antisocial activities</td>
<td>Directors, teachers, police, University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Strategies to reach MDGs**

**Workshop results from Plovdiv, Bulgaria**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>Implementation - depends on?</th>
<th>Budget - depends on?</th>
<th>Timeframe for implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal 1:</strong> Improvement in the provision of medical services and health monitoring of the population</td>
<td>Lobby on a local and national level for the improvement of health care provision in minority neighborhoods</td>
<td>NGOs, Heath Casse, personal physicians</td>
<td>External donors, w/ government participation</td>
<td>Within 3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medical-social workers to mediate between personal physicians and the community (providing information in the area of healthcare)</td>
<td>NGOs, state</td>
<td>External donors, w/ government participation</td>
<td>Pilot projects for 2 years, afterwards to have as part of a national program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Holding of informational health lectures and talks for the community with the participation of doctors and local NGO leaders</td>
<td>Health experts, local leaders, NGOs</td>
<td>External donors</td>
<td>Within 1 year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal 3:</strong> Improvement in the standard of living to ensure improved health of the population</td>
<td>The establishment of an effective, functional 24-hours medical unit (including an emergency unit) particularly for the neighborhood of Stolipinovo</td>
<td>National program on a local level, Heath Casse, NGOs</td>
<td>External donors, w/ national participation</td>
<td>Within the framework of 3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lobby to update the infrastructure regulatory plan for Stolipinovo, with the goal of creating real map of the neighborhood</td>
<td>NGOs/ medical unit working in the neighborhood/ other institutions w/ direct influence and work in the area</td>
<td>National budget</td>
<td>Within the framework of 1 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Group 3 (health) - facilitator Rada Noeva**
Summary of evaluations of the Workshop in Plovdiv, Bulgaria

Scores are on a scale 1 – 5, 1 being “very bad”, and 5 being “excellent”.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introductory presentations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brainstorming - community problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing a vision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benchmarking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategies for reaching the goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization of seminar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitator performance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Could you use the benchmarking method in your future work?
- Yes, because this approach offers exchange of opinions and reaching the core of the issues
- Of course, I will be able to analyze better my work. I have always had a vision, but this workshop helped me put it in real terms

Which was the most useful session and why?
- Vision and goals - it will help me at my own work (3 people)
- Vision and goals - because we really need to think about this
- The benchmarking session, I learned something new that will extremely useful in organizing my work

Which was most interesting and why?
- Developing strategies, it was creative

What would you do better?
- I would provide participants with more information on past activities.
- I would do a spent more time on the benchmarking and do it in more than one step.
- I would organize the workshop outside of Plovdiv.
## Prioritizing Goals
**Workshop results from Gornoaltaisk, Russia**

### Group 1: Social Sector - facilitator Kate Lapham

**Goal 1: Improve women's health by increasing the quality of healthcare and public health education.**

- **Problems:**
  - Discrimination
  - Unemployment
  - Role of the mother and family in society
  - Quality of public health services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsibilities</th>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Create legal infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
<td>Creation of NGOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic development</td>
<td></td>
<td>Empowerment of women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formulation of new views</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Goal 2: Decrease infant Mortality by 50%**

- **Problems:**
  - Socio-economic development in the RA
  - Absence of informational programs
  - Lack of awareness of legal rights

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsibilities</th>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develop and organize needs-based programs</td>
<td></td>
<td>Social activism</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Group 2: Ecology - facilitator Kate Lapham with Marina Ol'shanskaya

**Creation of a network of legally protected nature preserves with a functioning informational infrastructure.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsibilities</th>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of coordination</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lobby the authorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitation of investment and infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in developing monitoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Group 3: Economic Development - facilitator Kate Lapham

**Goal 1: Create infrastructure in the Republic of Altai that will facilitate the economic, social and cultural development of its citizens**

- **Financial**
  - Lack of coordination among regional authorities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsibilities</th>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develop strategy for infrastructural development</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hold the government accountable for its policies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Goal 2: Diversify the economy based on comparative advantage**

- **Irrational use of natural resources**
- **Imperfect legislation**
- **Lack of cooperation among regions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsibilities</th>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support of small business</td>
<td></td>
<td>Environmental conservation and rational use of natural resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td>Monitor strategy development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in debating legislation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Goal 3: Create a highly educated and motivated workforce**

- **Insufficient levels of education**
- **Lack of modern educational programs for professionals**
- **Lack of labor policy**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsibilities</th>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Influence labor policy</td>
<td></td>
<td>Monitor the quality of education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitate adult professional education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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# Prioritizing Goals

## Workshop results from Gornoaltaisk, Russia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group 1: Social Sector - facilitator Kate Lapham</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal 1: Improve women's health by increasing the quality of healthcare and public health education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Problems:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrimination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role of the mother and family in society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of public health services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Responsibilities:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create legal infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formulation of new views</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group 2: Ecology - facilitator Kate Lapham with Marina Ol'shanskaya</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Creation of a network of legally protected nature preserves with a functioning informational infrastructure</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Problems:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of coordination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People do not participate in the administration and activities of LPNR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of investment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate legal and physical infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absence of a zoning system to classify recreational territories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absence of a single source of information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Responsibilities:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration and monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitation of investment and infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support community-based initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development, monitoring and enforcement of a zoning system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creation and support of an information system</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Group 3: Economic Development - facilitator Kate Lapham**

**Goal 1: Create infrastructure in the Republic of Altai that will facilitate the economic, social and cultural development of its citizens**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Financial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of coordination among regional authorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Responsibilities:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of financial support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invest in the economy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Goal 2: Diversify the economy based on comparative advantage**

| Irrational use of natural resources |
| Imperfect legislation |
| Lack of cooperation among regions |
| **Responsibilities:** |
| Support of small business |
| Development of strategy |
| Monitor strategy development |
| Participation in debating legislation |

**Goal 3: Create a highly educated and motivated workforce**

| Insufficient levels of education |
| Lack of modern educational programs for professionals |
| Lack of labor policy |
| **Responsibilities:** |
| Influence labor policy |
| Facilitate adult professional education |
| Monitor the quality of education |
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### Indicators and Benchmarks
#### Workshop results from Gornoaltaisk, Russia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group 1 - health - facilitator Kate Lapham</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vision:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 1: Improve women's health by increasing the quality of healthcare and public health education</td>
<td>% of healthy pregnant women</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of active family planning centers</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of women dying in childbirth</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of women with access to prenatal health monitoring</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 2: Decrease infant mortality by 50%</td>
<td>Infant mortality per 1,000 live births</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of qualified medical professionals in maternity wards</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quantity of maternity wards</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Access to modern medical equipment in maternity wards</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Access to public educations programs on motherhood and children</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 3: Stabilize the number of people infected with HIV/AIDS, hepatitis and other epidemiological diseases</td>
<td>Number of registered HIV cases</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public health educational centers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of modern equipment and medical staff (per month)</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public health announcements in the mass media</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mandatory sex education</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4 per month from the 5th grade from kindergarten</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of youth participating in extracurricular programs</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group 2 - ecology - facilitator Marina Ol'shanskaya, Kate Lapham</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vision:</strong> Ensure ecological sustainability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 1: Creation of a network of legally protected nature reserves (LPNR) with a functioning informational infrastructure</td>
<td>Number of population participating in LPNR</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Utilization of Solid Waste</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Ecology-related violation</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of inquires at information centers per season</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ratio of registered to unregistered tourists</td>
<td>30/70</td>
<td></td>
<td>50/50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Revenues from eco-tourism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Increase 10 times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of groomed hiking trails</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Indicators and Benchmarks
### Workshop results from Gornoaltaisk, Russia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group 3 - economic development - facilitator Kate Lapham</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vision: Eradicate poverty and facilitate economic development in the Republic of Altai</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 1: Decrease the number of people living in poverty</td>
<td>% of population with incomes below the survival minimum</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vision: Create infrastructure in RA that will facilitate the economic, social and cultural development of its citizens</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 2: General provision of electricity and transportation infrastructure</td>
<td>Electricity consumption as a % of the level for Western Siberia</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vision: Diversify the economy based on comparative advantage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 1: Increase the quantity and quality of paid services available</td>
<td>Quantity of services per capita in rubles</td>
<td>1331</td>
<td>1464.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vision: Create a highly educated and motivated workforce</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 1: Increase the quality of the educational system and workforce qualifications</td>
<td>% of people enrolling in higher education</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Workshop evaluation Gorno-altaiisk, Russia**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity #</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Evaluation score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Introductory Presentations on the MDGs and Benchmarking</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>Where is the Community Today?</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>Vision for Gorno-altaiisk</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>Challenge Matrix - Assessing Community and Government Roles in Problem Solving</td>
<td>4.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Establishing Benchmarks</td>
<td>4.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Evaluation of Benchmarks</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Relating Benchmarks to the MDGs</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>General Organization</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>Trainer</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Впервые в республике

Недавно впервые в России, а именно в нашей республике, состоялся семинар, организованный Программой развития ООН (ПРООН) Молодежи и Нью-Йорка. Встреча прошла с использованием авторской методики ученых Кембриджского университета, ведущей выступки его сотрудника Кейт Лэплас.

Менеджер проекта ПРООН из московского офиса Марина Ольшевская в Кейт Лэплас провела пресс-конференцию для журналистов республиканских СМИ по итогам семинара "Цели развития тысячелетия для Республики Алтай", в работе которого участвовали представители всех государственных и исполнительских органов власти республики, общественных организаций.

Согласно манифесту, который в сентябре 2000 года в Нью-Йорке подписали страны ООН, в этом историческом событии участвовали представители 191 страны мира, в том числе 147 стран государств и правительств. Единолично была принята Декларация тысячелетия ООН, в которой прописывались цели, принципы и пути мирового сообщества на XXI век.

Стоит отметить, что в составе делегации, а также ООН, белезыми, неграмотностями, ухудшением окружающей среды и двойственностью женщин. Все это получилось главным целью развития тысячелетия (ПРТ). Научный, научный, научный, а также на обязательство по снижению динамики в мире к 2015 году и далее.

Участники семинара в Горно-Алтайске готовятся адаптировать эти глобальные цели и задачи применительно к Республике Алтай. Понимая, что глобальная мировая цель - сохранение окружающей среды, сохранение экономического, социального и культурного развития и улучшение здоровья населения.

Среди глаобальных целей - сохранение окружающей среды, улучшение здоровьес карт, актуальны и для нашей республики. К 2015 году планируется сократить уровень детской смертности и обеспечить улучшение здоровья карата с 20 до 40 процентов.

За счет исполнительских, министерских, комитетов и ведомств, медицинских учреждений должна стать стабилизация заболеваемости СПИДом и другими эпидемией. Единой глобальной целью для нас является создание экономически эффективной инфраструктуры туризма, которая бы не наносила ущерба окружающей среде. К 2005 году планируется уменьшить число экологических проблем вдвое, к 2015 году - в десять раз.

Ставится задача каждый год добиться полной утилизации твердых отходов. Как видим, цели и задачи для нашей республики выбраны актуальными, однако возникает вопрос, реальное ли их выполнение. Ожидается, да, но при условии, если и законодательные, и правовая и политические структуры страны, и общественность проникнут их значимостью. Это нужна комплексная работа по подготовке кадров, которые найдут отклик не только в ООН, но и в мировых финансовых кругах, которые будут готовы к сотрудничеству.

И первые шаги в этом направлении у нас в республике, по всей видимости, сделала представитель местной команды ООН. Они уже сумели привлечь гранты и добиться выделения необходимых средств для осуществления ряда актуальных проектов в нескольких районах нашей республики.

В. Параев.

Бюджет проведения практических занятий в Чемальском районе
5-6 сентября 2002 г.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Наименование расходов</th>
<th>Цена</th>
<th>Стоимость</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

---

Ольшевский
29 марта 2003 года
5 НОВАЦИИ
### Sample Participants Matrix

**Dates:** March 24, 2003  
**Total number of participants:** 21  
**Sectors covered:** Education and Health

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Participant &amp; Number</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td>Teachers (2)</td>
<td>Have the most hands-on experience and immediate knowledge and understanding of the issues and challenges surrounding the provision of education to Roma children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principal (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deputy Principle (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roma Pre-School trainers</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>Around since only recently, the pre-school training program serves as a method of empowering Roma community members and provides an incentive for Roma children to attend school. The participation of representatives of the Roma trainers in the workshop is invaluable, as they provide a unique perspective on the problems and challenges faced by Roma children and their families</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| NGO representatives/leaders| (3)                  | Working on the front lines of the implementation of educational programs, NGO representatives will bring both an operational and policy-making perspective on the issues and challenges of Roma education.  
N.B. split between participation of leaders or staff from the NGOs will be decided at a later stage |
| Members of the Parents School Councils (1) | Parents School Councils play an important role in the life of the schools, and are actively involved in the decision-making process. |
| Education experts (1)      | Provide an academic view and an outside independent perspective on the issues and challenges faced by the community.                                           |
| Local administration (1)   | Present the constraints and challenges from the local government perspective; familiar with the regional particularities and specifics.                  |
| Ministry of Education (City of Plovdiv) (1) | Provide an overall perspective of the challenges faced at the national level |

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Health</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO representatives/leaders (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Working on the front lines of the implementation of health programs, NGO representatives will bring both an operational and policy-making perspective on the issues and challenges in the provision of health services to the Roma population. N.B. split between participation of leaders or staff from the NGOs will be decided at a later stage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roma health mediators (0) (Two were invited but could not attend)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Around from only recently, newly trained Roma health mediators are well aware of the health issues among the Roma community. Although Plovdiv is not part of this pilot project Sofia and Kiustendil are just two of the cities where these mediators were active.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health experts (0) (One was invited but could not attend)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Provide an academic view and an outside independent perspective on the issues and challenges faced by the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal administration (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Present the constraints and challenges from the local government perspective; familiar with the regional particularities and specifics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local doctors / nurses (1) (3 were invited but cancelled at the last moment)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Have the most hands-on experience and immediate knowledge and understanding of the issues and challenges surrounding the provision of health to Roma.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Health (city of Plovdiv) (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Provide an overall perspective of the challenges faced at the national level.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>