

Enap
Programa de
Altos Executivos

d.i.e

Deutsches Institut für
Entwicklungspolitik



German Development
Institute

MGG
Managing Global Governance

Report



**Capacity Building for the 2030 Agenda:
Peer Exchange of National Schools of Public Administration & Think
Tanks on National SDG Implementation
Brasília, 26 February – 1 March 2018**

SUMMARY

1. CONTEXTUALIZATION	3
1.1. RESOURCES TO IMPLEMENTATION	4
2. DISCLOSURE, INVITATIONS AND SEMINAR PARTICIPANTS	4
3. WORKSHOP IMPLEMENTATION	12
3.1. WORKING GROUPS - ORGANIZATIONAL DYNAMICS AND RESULTS	17
3.2. AGREEMENTS ON FUTURE COOPERATION	18
3.3. PICTURES OF THE EVENT	19
4. EVALUATION.....	21
4.1. EVALUATION OF THE PROGRAM.....	22
4.2. AVALIAÇÃO DA APLICABILIDADE.....	23
4.3. CONTRIBUTION OF PARTICIPANTS	23
4.4. SUGGESTIONS	23
5. COMMENTS OF THE COORDINATION OF HIGH EXECUTIVE.....	24
Annex 1 - Report of the Working Groups.....	25

1. CONTEXTUALIZATION

Given that the Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) were developed by 150 countries during the United Nations (UN) summit in 2015, it can be said that the SDG defines the humanitarian themes that should serve as a priority in international public policies, until the year 2030.

The implementation of SDG calls for a global effort and wide participation of the public sector, private companies and society in the development of policies and actions that contribute to raising the Human Development Index (HDI) and improving the environmental framework, ensuring resources for generations future.

To assist in this effort, Enap and the German Development Institute (DIE) designed and promoted the workshop 'Capacity Building for the 2030 Agenda: Peer Exchange of National Schools of Public Administration & Think Tanks on National SDG Implementation'.

This workshop focused on national public administration schools and other partners of the Global Governance Management (MGG) program that focus on capacity building for the public sector. It was intended to strengthen the skills and competencies of specialists who design and implement training courses for public officials with thematic focus on the implementation of national SDG. In the face of increasing challenges in national public policies and in the global context, it is essential to link the modernization of public administration to the principles of sustainable development.

The interactive, practice-oriented format for a group of approximately 40 professionals allowed for peer-to-peer exchange for mutual learning and joint knowledge production. Almost all participants were invited to take on responsibilities as co-organizers of panels, rapporteurs and / or heads of working groups.

During the meeting, different dimensions of the discussion about the implementation of SDG were discussed. In this way, the different work sessions were organized in the following themes:

- Organizing Governments to Meet SDGs: Perspectives from International Organizations
- Organizing governments to meet SDGs: regional perspectives
- Identify key challenges for public sector capacity building on the national implementation of SDG
- Sharing of national experiences in training for the public sector in the implementation of domestic SDG.
- Managing horizontal and vertical coordination / integration for the national implementation of SDG
- Data and SDG revolution: Addressing the challenges of monitoring and evaluation at the national level
- Group work: Elaboration of a training format for public officials in the implementation of domestic SDG

1.1. RESOURCES TO IMPLEMENTATION

This activity was developed under the umbrella of a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) signed between Enap and DIE in the year 2017, which defined the following divisions of responsibilities:

"Enap and DIE agree on the following obligations of the participants:

- There will be no financial transfers between the participants of this MoU;

- Contribution of Enap: Accommodation and food for all participants in the Enap facilities; travel costs and fees for speakers based in Brazil;

- DIE contribution: travel costs for participants from MGG countries; travel costs and fees for speakers not resident in Brazil;

- Participating institutions in Germany / Europe will pay the travel costs of their own employees. "

Following the instructions of the MoU, no onlendings were made between the two institutions for the implementation of the workshop.

Enap was responsible for the physical facilities for holding the event, feeding participants during breaks and lunches, travel costs for Brazilian participants who did not live in Brasilia. In addition, it had the fundamental support of the Latin American Bank (CAF) to pay the hosting costs of 'international' participants.

For its part, the DIE was responsible for the costs related to the tickets of participants from MGG countries and guests from the UN and OECD System. In addition to the dinners offered to the 'international' guests.

2. DISCLOSURE, INVITATIONS AND SEMINAR PARTICIPANTS

The DIE was responsible for inviting MGG participants, as well as representatives from the OECD and the UN System.

In turn, Enap was responsible for invitations to Brazilian participants. Selected from two criteria: a) federal government institutions with actions in the implementation of SDG in Brazil; Government Schools, identified from the Network of Government Schools, that already presented actions related to the construction of capacities for the implementation of the SDG.







It is important to note that not all federal government institutions invited by Enap were able to participate in the workshop, however, the audience of the event was qualified, enhancing the expected results of the activity.





Below we present the lists of participants, divided between guests from Brazil and international guests:



Table 1 - List of 'International' Participants

	Name	Position	Institution	Picture
1	Adriana Plasencia Díaz	Professor	National Institute of Public Administration Mexico	
2	Carolin Steffens	Research Fellow	German Research Institute for Public Administration	
3	Citlali Ayala	Coordinator Diploma in International Cooperation for Development	Instituto Mora	
4	Edwin Lau	Head of Division	Reform of the Public Sector, Directorate of Public Governance	
5	Eko Prasajo	Professor	Universitas Indonesia	
6	Elizabeth Niland	Focal Point of the Division for Public Administration and Development Management	United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs	

7	Freesca Syafitri	Analyst	Secretariat General of the Indonesian Parliament	
8	Harsh Sharma	Professor	Administrative Staff College of India	
9	Imme Scholz	Deputy Director	German Development Institute	
10	Jiahan Cao	Senior Scholar	Shanghai Institutes for International Studies	
11	Lakshmi Narayanan Venkataraman	Professor	Faculty Coordinator of the MA (Public Policy & SD) programme, TERI School of Advanced Studies	
12	Lixia Tang	Professor	China Agricultural University	

13	Medelina Hendytio	Deputy Executive Director	Centre for Strategic and International Studies - Indonesia	
14	Philani Mthembu	Executive Director	Institute for Global Dialogue	
15	Sachin Joshi	Chief Operating Officer	Confederation of Indian Industries-Centre of Excellence for Sustainable Development	
16	Simona Costanzo Sow	Course Coordinator	United Nations System Staff College, Centre for Sustainable Development	
17	Sipho Manana	Deputy Director for Training Management and Delivery	National School of Government South Africa	
18	Sven Grimm	Head of Training Department	German Development Institute	

















19	Tatjana Reiber	Head of MGG Academy	German Development Institute	
20	Thomas Fues	Senior Researcher - Organizador do Workshop	German Development Institute	
21	Tshombe Lukamba-Muhiya	Professor	North West University South Africa	
22	Wulf Reiners	Head of MGG Programme	German Development Institute	
23	Yogi Suwarno	Vice Chairman of Academic Affairs	National Institute of Public Administration Indonesia	
24	Zhengwei Yang	Director-General	Department of Research, China Academy of Governance	

Table 2 - List of 'Brazilian' Participants

	Name	Position	Institution	Picture
1	Camila Neves Soares Oliveira	Environmental analyst	MMA	
2	Carolina Pfeilsticker	Director of Institutional Relations for Corporate Education	ISC/TCU	
3	Denise Britz Silva	Professor	ENCE/IBGE	
4	Denise Kronemberger	Advisor to the Presidency	IBGE	
5	Didier Trebucq	Country Director	UNDP in Brazil	
6	Dolores Brito	Executive Analyst in Metrology and Quality	Inmetro	
7	Francisco Gaetani	President	Enap	

8	Haroldo Machado Filho	Senior Advisor	UNDP in Brazil	
9	Henrique Villa Ferreira	National Secretary of Social Articulation	Segov	
10	João Vitor Domingues	TAE - Workshop Organizer	Enap	
11	José Botelho Neto	Advisor to the Coordination of SDG, Dept. of Political-Social Relations	Segov	
12	José Eduardo de Malta Brandão	Researcher of the Directory of International Studies	IPEA	
13	Juliana Guedes da Costa Bezerra	Environmental analyst	MMA	
14	Juliana Mozachi Sandri	Director	UniBC	

15	Júnia Rosa Soares	President	ENA/SC	
16	Letícia Godinho	General-Diretor	Escola de Governo da Fundação João Pinheiro	
17	Marcelo dos Santos	Private Sector and Institutional Relations Executive	CAF	
18	Marcelo Rodrigues de Holanda Maia	Manager of Technology and Training Support	ENCE/IBGE	
19	Natália Massaco Koga	EPPGG	Enap	
20	Nicola Speranza	Head of Policy Division for Sustainable Development	MRE	
21	Pedro Assumpção Alves	Advisor to the General Coordination of Senior Executives - Workshop Organizer	Enap	

22	Rafael Mendonça Andrezo	Analyst	UniBC	
23	Ricardo de Lins e Horta	Coordinator of Institutional Articulation - Workshop Organizer	Enap	
24	Sergio Kelner	Director of the Department. of Education for Citizenship and Social Innovation	Segov	
25	Sérgio Barreiros	Deputy General - Director	Instituto Rio Branco	

The event was widely publicized by Enap and DIE in the different communication channels. Thus, materials were transmitted on the electronic site of the two institutions in addition to the use of social media for dissemination.

3. WORKSHOP IMPLEMENTATION

The workshop 'Capacity Building for the 2030 Agenda: Peer Exchange of National Schools of Public Administration and Think Tanks on National SDG Implementation' was an activity designed to stimulate peer-to-peer exchange and to promote mutual learning in the construction of server-oriented training activities involved in the implementation of Agenda 2030 and the SDGs.

Thus he presented three Objectives in his concluding document:

- Strengthen the capacities of institutions responsible for capacity

- building for the public sector, with a thematic focus on the role of public officials in the implementation of SDG.
- To deepen the experience of participants in effective didactics for training in sustainable development.
 - Make recommendations to participating institutions on the future development of the curriculum in Agenda 2030 from a multi-stakeholder perspective.

To achieve these objectives, this activity was divided into different thematic sessions, which sought to promote the discussion from different dimensions of the SDG implementation. Table 3 presents the schedule of the activities carried out during the workshop:

Table 3 - Activity Schedule

Sunday, 25 February 2018 Arrival, check-in at ENAP guest house, welcome dinner	
Monday, 26 February 2018	
9:00-10:00	Welcome addresses <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Francisco Gaetani, ENAP President - Christoph Bundscherer, German Deputy Ambassador - Imme Scholz, DIE Deputy Director - Sergio Kelner, SEGOV Director - Denise Britz, IBGE Professor - Didier Trebucq, UNDP Director - Marcelo dos Santos, Development Bank of Latin America Director in Brazil
10:00-10:30	Coffee/tea break
10:30-11:30	Interactive round of introductions Co-chairs: Pedro Alves, ENAP & Thomas Fues, DIE
11:30-12:30	Introduction to seminar (objectives, learning outcomes, content, methSDG, programme, modalities) Ricardo Horta, ENAP & Sven Grimm, DIE Q & A
12:30-14:00	Lunch
14:00-15:30	Getting governments organised to deliver on the SDGs: Perspectives from international organisations Chair: Wulf Reiners, DIE Speakers (20 minutes each): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Simona Costanzo Sow, United Nations System Staff College - Edwin Lau, OECD Global Network of Schools of Government - Elizabeth Niland, UN Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Division for Public Administration and Development Management Discussant (5 minutes): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Haroldo Machado, UNDP Q & A
15:30-16:00	Coffee/tea break
16:00-17:30	Getting governments organised to deliver on the SDGs: Regional perspectives Chair: Medelina Hendyio Speakers (20 minutes each):

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Tshombe Lukamba-Muhiya, North West University, South Africa - Eko Prasajo, Universitas Indonesia <p>Discussant (5 minutes):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Speaker <p>Q & A</p>
17:30-18:00	Reflection and summing up: Key takeaways from the day by 2 rapporteurs (rapporteurs will be asked to present short write-up the following day) ENAP research staff
Evening	Reception by German Embassy
Tuesday, 27 February 2018	
9:00-10:30	Identifying key challenges for public sector capacity building on national SDG implementation Co-chairs: Pedro Alves/Ricardo Horta, ENAP & Imme Scholz, DIE Start in plenary session, then 4 break-out groups (2 convenors for each group: Sachin Joshi, Citlali Ayala, Philani Mthembu, Medelina Hendytio, Jiahan CAO, Lixia TANG, Freesca Syafitri, LN Venkatraman, Amar Sinha)
10:30-11:00	Coffee/tea break
11:00-12:30	Reports from break-out groups (with PPP or flipchart) Co-chairs: Pedro Alves, ENAP & Imme Scholz, DIE Q & A
12:30-14:00	Lunch
14:00-15:30	Sharing of national experiences in capacity building for the public sector on domestic SDG implementation Co-chairs: Ricardo Horta, ENAP & Imme Scholz, DIE Speakers (10 minutes each; speakers will be asked to provide a written report in advance on the basis of a template provided by the organizers): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Siphon Manana, National School of Government, South Africa - Zhengwei YANG, China Academy of Governance - Yogi Suwarno, National Institute of Public Administration, Indonesia - Adriana Plasencia, National Institute of Public Administration, Mexico <p>Q & A</p>
15:30-16:00	Coffee/tea break
16:00-17:00	Sharing of national experiences in capacity building for the public sector on domestic SDG implementation, continued: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Harsh Sharma, Administrative Staff College of India - Fernando Filgueiras, National School of Public Administration, Brazil <p>Q & A</p>
17:00-17:30	Introduction to group assignment: Designing a capacity building format for public officials on domestic SDG implementation Pedro Alves, ENAP & Tatjana Reiber, DIE
17:30-18:00	Reflection and summing up: Key takeaways from the day by 2 rapporteurs of ENAP research staff
Evening	Dinner & cultural event
Wednesday, 28 February 2018	
9:00-10:30	Managing horizontal & vertical coordination/integration for national SDG implementation

	<p>Co-Chairs: Amar Sinha, RIS & Sven Grimm, DIE</p> <p>Speakers (20 minutes each):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Eko Prasajo, Universitas Indonesia - Carolin Steffens, German Research Institute for Public Administration <p>Discussants (5 minutes each):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Henrique Villa, SEGOV Brazil <p>Q & A</p>
10:30-11:00	Coffee/tea break
11:00-12:30	Working groups (2 convenors for each group) begin designing a concrete capacity building format for public officials. Thematic focus of working groups to be based on preferences of participants to be requested beforehand. Example: ENAP is interested to work on “municipalities and SDGs”.
12:30-14:00	Lunch
14:00-15:30	<p>Interim reports from working groups (with PPP or flipchart)</p> <p>Co-chairs: Pedro Alves, ENAP, Anrea Zimmermann, ENAP & Tatjana Reiber, DIE</p> <p>Q & A Q & A</p>
15:30-16:00	Coffee/tea break
16:00-17:30	<p>Data revolution & SDGs: Addressing the challenges of monitoring & evaluation at the national level</p> <p>Chair: Philani Mthembu, Institute for Global Dialogue, South Africa</p> <p>Speakers (20 minutes):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Denise Kronemberger, Brazilian Institute of Geography and Statistics (IBGE) - Jiahao CAO, Shanghai Institutes for International Studies <p>Discussants (5 minutes each):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - André Mello e Souza, Researcher Brazilian Institute for Applied Economic Research (IPEA) <p>Q & A</p>
17:30-18:00	Reflection and summing up: Key takeaways from the day by 2 rapporteurs of ENAP research staff
18:30-20:30	<p>Public event: Info Session about the German Development Institute (DIE), the MGG Academy and the Alumni Network</p> <p>Co-chairs: Pedro Alves, ENAP, Anrea Zimmermann, ENAP & Tatjana Reiber, DIE</p> <p>Q & A Speakers (20 minutes):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Imme Scholz, DIE Deputy Director
Evening	Dinner
Thursday, 1 March 2018	
9:00-12:30 Incl. break	Working groups finalize designing a concrete capacity building format for public officials (2 convenors for each group)
12:30-14:00	Lunch
14:00-15:30	<p>Presentation of results by working groups</p> <p>Co-chairs: Pedro Alves, ENAP, Anrea Zimmermann, ENAP & Tatjana Reiber, DIE</p> <p>Q & A</p>
15:30-16:00	Coffee/tea break
16:00-17:30	<p>Discussion on possible future collaboration</p> <p>Co-chairs: Pedro Alves, ENAP, Ricardo Horta, ENAP & Sven Grimm, DIE</p>
17:30-18:00	<p>Words of appreciation & farewell</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Imme Scholz, DIE - Simona Costanzo Sow, United Nations System Staff College - Francisco Gaetani, ENAP - José Estanislau, Rio Branco Institute

Evening	Good-bye dinner
Friday, 2 March 2018: Departure	

The schedule of activities presented in Table 3 allows a presentation of the logical structure of the workshop. At first, create within the group the appropriate environment for the collective construction of knowledge. From there, from global perspectives, to patterns of macro-regional organizations, and only then to address specific cases from different countries and institutions.

It is important to note that an expressive part of the workshop was dedicated to the collective construction of courses aimed at building the capacity of public servants for the implementation of Agenda 2030 and SDG.

Thus, the event was initiated from a concern with the construction of a cohesive group with common interests, committed to the exchange of experiences and collective construction based on dialogue.

The organizational dynamics of the working groups and the results achieved will be discussed in a specific session of this report.

The first discussion of content came from the perspective of international organizations on the organization that different States were adopting to make feasible the implementation of SDG. In this sense, the presentation of Simona Costanzo Sow had as its theme the training of the Staff of the UN System, with a perspective on the implementation of Agenda 2030. In turn, the presentation of Edwin Lau presented the perspective and guideline within the OECD to provide support the different members in the implementation of the SDG. Finalizing with the perspective of the UNDP office in Brazil, what guidelines were adopted and strategies to support the Brazilian government in Agenda 2030.

The second session of content, sought to address regional perspectives of governmental organization for the implementation of Agenda 2030 and SDG. Thus, Tshombe Lukamba-Muhiya sought to present the perspective of the African Union of Nations in relation to Agenda 2030. In turn, Eko Prasajo presented the debate in the Asian context.

The activities of the second day of the workshop were started by dividing the participants into groups, whose responsibility was to identify common elements that could be identified as central challenges for the implementation of SDG in different countries.

Following this, two sessions were held to share national experiences in the organization of different governments for the implementation of SDG.

In this way, Sipho Manana presented the South African case, and in particular, the National Office of South African government. Zhengwei Yang, the case of the Chinese government, from the perspective of the Chinese Academy of Governance, highlighting the interconnections and contradictions between Agenda 2030 and the different Chinese long-term plans. Yogi Suwarno of the Indonesian National Institute of Public

Administration presented an account of the activities carried out at his institution, making it clear that although the initiatives are still at an early stage, they have a great potential for impact as a result of the unitary structure of the Indonesian state. Harsh Sharma, in turn, sought to demonstrate the complexity of envisaging large-scale training in the Indian public service due to the scale and decentralization of services. Finally, Fernando Filgueiras and Natalia Koga, from Enap, presented a recent survey carried out with civil servants of the Brazilian public administration, whose results point to a lack of knowledge regarding Agenda 2030 at worrying levels.

Management of horizontal and vertical coordination of SDG was the subject of one of the discussion sessions. The presentation by Secretary Villa gave participants an overview of the complexity of the integration of the Agenda 2030 in Brazil, taking into account the continental characteristics of the country, the tendency of the federal administration to organize themselves in 'silos' of attributions and mandates, and, the division country. On the other hand, Eko Prasajo presented the Indonesian case, from the coordination in a unitary state. Finally, Carolin Steffens presented the organization of the German public administration, whose federative characteristic was checked by the organization of the guidelines of sustainability assimilated by different instances of government like national strategy.

The Monitoring and Evaluation challenge was the theme of the last workshop content session. Although two of the presentations are related to the Brazilian case, the discussions at this table were able to shed light on the challenges faced by different countries. Thus, risks related to the monitoring of the 169 targets proposed for the 17 SDG were listed, mainly to ensure that they are viewed in a universal way, seeking to break with the culture of fragmentation, almost inherent in different public administrations.

A more detailed account of agreements on future cooperation will be held at a thematic session on the outcome of the workshop.

3.1. WORKING GROUPS - ORGANIZATIONAL DYNAMICS AND RESULTS

The expected result of this activity was that each working group developed a proposal of training activity for the construction of capacities of public servants for the implementation of Agenda 2030. In order to

The working groups were organized in order to enhance the results of the workshop held in Brasilia. Thus, on the first day of the workshop, five themes were proposed for the construction of training activities. Participants were able to choose the theme with greater affinity or interest. The following topics were proposed:

1. The role of local governments for SDG implementation (target groups would be public officials working in local governments).
2. How to organize multi-stakeholder partnerships for SDG implementation.
3. Managing horizontal coordination for national SDG implementation.
4. Indivisibility of the SDGs: How to implement SDGs in an integrated manner.

5. Introductory course to SDGs for public administration.

During the first session for the working groups, a new topic was proposed:

6. Preparation of a proposal for the workshop serie on “SDG learning, Training and Practice” (<https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/hlpf/2018/SDGsLearning>) from UNDESA and UNITAR – side event to the next HLPF meeting in New York (9 – 13 July 2018)

After the division of the participants into groups it was presented the logical thread for the construction of training activities.

The working groups began on Tuesday, February 27. Facilitators began by encouraging participants to think about the ingredients of a large seminar. Tatjana Reiber facilitated a dynamic plenary session to collect ideas and warm up the group. Pedro Alves then presented the objectives and step-by-step of the working groups. Andrea Zimmermann facilitated the organization of the groups. Six working groups were formed. Late Tuesday afternoon, the groups had a brief meeting to define the roles of facilitator, rapporteur and observer.

The first working session took place on Wednesday, February 28. The groups began to work on the framework conditions, general objective of the seminar and learning objectives. The facilitators gave a note to the participants about the Blooms taxonomy, which contained guidelines for developing good learning objectives.

The second session of the working group was held on Wednesday afternoon. The groups continued to work on defining the program.

On the morning of Thursday, March 1, the last working session was held. Finally, participants discussed methSDG, formats, experts and follow-up activities.

The presentation of the results of the working groups was held on Thursday afternoon. The groups were encouraged to use creative approaches to presentation as storytelling.

The results of the Working Groups are presented in the annex to this report as a specific report.

3.2. AGREEMENTS ON FUTURE COOPERATION

On the last day of the seminar, a session on future cooperation agreements was organized, coordinated by Sven Grimm (Head of Training Department - DIE), in which the main agreed points were:

a) Proposal for the High Level Political Forum in New York in July, depending on the approval of the panel proposed by group 6, this will be the first commitment of the group formed in Brasilia.

b) Organization of a book, summarizing the presentations made throughout the workshop. The suggestion is to make a collection of our presentations, revised in the light of the discussions held throughout the seminar. Timeline for publication is as follows:

- March 16: Deadline for a short summary (200 to 250 words maximum) for

Adriana, Pedro and Sven for those who want to contribute (adrianaplasencia@hotmail.com, pedro.alves@enap.gov.br, sven.grimm@die-gdi.de).

- April 6: We will contact a structure (preliminary content table) and ideally with a first draft of an introduction based on your abstracts.

- June 4: deadline for full contributions. You send them to the editorial team (Adriana, Pedro, Sven).

- July 2: Provide feedback on chapters.

- July 14: deadline for comments and reviews

The timeline was determined by the OECD Government Schools Network meeting in Helsinki (September 13-14), where we would like to present the completed book.

Contributions should be about 12 pages (which means about 5,000 to 6,000 words if I'm not mistaken).

(c) Thirdly, the follow-up meeting for the exchange on implementation and the first experiences with the Agenda 2030 courses:

There was a suggestion of our Chinese colleagues, Prof. Yang and Prof. Zhou (who could not join us in Brasilia) to welcome us to a meeting in China (place to be confirmed). We should consider a follow-up particularly under the title of exchange of first experiences with training, ideally based on the implementation of points discussed in Brasilia.

d) Fourth, there are several other suggested meetings, involving various stakeholders. We take note of the suggestions / offers from the Indonesian Parliament (seminar of parliamentary officials), possibly also from a meeting with the private sector in India.

3.3. PICTURES OF THE EVENT





4. EVALUATION

On the last day of the workshop, participants were asked to complete a Reaction Assessment form, the results of which will be discussed below.

Table 1 - Scale of evaluation

1	2	3	4	5	Not applicable (NA)
Strongly disagree	Partially disagree	I do not agree or disagree	I agree partially	I totally agree	

The items for evaluation were divided into 4 categories: a) Evaluation of the Seminar Program; b) Evaluation of the Applicability of the Seminar; c) Contributions of the Participants; d) Physical infrastructure to carry out the activity.

Each of these categories will be discussed below.

At the end of the evaluation the participants should assign a global grade to the workshop on the scale of 0 to 10. In addition to making qualitative comments to improve the activity.

The first point to highlight is that the overall grade of the workshop on the scale of 0 to 10 was 9.04. This is a high note within the evaluation parameters of the events performed by Enap.

4.1. EVALUATION OF THE PROGRAM

The evaluation of Program, with all items receiving grades above 4. The highest grades were conferred on the facilitation of the Work Groups (average 4.89) and on the expansion of contact networks for future peer-to-peer exchanges (mean 4.85). On the other hand, the worst evaluations were given to the item referring to the ability to observe obstacles to the implementation of SDG and to the expansion of the expertise of the participants in didactics for activities aimed at the implementation of SDGs.

Table 4 - Average Program Evaluations

Average of the Seminar Program Evaluation	4,70
1. The workshop has strengthened my capabilities in the field of capacity development for the public sector.	4,53
2. The workshop helped me to deepen my expertise on effective didactics for capacity building on sustainable development.	4,46
3. I have improved knowledge/skills for future curriculum development on the 2030 Agenda in a multi-actor perspective.	4,59
4. I could improve my ability to better analyse the challenges of SDG implementation in my domestic context.	4,67
5. I can now better identify opportunities, constraints and obstacles to the effective management of SDG implementation by the public sector.	4,44
6. I expanded my international network of contacts for peer exchange, sharing experiences and mutual learning.	4,85
7. The sequence of sessions contributed to my learning.	4,62
8. The contents contributed to the achievement of the proposed objectives.	4,50
9. I am satisfied with the output of my working group on designing a capacity building format.	4,62
10. The facilitation of the working group sessions was supportive.	4,89

These data demonstrate that the workshop achieved the goal of peer-to-peer exchange, in addition to proposing curricula for activities aimed at the implementation of Agenda 2030. On the other hand, regional specificities should be taken into account for the identification of challenges and obstacles to the implementation of Agenda 2030.

4.2. AVALIAÇÃO DA APLICABILIDADE

Regarding the applicability of the workshop, the participants emphasized that they would recommend the seminar for colleagues and that they would make use of the contents developed in their professional life. However, the item that received the worst evaluations was related to the relevance of the contents for their professional activity (average of 4.53).

Tabela 5 – Avaliação de Aplicabilidade

Average of the Applicability	4,71
11. The subjects covered are relevant to my professional activity.	4,53
12. I will make use of the content of the course in my work or in my professional life hereafter.	4,75
13. Would recommend the SEMINAR to friends and colleagues. What argument would he make if asked why? (write below)	4,86

These data shed light on an important element of Agenda 2030. Despite the effort to select participants that were somehow involved in the implementation of Agenda 2030, the relatively low evaluation of item 11 suggests that SDG content and the Agenda 2030 are not part of the day-to-day work of most public servants in different countries.

We emphasize four arguments for the recommendation of the course, which, in our opinion, summarize the other contributions:

“You will learn doing and know interesting people.”

“It’s a hands-on workshop.”

“Because it is a change of thinking and acting.”

“Participatory working, friendly international people.”

“Participatory process, network, facilitation team.”

4.3. CONTRIBUTION OF PARTICIPANTS

The participants' contribution received a score of 4.71, demonstrating that the interaction between the participants was fruitful and productive.

4.4. SUGGESTIONS

Among the suggestions given by the participants of the course, we highlight the provision of material (indication of preliminary readings) for an early preparation, in addition to the fact that the schedule was quite extensive, requiring physical and

intellectual wear of the participants.

5. COMMENTS OF THE COORDINATION OF HIGH EXECUTIVE

In general, the workshop fulfilled the purpose for which it was intended. It allowed peer-to-peer exchange to strengthen the debate on capacity-building training for the implementation of Agenda 2030 and SDG.

More than that, the workshop allowed the construction of curricula for the development of activities by Government Schools and Training Institutions in the themes of SDG and Agenda 2030.

From the institutional point of view, Enap was strengthened by the offer of this workshop. This activity served as a platform for the promotion of the School in the theme of Agenda 2030. It also allowed the realization of a series of parallel agendas with the different participants, who paved the way for the construction of future bilateral partnerships.

In relation to the group of participants, it can be said that the workshop served as the founding moment of a community of practioners on the theme of capacity building for the Agenda 2030, with potential to expand the performance and maturation of the debate on the theme.

Finally, the partnership between Enap and DIE was very fruitful, being this activity the first of a series of actions in planning between the two institutions.

Brasília-DF, 27 de março de 2018

Pedro Assumpção Alves

Coordenação-Geral de Capacitação de Altos-Executivos

Arquivo: Relatório da Coordenação

ANNEXES:

Annex 1 - Report of the Working Groups

Annex 2 - Report of Camila Oliveira