Market Systems Development Working Group
Minutes of Meeting, Nairobi, 19th February 2018

9th March 2018

Participants
- ADA: Susanne Thiard-Laforet (Co-Chair)
- BEAM Exchange/DCED: Mike Albu
- DCED Secretariat: Jim Tanburn, Nick Wilson
- DFAT: Julie Delforce
- Gatsby Foundation: Georgina Duffin

- GIZ: Birgit Seibel
- MasterCard Foundation: Nafis Muntasir
- Norad: Mehraz Rafat
- Sida: Gun Eriksson Skoog
- ILO, the Lab: Steve Hartrich
- USAID: Tatiana Pulido

Apologies
- DFID: Francesca Brown
- Gatsby Foundation: Neil Satchwell Smith
- MasterCard Foundation: Lindsay Wallace

- SDC: Andrea Inglin (Co-Chair)
- UNIDO: Ali Badarneh
- USAID: Kristin O'Planick
- WBG: Tania Begazo

Agenda
1) Introductions and expectations for the day
2) Sharing experiences from MSD programmes
3) World café on potential Working Group goals
4) Concluding discussions and priorities
5) Next steps

1) Introductions and expectations for the day
Susanne Thiard-Laforet (Co-Chair) introduced the two main goals for the meeting: to set the agenda for the group for the first year, and to develop a long-term vision. Working Group members began by introducing themselves and their organisations' approaches. They briefly gave their expectations for the meeting.

Jim Tanburn summarised the workings of the DCED Trust Fund, managed by IFC. He noted that the situation is still evolving with respect to the MSD Working Group accessing additional funds. The Secretariat is not currently in position to clarify or liaise, however, because the tender process is still on-going. In the circumstances, it would be particularly useful if the Working Group could set priorities for its various work items.

2) Sharing experiences from MSD programmes

Based on two stories from Gun Eriksson Skoog and Mike Albu, the group analysed and discussed existing experiences with the MSD approach.

3) World café on potential Working Group goals

Participants discussed three questions:

- Where is the entry point for making market systems development **the** approach?
- What are the most important issues raised in response to the first question? And how could we integrate those into the agenda?
- What goals can the group take from the above two questions?

The discussions were then summarised by the rapporteurs, as follows:

Steve Hartrich reported that the discussions in the group had focussed around packaging and communicating MSD, including communicating MSD's underlying values. A few members mentioned continuing adverse gut-reactions to the approach from colleagues simply because the term 'markets' arouses suspicion. Further specific questions on communication strategies were: who are our audience? What is the best message to reach them? Members noted, however that making the MSD approach generally applicable to all development cooperation – **the** approach – is not realistic and beyond the scope of the Working Group. The main, if not the only, focus of the DCED is private sector development and the main 'audience' of the WG is DCED members, many of whom still struggle to develop knowledge, methods and procedures within their own organisation.

Julie Delforce noted that the primary goal discussed in her group was the need to create an evidence base that is tailored to donor needs. Most programmes would already have information and data readily available (including outside the traditional/popular sectors for MSD), but it would need to be 'packaged' more appropriately for donors. Julie also reported that her group discussed the desirability of both a helpdesk for MSD support and a toolkit for MSD programme procurement processes. The helpdesk could be used by all DCED members on demand, based on a framework agreement, and the toolkit would collect and systematise experience of designing and procuring MSD programmes. Mike Albu noted that a working document was being drafted now on issues arising in procurement of MSD programmes, and he would share it with the group shortly. Gun Eriksson Skoog also mentioned that Sida is about to embark on a review of its management of MSD programmes.

Georgina Duffin reported that her group had focussed on the skills and good practices that would be most useful in supporting donor roles in MSD. The group discussed the provision of this through online systems and in-person. The group envisioned a mix of discussion and producing knowledge products (e.g. structured case studies). A preference for in-person exchange and interactive workshops for sharing experiences and learning from each other was expressed. The importance of donors/funders and implementers/facilitators learning from each other to improve interaction and practices was also noted.

4) Concluding discussions and priorities

Following the day's discussions, Working Group members agreed that the MSDWG should focus on the needs of the Working Group members. Mike Albu explained that previously BEAM has provided an important platform for practitioners, which was also important for many donors. At the same time it will be essential for BEAM and Working Group to develop products, services and support for donors who are already using (or willing to use) the MSD approach. BEAM needs to retain contacts with, and services for, practitioners, but it was felt that a gradual shift towards serving donor needs is necessary (or doing both if resources allow).

Several members suggested that arranging or producing a training course or materials specifically for donor staff would be a productive use of the group's resources, preferably on a regular basis. Mike Albu noted that a training provider could be commissioned to produce a pilot, perhaps focusing on one theme to start with. Nafis Muntasir suggested that the group look at the existing resources available on donor-centred MSD trainings.

As a means to clarifying priorities for the group as a whole, it was suggested that each person in the group give their one, top priority for a possible additional work item. Answers are summarised below.

WG member	Top Priority
Susanne (ADA)	A 'help desk' function for MSD related queries, ideally with a phone number that one could ring for practical advice to address specific situations and issues.
Steve (ILO)	Synthesising, packaging and communicating evidence/results, particularly in support of MSD programme design
Tatiana (USAID)	Resources that package and communicate MSD results, particularly for senior colleagues
Gun (Sida)	Face-to-face learning events, e.g. interactive workshops, exchange of experiences etc. on specific aspects of MSD, concerning MSD management as well as MSD applications.
Mehraz (Norad)	15-20 micro-case studies covering MSD programmes in a range of sectors (agriculture, renewable energy, ICT, manufacturing etc.). E.g. four PowerPoint slides for each case: What was the problem? What were the interventions? Results? Why was it different?
Nafis (MCF)	Evidence and good practices, particularly in youth employment
Birgit (GIZ)	Short pieces of evidence, not only in agriculture but also in other sectors (manufacturing, industry, environment etc.); what is different about this approach? Results?
Julie (DFAT)	Supported others on 'communication of results'. Also, explore further adaptation of MSD practice, for example through hybrid push-pull models, which could make the approach more effective for helping marginalised groups (e.g. those in extreme poverty).
Georgina (Gatsby)	Tools for partnering with other donors would be most useful.

Susanne Thiard-Laforet observed that there were four key aspects to the day's discussions:
1. Generating and presenting evidence adapted to donor needs;
2. Capacity building and support, particularly in resources, training events and possibly a helpdesk, aimed at donors, as these are not currently available elsewhere;

3. Specific themes for the Working Group to focus on; and
4. Interactive format for Working Group meetings and events.

Working Group members discussed the themes that would be of most interest for the group:

- Gun, Georgina and Birgit agreed to discuss MSD and structural transformation (including an ODI study commissioned by Gatsby). Francesca at DFID has been asked to join the discussions. Sida will invite the Working Group to an event in May (probably the 16th) when the ODI visits Stockholm. It could be possible for the Working Group to start specific activities before the Annual Meeting, because Germany might be in position to finance specific activities. Birgit Seibel will investigate and report back to the Chairs; if it is possible, draft ToR etc. will be circulated to the group for comment.

- Steve and Nafis agreed to discuss MSD in youth employment, perhaps building on a new network coming out of MCF's CLAYE event, and leading up to the DCED Annual Meeting thematic day in June (GDPRD is also working on this theme).

- Opportunities to collaborate with other DCED Working Groups were also discussed, in particular the WG for Results Measurement, recognising the need to develop indicators or other ways for donors to encourage implementers to apply adaptive management, to achieve systemic change. The Group noted the lack of agreement at present on this theme.

Some members agreed to work on the next steps for developing donor support resources on MSD.

5) Next steps

When?	What?	Who?
February/March 2018	Finalise the minutes, including comments from those members of the group who were not able to join the Nairobi meeting in person.	Working Group members
March/Early-April 2018	Draft Work Plan and Budget for FY2018/2019.	Co-Chairs + BEAM/DCED Secretariat
April 2018	Comments on Draft Work Plan and Budget (a conference call will be organised if there is demand for it).	All Working Group members
May 2018	Submit Draft Work Plan and Budget to DCED ExCo.	DCED Secretariat
Early-June 2018	Next Annual Meeting, including Working Group meeting and approval of the Work Plan.	All Working Group members + BEAM/DCED Secretariat