



DLP

Policy and Practice for Developmental
Leaders, Elites and Coalitions

DEVELOPMENTAL LEADERSHIP PROGRAM

Research Paper

08

Leadership Training and Network Formation: The evolution of the LEAD process

Marine Destrez & Nick Harrison
January 2011



The Developmental Leadership Program (DLP) addresses an important gap in international thinking and policy about the critical role played by leaders, elites and coalitions in the politics of development. This growing program brings together business, academic and civil society partners from around the world to explore the role of human agency in the processes of development. DLP will address the policy, strategic, and operational implications about 'thinking and working politically' - for example, about how to help key players solve collective action problems, negotiate effective institutions and build stable states.

The Developmental Leadership Program

E: info@dlprog.org

W: www.dlprog.org

Abstract

Leadership training programs and courses have a variety of aims, methods and participants. This case history traces the evolution of LEAD International. It shows how LEAD started as a well-funded international training program, lasting for a two-year period for each cohort, which aimed to enable leaders from developing countries to engage better politically and professionally with the international community on environmental issues. Over time it has become a more decentralised, shorter and diversified program, increasingly shaped by the needs, interests and priorities of its national Member Programs. This was in part, also, a consequence of reduced resources. The study shows that its focus on the role of individual human agency in promoting environmental and developmental progress is complemented by a strong sense among its Fellows of the value and importance of networks, within and across countries. As with many other leadership development programs, LEAD has no systematic process of evaluating, measuring and recording the developmental impact of the work of its Fellows in different countries. The case is made for the need to develop evaluation and monitoring of this in future, perhaps in conjunction with other leadership programs.

Executive Summary

The LEAD International Fellowship Training Program offers a useful case study for the Developmental Leadership Program (DLP) of how external agents may contribute to sustainable development by investing in such programs, leaders and networks. The findings of the research include the following:

- Even though the impact of the training is not fully proven, given the absence of robust evaluation procedures, the LEAD objective remains committed to advancing sustainable development processes. The initial aim was to equip leaders to engage professionally and politically with international negotiations processes. The outputs are now considered to be broader, involving both practical activities and new ways of thinking about processes. Alumni of the program have gone on to develop research and on-the-ground projects as well as sustainable development policies in their own countries.
- LEAD provides a leadership training and network program that does not perceive individual career advancement and developmental objectives to be mutually exclusive. Professional advancement of the alumni is thought to promote the values of sustainable development at higher level of decision-making, where influence is deemed to be more important.

This research also reaches important conclusions regarding leadership training models:

- Possessing a core model for the training helps maintain its coherence and the message it seeks to transfer to its participants. The core model refers here to a theoretical background, in the case of LEAD this is Systems Thinking, and a training journey structure for each participant. LEAD training quality improved with a structured model, gaining in cost effectiveness and positive appreciation from the participants.
- Time matters. Because leadership training appears to be an essential opportunity for leaders to reflect on their vision and create a network, continuing involvement in a program after the formal sessions are completed seems to matter. This is a major challenge for training providers.
- Funds matter. Because of the importance of developing accurate and up-to-date case studies, as well as investing time and effort in the selection program, decreasing the price of the training also impacts the level of demand and therefore competitiveness of the training.
- Context matters. The political and historical context has informed the choices and priorities of the national and international LEAD training. In Indonesia, for instance, the program has been mobilising its network to participate in the rebuilding of the economy and political life in a sustainable way after the 90s. This has informed the training themes and the focus in recruitment of the participants.
- Selection and post-training activities seem as important as the training process itself. The national context has informed the way national programs have adapted those processes to financial constraints. Responding to national context enables trainers to be more innovative and focused in

the way they select and train participants.

A number of key policy messages emerge from this study:

- LEAD developed long ago a model of training which has mixed knowledge and skills modules as well as field experience and personal awareness. It is important to enquire into the impact of those different elements and the extent to which each or all may depend on the cultural and professional background and personal vision of the participant.
- The importance of social capital within networks and leadership processes has been emphasised by most LEAD actors as a key to developmental impact. But how networks operate as the political and social mechanism of this process remains poorly understood, and requires further research.
- In addition, evaluating, mapping, measuring and recording the developmental impact of Fellows' and national program initiatives requires more attention if a better and more policy-relevant understanding of the value of leadership training programs is to be achieved.

Introduction

Leadership for Environment and Development (LEAD) is the world's largest international not-for-profit organisation focused on training for leadership and sustainable development. Since 1991, its mission has been to inspire leadership and change for a sustainable world. It has undertaken to achieve this by identifying individuals with leadership potential, developing this potential through its innovative training programs and then supporting and working with these emerging leaders to mobilise action. Central to this, has been the LEAD Fellowship Program which over the past two decades has trained over 2,000 LEAD Fellows¹ in 15 cohorts² across 12 regional Member Programs³ and as such represents a well-established and ambitious leadership development training initiative.

The Developmental Leadership Program (DLP) under its first organizational form (the LECRP⁴) explored the role and impact of leaders in shaping institutions, state building and development outcomes. The DLP has followed this up by exploring further areas of interest around the following assumptions:

- Leadership is about processes not personalities.
- Development is a political process, requiring political mechanisms of negotiation between interests.
- Leadership processes and mechanisms are context specific.
- Elites are a useful and necessary context to understand developmental leadership.
- Contextualized and locally adapted institutions are more likely to be effective.
- Developmental leadership research has to be made relevant for the development community.
- Exploring the role of leaders, elites and coalitions in different contexts contributes to our understanding of the structure -agency issue in social science.

The DLP explores the potential of individuals, coalitions and networks to bring about change through political processes. LEAD operates on the assumption that individuals and networks of individuals are what matter. So for the DLP program, the LEAD Fellowship Program provides a unique case study of an external agent attempting to foster change through facilitating the emergence of developmental leaders and networks.

This study examines the establishment and development of LEAD over time and across continents. Through interviews and desk research exploring the development and evolution of its Member Programs, training and network, we will pursue two key lines of enquiry. Firstly, *what is the LEAD*

¹ During the LEAD Fellowship training, trainees are referred to as 'LEAD Associates' and on completion graduate to become 'LEAD Fellows'.

² Groups of trainees ('cohorts') initially undertook two years of training which later (in 2004) reduced to just one.

³ Member Programs cover different countries/regions internationally. Originally (in 1992) 7 LEAD Member Programs were created and this increased to 9 (in 1995) and has since settled at 12 in 2010.

⁴ Leadership, Elites and Coalitions Research Program.

approach to facilitating the emergence of developmental leaders and coalitions? and secondly, *how has this approach been adapted and evolved over time and context?*

In order to respond to those questions, we seek to evaluate:

- Does LEAD have a theory of change and, if so, how does the syllabus and training program reflect this?
- What content and processes are employed by the LEAD Fellowship Programs prior to, during and post training which are intended to be promote institutional reform and solve problems of collective action?
- What are the anticipated development impacts of the training?
- What are the political, cultural and historical events or processes that have impacted on the design, delivery and/or potential impact of the training?
- What differences and similarities exist between the training delivered in the different regions studied and how are they related to external constraints or internal processes?

To address the first line of enquiry we describe LEAD's objectives and how, through the delivery of its programs, it aimed to achieve them. We explore how the LEAD training process sought to encourage the creation of developmental networks and to deepen participants' understanding of the collective action problems of development and the political means for their resolution in different institutional contexts.

To address our second line of enquiry, we explore how the training philosophies, curricula and practical programs have evolved since the inception of LEAD and what differentiation has occurred between and across its arms and the international secretariat.

The LEAD Fellowship Program was designed and developed by the US-based Rockefeller Foundation in the years preceding the 1992 Rio Conference⁵ and was initially created with a budget to run over ten years with the ambition to eventually establish it as an independent program. It became an independent entity in 1994 and, after a decade of operation, the decision was taken to continue its activities and expand the reach of its program. Initially, with further support from the Rockefeller Foundation, then independently, LEAD has gone on to deliver leadership training for twenty years and more recently has developed increasing capacity for the delivery of development projects.

LEAD is in fact, a global network of organisations made up of an international secretariat and twelve national and regionally based 'Member Programs'. The Member Programs are based in host organisations, which deliver the LEAD Fellowship Program to successive groups (or 'cohorts') at the national or regional level. They are also responsible for recruiting the trainees (or 'LEAD Associates') to participate in the program and the delivery of alumni activities to support the Member Program's network of trainees once they have completed the program (or 'LEAD Fellows').

The training is delivered broadly in two main parts: the national/regional sessions and the international sessions. Originally the entire LEAD Fellowship Program lasted two years but over time this has reduced to less than a year. The national/regional sessions consist of a number of training events developed locally by the local Member Programs, usually contextualizing sustainable development issues at their national or regional level. The international sessions are organised by the international secretariat, LEAD International, which is based in London, from where the LEAD Europe Member Program is also coordinated. The background and characteristics of Fellows across different Member Programs and

⁵ The United Nations Earth Summit held in Rio de Janeiro (1992).

cohorts varies considerably and a full breakdown can be found in the appendix of this paper.

In the first chapter we begin by introducing the LEAD Program's origins, structure and approach, outlining the original theory of change on which its early activities were based. In chapter two we then go on to look at how this activity was reviewed and refocused and broadly at how the program has evolved over the years. Through chapters three and four we undertake a more detailed examination of the international training sessions and compare similarities and differences in the evolution of three varied Member Programs in Mexico, Indonesia and Africa. Finally we draw together some key observations and suggested further areas for enquiry in the concluding chapter.

1.0

The LEAD Program: Origins, Structure and Approach

1.1 LEAD's Origins and Structure

1.1.1 A program of the Rockefeller Foundation

The LEAD program began in 1991 as a ten-year initiative established by the US-based Rockefeller Foundation, one of the oldest and largest private charitable organisations in the world. Founded in 1913, the foundation had traditionally focused on agricultural and science-based development, emphasising the importance of education and learning in its mission “to promote the well-being of mankind throughout the world” (Rockefeller Foundation, 2010). It had largely worked in the US and only began to open itself to international perspectives in the late 1980s when the appointment of Peter Goldmark as the new Foundation President⁶ saw the launch of three new initiatives⁷ which included a *Global Environmental Program* (Teltsch, 1990). Goldmark asked his Vice President, Kenneth Prewitt, to identify environmental challenges and approaches to addressing them through which this new program could make an impact. As a result, along with a program for domestic sustainable energy research⁸, a global program focussed on cultivating environmental leadership in developing countries was established (Prewitt, 1990). And so, in 1991, the precursor to Leadership for Environment and Development (LEAD) was born.

The LEAD concept had already been the subject of discussion for some time as Prewitt reports conversations with Gro Harlem Brundtland shortly following the publication of her Commission's seminal report in 1987 (The Brundtland Commission, 1987) together with numerous other stakeholder consultations undertaken over two years⁹ prior to the program's launch (Prewitt, 2010 and LEAD, 1991). An early concept note¹⁰ observed “*it is worth determining whether a Foundation program could help develop and support a cohort of new leaders who, equipped with a fresh combination of skills and perspectives, would be linked through their experience and careers in a global network focused on environmentally sound development*” (Prewitt, 1990).

Prewitt's observations of international efforts targeting development challenges such as HIV/AIDS¹¹ suggested they were considerably enhanced by the integration of diverse perspectives from across

⁶ Peter C. Goldmark Jr. was elected in 1988.

⁷ The two other programs included a domestic program of school reform and an international security program.

⁸ The Energy Foundation was a major program to study sustainable energy sources launched in 1990 by Rockefeller and an alliance with other organisations.

⁹ Though there are documents which refer to this process in general, there is no documentation about how it took place, suggesting it may have been a largely informal process.

¹⁰ This paper is the first within the LEAD archives to describe the LEAD concept and was signed by Kenneth Prewitt, with all subsequent material signed by Al Binger.

¹¹ Prewitt was working mainly with health and population issues at that time and attending numerous conferences on these topics. He refers to progress made on HIV/AIDS when Southern countries joined the discussion emphasising the importance of gender issues, which enabled programs to better tackle root causes of the epidemic.

the world, and particularly those closest to the issues being addressed (Prewitt, 2010). Therefore, it followed that by targeting experts from developing countries to gain the core skills and knowledge needed to effectively engage in international conferences concerning environment and development issues, the LEAD program could build capacity to strengthen these countries' participation in international political processes and negotiations. By strengthening participation in this way, it was hoped that this would contribute to a more efficient and coordinated global response to environmental and development challenges.

In keeping with the foundation's approach, the LEAD program was ambitious in scale and well funded (Fosdick, 1989: 22)¹². It shared many features common to the foundation's other projects (Prewitt 2010 and Masood, 2010) but departed from the usual focus on science-based development with its focus on sustainable development. Sustainable development was seen as a high level political process, needing clear direction at the international policy level and collaboration between international experts (Prewitt, 2010; LEAD, 1992a; and Byravan, 2001). Prewitt described the objectives of the project as “*very political*”, “*creating a generation of leaders from the South who could counter balance the voices from the North at international conferences on sustainable development*”. The scale was international with an initial focus on developing countries with the largest populations (Prewitt, 2010) and was driven by the intention to instigate change through empowering representatives from these countries in such a way that they would go on to champion sustainable development through influencing international policy.

1.1.2. Embedded in the South, Coordinated from the North

The program was initially structured to be delivered locally by host country institutions, with overall coordination from the Rockefeller Foundation based in the US. Once established, this coordination would be relocated to a developing country. The aim was to deliver training to cultivate a cadre of leaders in these countries who would strengthen sustainable development at the international level whilst contextualising it in their own country and helping to build national perspectives on the issues it addressed (LEAD, 1993a).

To cultivate these leaders who could better develop and represent their countries' views concerning environment and development matters at international level, the recruitment and training was devolved to an initial selection of host countries targeted for the program¹³. To effectively integrate delivery of the program into these countries, the foundation spent a year identifying and selecting a range of local institutes, think tanks, universities (and later NGOs) to host and deliver the program in-country. Local directors and support staff were recruited and it was hoped that by embedding delivery locally in this way, the program would identify and recruit the best potential candidates for training and the program would be better tailored to the unique political context of each region (LEAD, 1993a). Interestingly, in some cases, the host institutions also went on to play a crucial role in championing and protecting the work of the program within the host country, such as in the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) where the program was established during a time of considerable political upheaval in the region (LEAD, 1991).

Despite devolving elements of program delivery to local teams in host countries, the funding and overall management of the program remained coordinated by the Rockefeller Foundation's Global Environment Program in the US. Then in 1993, although still entirely funded by the Foundation, central coordination of the program was moved onto a more independent footing, becoming the *LEAD Institute* (a not-for-profit corporation) in 1993 before taking on full US charity status to become *Leadership for the*

¹² M. Gates, one of the original foundation trustees, stated in 1911: “*The Rockefeller Foundation should in general confine itself to projects of an important character, too large to be undertaken, or otherwise unlikely to be undertaken, by other agencies*” (Fosdick, 1989: 40).

¹³ Initial Member Programs were established in: Brazil, China, India, Indonesia, Mexico, Nigeria, and the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) of the former USSR.

Environment and Development International, Inc. in 1994. Then in 2000, the organisation, maintaining its charitable status, moved from New York to London on the basis that the European Union provided a better funding environment for charities at that time (Martin-Lefevre, 2000). Since then, delivery of the LEAD Fellowship program has remained with the national host institutions (or 'Member Programs' as they became known) apart from the International Training Session (ITS) component, which has largely been coordinated by the LEAD International secretariat in London.

1.2 LEAD's approach and theory of change

1.2.1 High level training for high potential trainees

From the beginning, LEAD's delivery approach involved recruiting high-potential trainees within developing countries and exposing them to high-level international leaders and field specialists while training them to engage more effectively on sustainable development issues at the international level. The training process initially lasted two years with further learning and progressive support being provided to alumni (or 'LEAD Fellows') on completion of the program.

During early cohorts, international calibre experts would be brought in to design and refine the knowledge and training content of the program. For example, Prof. Dennis Meadows, the renowned academic and co-author of *The Limits to Growth* (Behrens W. et al, 1974) was heavily involved in coordinating and delivering various training modules up until 1998 and the first decade of LEAD rarely saw an ITS without a Minister or a President in attendance (e.g. Mikhail Gorbachev former President of the Soviet Union, opened the ITS in 2001).

An early refinement of the LEAD program refocused training objectives to ensure that its outcomes included some form of practical action such as national position papers, articles published in international journals and policy recommendations (LEAD, 1991). This in turn, was reflected in the recruitment of trainees who were selected on the basis of having promising career prospects as well as leadership potential and an interest in sustainable development (Prewitt, 2010).

The cultivation of individuals with high potential to assume positions of influence at both national and international level reveals much about the underlying ambition of the LEAD program to affect high-level change. Interviews with staff and early concept notes from the program suggest that the ambition was not to change the world by creating a popular movement, but to train and prepare in-country leaders to access and influence international processes more effectively (Prewitt, 1990; 2010).

1.2.2 Broadening perspective through interdisciplinary and systemic thinking

To effectively develop trainees to engage with, and champion, sustainable development issues more effectively in international processes, early designers of the LEAD program believed it was important to broaden their perspective through facilitating exchanges between disciplines and enabling them to apply a systems thinking approach when addressing complex issues (LEAD, 1999-2010).

Therefore, another important dimension introduced to the program from the beginning was its emphasis on bringing together trainees from different sectors and disciplines (LEAD, 1996-2010). This interdisciplinary focus is also reflected in the diversity of backgrounds represented by Member Program directors and trainers. However, a predominance of staff with science backgrounds may indicate some transference of the Rockefeller Foundation's initial bias towards science-driven development (Wiyon-

oputriin, 2010; Phartiyal, 2010; and Binger, 1992)¹⁴.

Similarly, Systems Thinking approaches were presented in early cohort training by Dennis Meadows in order to help participants develop skills to more clearly understand the inter-linkages between different challenges sustainable development seeks to address and enable them to identify stronger systemic solutions as leaders. Meadows and his colleagues' work (e.g. Behrens W. et al, 1974) provided a strong theoretical basis for these modules and they remain core to both national and international training sessions to this day (Kellow, 2010; Chiotha, 2010; Mass, 2010).

1.2.3 Building multi-cultural understanding

Beyond the in-country training delivered by Member Programs, the international sessions of the program also introduced important international and multi-cultural dimensions, which over time have grown to become a centrepiece of the training. Trainees from early cohorts of the program reported that, for many, the training sessions provided the first multi-cultural experience they had ever had (Wiyonoputriin, 2010; Phartiyal, 2010). Facilitating debate and dialogue between different cultures and nations appears to have become a key component of the program, with the shared experience of the training intended to foster relationships, strengthening Fellows' ability to work together and laying foundations for future collaboration (Prewitt, 2010). However, whilst this played an important role in broadening perspectives, trainees have also remarked that the emphasis of the training remained focused on developing and articulating national perspectives in an international context rather than creating an intercultural network with a global vision.

1.2.4 LEAD's theory of change

Initially then, the early LEAD program was created to address the perceived lack of appropriately trained developing country participants in international environmental conferences at the beginning of the 1990s. This lack of effective participation was seen as detrimental to equitable international negotiations concerning environment and development and consequently preventing effective sustainable development from taking place.

The program's theory of change was that by providing leadership training, introducing international, multi-sector, multicultural and multidisciplinary perspectives and key contacts to a few carefully selected individuals from the most populated developing countries, a cadre of experts could be developed who would then progress in the hierarchy and contribute to the political process at the international level: *"Collective and not individual actions should be the route on environmental/development problems. However, due to the highly complex nature of environment/development issues, such collective action depends upon the involvement of well-educated, organized and motivated groups of individuals"* (Binger, 1991).

In the following chapter, we will examine how the financial and contextual constraints along with internal discussions that arose through reviews of the curriculum, forced the program to evolve. We then go on to explore how differences in context influenced this process through comparative analysis of activity in three selected Member Programs.

¹⁴ Fellows interviewed for this study have suggested training did have a physical science bias and early correspondence between Member Programs also appear to focus more on physical science issues.

2.0

The Evolution of LEAD: Reviewing and Adapting

2.1 Reviewing and refocusing the program

2.1.1 Reviewing the curriculum

Reviews of the program curriculum appear to relate to periods of tension and consequent revision of the governance structure of the LEAD program. Whilst the initial structure had allowed for diversity in delivery by devolving autonomy to host country institutions, this came at a high financial cost and made effective review of the curriculum across the whole organisation considerably more challenging (Martin-Mehers, 2010). Even the definition of sustainable development varied across the Member Programs (Tudela, 1996), and whilst useful in exposing trainees to different perspectives, numerous reports highlighted difficulties in coordination and collaboration across such diverse programs, cautioning that not enough had been done to ensure consistency in training content across LEAD as a whole (Hendricks et al, 1997).

In 1992, a “Curriculum Development and Review Group” was established to design guidelines for Member Program training and the ITS. During 1996-7 the Member Programs and ITS curricula were then reviewed¹⁵ together with LEAD’s over governance and vision. Reports and correspondence from this process highlighted the need for more consistency in the quality and content of training across the program as a whole (Hendricks et al, 1997; Tudela, 1996; Member Program faxes, 1995-1997).

In 1998, in response to these initial review findings and following a long process of negotiation, a framework agreement on delivery was established between the Member Programs and a new ‘Head of Training’ post was created to improve coordination, consistency and quality of the training delivered across the Member Programs (Hendricks et al, 1997).

The program doesn’t appear to have been built around one particular education or learning theory, but was instead developed and refined over successive cohorts, initially by the numerous consultants brought in to design and deliver training (Dennis Meadows being a key influence throughout this process), and then later by staff in the Member Programs.

The program constantly sought to use cutting edge techniques, evident in its application of new technology from the beginning of the training¹⁶. Program design also appears to have been influenced by trends in the learning community as Gillian Martin Mehers (LEAD’s first Head of Training) notes, citing her changing job title (from ‘Head of Training’ to ‘Head of Capacity Building’, and finally to ‘Head of

¹⁵ On this occasion the process was overseen by a more ad hoc ‘Curriculum Advisory Committee’.

¹⁶ Computers were distributed to every participant in the early cohorts, and computer skills played an important part of the training time in early sessions.

Learning’) as an example of how “*evolution of knowledge and debate in that area*” influenced the program. Political and international relations factors also appear to have influenced the choice of themes and foci covered in training at different times and these will be explored further.

As a result of intensive review and refinement of the training curriculum in the first decade of program delivery (including three curriculum groups, three full consultant reviews, and the ongoing work of permanent staff dedicated to each training session), some modules appear to have emerged and remained as key in the LEAD learning process.

2.1.2 Developing the network

Over the years, the network of LEAD alumni (or ‘Fellows’) grew into what has become perhaps one of LEAD’s most important assets. From 2000 a ‘Fellows Program’ was initiated and separately funded by the Rockefeller Foundation, with a post created in the international secretariat in London dedicated to mobilizing the network (Byravan, 2001; Mawson, 2010)¹⁷.

With a new commitment to strengthening the network, this aspect appears to have become increasingly prominent. The original rationale for its development was to help build relationships between actors that would go on to work together at the international level. Since then, and due in part to the decentralised nature of LEAD as an organisation, its role and value has gradually evolved along with perspectives of it across the Member Programs. These different perspectives provide a useful way to examine commonalities and differences within LEAD and in the remainder of this chapter we will present a selection of these views gathered during interviews with LEAD trainers, staff, and Fellows in November 2010.

For many of those interviewed, the LEAD network appears to serve an important practical role in providing Fellows with professional support when addressing sustainable development challenges back in their professional lives. LEAD’s current Head of Learning and Leadership, Edward Kellow, describes this as part of the way in which the program generates a ‘ripple effect’ of change. After the program, Fellows return to their organisations diffusing their learning and with the support of the network, provoke change (Kellow, 2010).

Fellows from more recent cohorts¹⁸ describe the network as a valuable tool enabling cooperation and mutual support between individuals on the basis of trust, shared experience and a vision created during the LEAD training and sustained by ongoing alumni relationships (Lewis, 2010; Joubert, 2010). Others too have emphasised the importance of the network for helping bring together groups of fellows to deliver projects together. Mass Lo, Director of the LEAD Francophone Africa Program (Lo, 2010), is a strong advocate of the importance of this function of the network and examples of a range of such projects have been gathered over the years. The network therefore also appears to help facilitate change by bringing together potential partners to develop ideas and deliver solutions.

One common observation of the network is that its value is different for everyone. Often referred to as the “LEAD family’, numerous testimonials (Abidi-Habib, 2010; Elias, 2010; Joubert, 2010; Lewis, 2010; Phartiyal, 2010; Dieye, 2010; de Wit, 2010; Wiyonoputriin, 2010) remarked on the value of the social capital provided by the network as being an over-arching benefit of the program¹⁹. Many interviewees found it difficult to specifically explain the value of this social capital for addressing sustainable develop-

¹⁷ Penelope Mawson, as Director of Communications, was the first person to have the responsibility for “mobilizing the network collectively”, while Sujatha Byravan was overall in charge of the more individual “Fellows Program”.

¹⁸ Cohorts 11 and 12.

¹⁹ It should be noted those testimonials come from Fellows who participated in the recent 2010 International Training Session and who are therefore currently well-connected to the LEAD network.

ment challenges, but the role of such networks is highlighted elsewhere (Baas, Brown and Rossi, 2000; AtKisson, 2010).

The network also seems to serve a valuable role in personal support with many Fellows reporting stories of mentorship; strong friendships and supportive relationships helping them through the challenges of delivering developmental action. Many also emphasised the importance of feeling they belong to a coherent group of individuals who share vision and aspirations.

2.2 Diversifying roles and approaches

Ongoing review and refocusing of LEAD's approach to delivery and the role of its training, the network and Fellows has led to some notable evolution over the years. From originally aiming to develop promising individuals and enable them to engage and create change at an international level, LEAD has evolved to build and maintain a network of Fellows both at the international and local level increasingly focussed on impact and project delivery. Early network development activities encouraged the formation of a strong visible community of LEAD Fellows. Partnerships, internships and exchanges were set up and Fellows were promoted as speakers at events, or nominated for key positions, board memberships and delegations to international conferences. Grants were made available for research and policy advocacy and to support the implementation of practical, on-the ground projects (Byravan, 2010).

This shift in emphasis was perhaps also due in part to changes in LEAD's operational context. In 2000, the Rockefeller Foundation approved a final five-year grant to LEAD, prompting the organisation to begin to reconsider its business model and search for new sources of income to fund its work. Around the same time, the training market began to 'catch-up' with what had originally been pioneering work undertaken by LEAD. Higher education institutions in developing countries increasingly began incorporating sustainable development and leadership training into their curriculum and numerous other competitors began to offer developmental leadership training similar to LEAD (Masood 2010; Prewitt, 2010).

In an increasingly competitive operating environment and with the further professionalisation of the development sector, LEAD began to place greater emphasis on demonstrating its impact. As a result, Fellows were increasingly portrayed as agents of change in their communities and organisations, facilitating direct impact through the implementation of projects. Not all supported this shift in emphasis and it created some tensions, with some across the LEAD network remaining dedicated to retaining the old model, while others actively pushed for LEAD to demonstrate its impacts more effectively (Lo, 2010)²⁰. Some supporting evidence was provided by the first comprehensive impact evaluation which took place in 2001 (Frankel and Harris, 1992) and subsequently anecdotal evidence and data was collected from training sessions on numerous occasions (LEAD, 2008). However no system for consistent monitoring and evaluation was put in place to trace the actual link between the training, its impact and the intended sustainable development outcomes, despite interest from numerous staff and Fellows to do this (De Wit, 2010; Chiotha, 2010).

From 2000, LEAD also began to diversify its activities. Departing from its initial focus on cultivating and supporting LEAD Fellows, the training offering has been broadened to include programs delivered for governments and private companies²¹ and the organisation has increasingly incorporated more direct management of development projects such as implementing community based climate change adapta-

²⁰ Mass Lo, Director of LEAD Francophone Africa, developed the idea of 'National Associations' of Fellows (in each country in his Member Program region) to demonstrate Fellows' practical projects and impact.

²¹ For example during 2007, LEAD began to deliver extensive training for the HSBC Banking Group.

tion in Africa and post-tsunami relief in Indonesia²².

LEAD was first developed with the objective of contributing to change at the international level by cultivating well-equipped individuals to better represent developing countries at international conferences and negotiating tables. The training was designed to accelerate this process by providing cohorts of experts ready to engage on sustainability issues at a high level and able to consider different perspectives and embrace the complexity of development challenges. The idea that individuals could be agents of change at any level, within their organisation and amongst their peers, became central. The process of curriculum review and external factors such as changes in LEAD's operating environment and the resources at its disposal led to an evolution in its theory of change. Although views differed across the Member Programs, LEAD slowly evolved to incorporate a less ambitious, or simply less universal and more bottom-up, understanding of what drives sustainable development. This understanding was built on the assumption that sustainable development can also be driven by local action and individuals at any level within their communities or organisations, using their networks, knowledge and skills to lead by personal example or through dedicated projects targeting change.

LEAD's governance structure, with its independent and nationally based Member Programs, was key in ensuring that training was well tailored and appropriate to local delivery context and accounts for the level of variation in training content across the organisation. The network gradually developed to become a crucial feature of the organisation and, despite variation across Member Programs, LEAD training remains a coherent program in the view of most of its members and participants.

It appears that some features remain key in explaining the objectives and vision of LEAD. Individuals are the key change agents, but they are supported in many ways (personally as well as professionally) by a network of individuals sharing their vision and experience. Sustainable development is seen as a problem of collective action and individuals are urged to work together to address it.

²² See: <http://www.lead.org/page/12> [last consulted 08/12/2010].

3.0

The International Training Sessions

As described earlier, LEAD Fellowship training is convened through two main types of sessions: the National/Regional Sessions and the International Sessions. While the International Training Sessions have always been a part of the LEAD Fellowship program (Prewitt, 1990), their structure and content have changed over time reflecting broader trends in the evolution of the program. In this chapter we describe these International Sessions, highlighting key content and outlining how their structure and delivery has evolved over successive training cohorts.

3.1 Evolution of the structure

Beginning in 1992, the first cohort of LEAD Fellowship training²³ included two International Sessions delivered midway and at the end of the program. This soon increased to three with the addition of a further 'introductory' session in cohort 2²⁴ but then reverted back to two in cohort 5²⁵ and later to just one session in cohort 12²⁶. The duration of each of these International Sessions also changed throughout this period from an initial average of eleven days in earlier cohorts²⁷ to just six days in later cohorts²⁸.

The two International Sessions broadly reflected the content of the two stages (years) of the Fellowship program curriculum and the content of the sessions were clearly defined.

The first session aimed to provide the opportunity for participants to build relationships of mutual understanding, to increase their leadership skills and their ability to intervene in the sustainable development arena. Content focused on scientific foundations including environmental science, ecosystem patterns and interaction with human systems (LEAD, 1993a; LEAD, 1993b).

The second session aimed to provide participants with "real world" exercises to put their training into practice through simulations and the exploration of local case studies. The aim was to build participants' leadership skills and their ability to develop effective responses to sustainable development challenges (LEAD, 1993a; LEAD, 1993c).

The addition of a third International Session in cohort 2 was intended to provide stronger orientation

²³ LEAD cohort 1, 1992-1994.

²⁴ LEAD cohort 2, 1993-1995.

²⁵ LEAD cohort 5, 1996-1998.

²⁶ LEAD cohort 12, 2007.

²⁷ From cohort 1-10 (1992-2003).

²⁸ From cohort 11 (2004) onwards.

to the program and help strengthen training quality (LEAD, 1993-2010) but due to the additional cost burden, various logistical complications and some overlap in content, the number of sessions subsequently reverted to two from cohort 5 onwards (LEAD, 1993-2010).

Being the most resource intensive and time-consuming part of the training, the International Sessions became an early casualty of the reduction in funding and suffered from the reluctance or inability of associates to devote substantial amounts of time to the training (LEAD, 1993-2010). This problem was noted by the Board when reviewing the failure to establish a LEAD Fellowship program in the US, where holidays were restricted and employers were not keen to allow individuals to take long periods of time off for training (Marton Lefevre, 2010).

With the introduction of the new international team and changes in the governance system, the content and delivery of the international sessions began to evolve. Taking over organisation of the sessions in 1998, LEAD's new CEO, Julia Marton Lefevre, and Head of Training, Gillian Martin Meyers, took the decision to maintain just two International Sessions per cohort, with optional regional sessions at the end of the first year (LEAD, 1993-2010). It appears these sessions lost the differentiation present between earlier sessions and presented skills modules, case studies and group work across both sessions (LEAD, 1993-2010). The sessions continued to take place over two weeks and generally at least two locations (e.g. the 2001 International Session based in Moscow flew participants to Armenia, Moldova and the Republic of Kalmykia) (LEAD, 1993-2010).

The new team took the decision to move away from the "safe locations"²⁹ originally favoured by the Rockefeller Foundation (Marton Lefevre, 2010). Consequently, the 1998 International Session took place in China and aimed at presenting an in-depth overview of the local and national challenges of sustainable development in that context. Changes to the location of the sessions enabled the development of a stronger relationship between the Member Programs hosting the International Sessions and the international secretariat (Martin Mehers, 2010). This, together with the curriculum development process³⁰ and the training of trainers exercise³¹, also influenced the evolution and coordination of the curriculum of the Member Program's national/regional sessions.

The team also emphasised the need for more interactive methods. Even though this requirement was present in the earliest concept notes (LEAD, 1990; LEAD, 1992a; LEAD 1993), it seems that trainees and the new team were not satisfied with the dynamics of the sessions. Gillian Martin Mehers describes a static curriculum delivered by the same team of external consultants over the years and explains how they tried to institute a more coherent team with up-to-date delivery methods. Overall, the International Sessions became undifferentiated, with less focus on building national positions³² and the demand for immediate outcomes (e.g. papers, professional articles and evaluation of the case studies) also appeared to diminish (LEAD, 1993-2010).

Cohorts 10³³ and 11³⁴ saw some other major transitions in the International Session. The Rockefeller Foundation had initially provided funding for a ten-year program, which was consequently extended for a further three years. Cohort 11 therefore became the first self-funded cohort and changes in the

29 Between 1993 and 1998, the IS took place in Costa Rica (introduction), Thailand (mid-term session) and Zimbabwe (graduation). It should also be noted that political tension increased in Zimbabwe in 1997, even though controversial land reforms had been taken place before.

30 The curriculum development process involved meetings of the Member Program Directors to discuss the coordination of curriculums. It was initiated in 1995-96 and continued until 2003.

31 The training of trainers' process was designed to train the Member Program training staff to deliver the basic modules of the LEAD fellowship training.

32 The earlier cohorts demanded "country position papers" on the key topics and included activities for Member Programs to get back together to reflect on their national perspective on the content delivered during the International Session.

33 LEAD cohort 10 (2003-2004).

34 LEAD cohort 11 (2005-2006).

program were dramatic with the International Session from 2004 becoming compressed into just one session of five-days duration. Despite the reduced delivery time, the overall structure of the session remained the same including leadership skills, case studies, group work and networking sessions.

Following the cessation of Rockefeller Foundation funding, another major change in the delivery of the International Sessions was the size of training team, which shrank from a typical staff of thirty LEAD staff and consultants, to about ten. The number of participants financially supported by LEAD International also reduced to just ten (LEAD, 1993-2010) and despite many discussions about whether or not the International Session should remain mandatory³⁵, it ceased to be a compulsory part of the Fellowship Program (LEAD, 1993-2010).

Edward Kellow, who took over as the Head of Learning in 2006 remarked on the lack of effective handover of methods and approaches used in delivery of the International Session (Kellow, 2010) and this may also explain some apparent changes in the sessions over this period.

3.2 Evolution of the context

The International Sessions set-out to provide participants with knowledge, skills, and hands-on practical experience of sustainability leadership, and to this list Edward Kellow (2010) adds personal awareness.

Over time, the knowledge content of the International Sessions evolved from an original focus on environmental science and human-ecosystem relationships (LEAD, 1993c) to an increased questioning of growth and a greater social science-based emphasis (Tudela, 1996). The training also increasingly focused on specific topics such as climate change, population and environment, integration and disintegration and a core curriculum covering the basics of sustainable development also evolved (LEAD, 1993-2010).

This shift in the knowledge content appears to correspond with the emergence of tensions over the innovative approaches used to deliver the Fellowship Program (China, 2010) and the content it included ³⁶(Tudela, 1996; Chiotha, 2010). Consequently, this appears to have diminished the appeal of the International Session for some of the Member Programs³⁷.

The issue of whether LEAD Fellowship training should be officially accredited has also been considered at various stages in its development. Whilst favoured by some Fellows and Member Programs (LEAD, 2010 evaluations), the difficulties of establishing an agreed standard which would align with so many varied academic systems across the regions in which LEAD training was delivered led to the conclusion that the idea was too challenging to be worth pursuing (LEAD, 1993-2010).

The skills development components of the early training, in keeping with LEAD's original theory of change, largely focused on competencies required for international negotiations: conflict resolution, presentation and negotiation skills (LEAD, 1993b). It seems that the different sessions then introduced modules that were more focused on general leadership skills at the local as much as the interna-

35 This is especially true of the early training, when many participants could not attend all International Sessions/ regional mid-term sessions.

36 A number of interviewees noted that LEAD was selecting specialists in various spheres, and could therefore not aim at making everyone more specialised in their own fields, but rather introduce them to different perspectives. Others, such as Sosten Chiotha (2010), regretted that the content became less academic and high level than it was before. A similar debate is seen surrounding Tudela's report (1996), where some comments note that the content of the proposed revised curriculum is too ambitious, and aiming at covering as much as an academic program.

37 Huxin (2010) indicates that the International Sessions have lost their relevance for the Chinese LEAD Fellowship training, as they are considered too interactive and not sufficiently academic in their content.

tional level (e.g. stakeholder engagement). The leadership skills (e.g. negotiation, stakeholder consultation, presentation) presented in the Fellowship training are both a reflection of the model of sustainable development leadership applied by LEAD as well as a reflection of the type of action the Fellows hoped to engage in on completing the program. In some cases they have also mirrored wider trends in the sustainable development learning community, one example being the shift in emphasis from 'stakeholder consultation' in 1998 to 'stakeholder engagement' in 2007 (LEAD, 1993-2010). However, despite LEAD's claim to be constantly developing groundbreaking approaches, there is some suggestion that the skills content hasn't changed that much and that LEAD is not currently as innovative as it used to be.

The practical experience components of the training were presented through field visits and case studies relating to themes explored in the program (e.g. visits to water-poor regions, while studying water management in Mexico). Despite being compressed to fit the overall reduction in the duration of the sessions over time, this element appears to have remained a constant part of the training throughout the evolution of the International Session. Case studies were presented both at the international and national/regional level and designed to confront participants with real life examples to test and develop the skills and knowledge they gained through the training. Further time was then allocated for participants to reflect on the case study and the learning journey accomplished.

While training was largely delivered face-to-face, LEAD also made good use of information technology developments in the delivery of both the national/regional and international sessions. In early cohorts, participants were provided with their own computers and trained in their basic use, while more recent cohorts increasingly used live web-forums, social networking and other online tools, increasing the amount of electronic-based training delivery in the Fellowship program.

3.3 Key components of the training

3.3.1 Systems Thinking

Systems Thinking has been, and continues to be, a key component of LEAD Fellowship training. It has its roots in the evolution of development thinking around the time of LEAD's inception in 1991, following the publication of the Brundtland report (The Brundtland Commission, 1987) and just prior to the 1992 UN Earth Summit in Rio that established sustainable development as a legitimate concept on the international scene. LEAD was part of a growing trend in projects addressing development challenges from this new 'sustainability' perspective and the Systems Thinking approach was becoming an increasingly respected concept, particularly well suited to understanding the complex interactions between human and ecological systems. Consequently, systems thinking became a key component of LEAD training from the outset (LEAD, 1993a) and its continuing inclusion in the program has, over time, contributed to the establishment and wider application of the approach.

When the new training team took over in 1998, leading Systems Thinking advocate, Professor Dennis Meadows, joined the team to coordinate the leadership skills modules³⁸. Meadows went on to develop among other things, computer games simulating the system dynamics and limits to growth and his involvement in LEAD training appears to be part of a broader mission to raise global awareness of the challenges presented by unsustainable patterns of development.

Around the same time LEAD was being established, the AtKisson Group³⁹ also began developing

³⁸ Meadows also recommended Gillian Martin Mehers for the Head of Training position she assumed the same year.

³⁹ http://www.atkisson.com/www_history.php

training based on Systems Thinking, designed by Donatella Meadows, another lead author of *The Limits to Growth* (Behrens W. et al, 1974) and former wife of Dennis Meadows. Donatella Meadows went on to create her own training in 1996 within the Sustainability Institute.⁴⁰ The LEAD curriculum was also born out of discussions within the Balaton Group, a scientific network set up by the Meadows' in 1982, self-defined as “cross-disciplinary, multi-cultural, and inter-generational meeting point for leaders and thinkers in sustainable development”.⁴¹

This LEAD approach to leadership was therefore strongly influenced by trends emerging from the work of this group of systems thinkers who continued developing their work through games and training (Dennis Meadows authored ten books and numerous educational games related to sustainable development leadership). Unique in its broad international application and focus on developing country context, LEAD's promotion of systems thinking continues to be evident with dedicated Systems Thinking modules and the application of Meadow's 'FishBanks' game continuing to be included in most national/regional and international Fellowship training sessions today.

3.3.2 Social Capital

Developing social capital among the Fellows within each cohort has also been a key component of LEAD Fellowship training. From its inception, the training at national/regional and international level was designed to incorporate informal activities to encourage participants to build social capital in the form of personal relationships and understanding within and across cultures, sectors and disciplines (LEAD, 1992a).

To help achieve this, participants were often organized into ad hoc thematic and geographic task groups. Typically, training tasks would then be assigned to participants in groups sharing their nationality (e.g. the production of national position papers on the sessions' topics), or their professional/sectoral background (e.g. the production of sectoral position papers). Thematic debates would also be encouraged through the initiation of informal discussions such as “Interest Groups” in 1998 or “Take the Lead” sessions in 2010⁴² (LEAD, 1993-2010). These activities directly linked to the aim of forming coalitions of leaders at the national and sector level by developing common understanding and language between individuals who would go on to influence and negotiate future environmental policies (LEAD, 1993c).

The formation of 'Working Groups' has also played a key role within the International Sessions since 1993 and continues today (LEAD, 1993-2010). Based on a similar rationale to the ad hoc task groups, Working Groups were established within each cohort as ongoing team units for undertaking training tasks such as field visits, group debates and presentations. Working Groups were deliberately designed to include a diversity of participants, mixing nationality, professional background and interests to challenge and develop participant's ability to work together in diverse teams (LEAD, 2004a). Working in this way provided an active learning experience for participants in how to coordinate and confront different perspectives to produce more effective results. These groups reveal both the importance of the international dimension of the LEAD program, and the usefulness of the International Sessions.

40 http://www.sustainer.org/?page_id=59

41 <http://www.balatongroup.org/>

42 Interest groups were convened around similar personal or professional interest, participants were encouraged to form those groups early on, but two evenings were formally set-aside for this activity between 1998 and 2003. In more recent cohorts, (cohort 15 in 2010 for example) the International Session asked participants to “Take the Lead” and over an afternoon the trainees were encouraged to announce a topic of interest, pick a room and navigate between conversations that might be of relevance to them. Participants were often strongly pushed to develop projects and partnerships during those periods, and in 1998 some seed grants were provided for projects created during those time periods (LEAD, 1993-2010).

4.0

Member Program Case Studies: Mexico, Indonesia and Francophone Africa

4.1 Member Program structure and characteristics

To compare and contrast the delivery of the LEAD Program across varied international contexts, this study focuses on three Member Program case examples: Mexico, Indonesia and Francophone Africa. These Member Programs are situated on three different continents, and represent fairly well the diverse international dimensions and varied contexts in which the LEAD Program has been delivered.

Mexico and Indonesia are part of the original LEAD Program established in 1992, while Francophone Africa only began in 2001. Contrasting their experiences highlights some interesting similarities, and distinct differences providing the basis for further exploration of how these factors may impact on the Program's overall outcomes and development impact.

We begin by providing some background about each program before presenting their similarities and differences, linking them to our research questions.

4.1.1 LEAD Mexico

The Mexican Program was created in 1991 and since that time has been based in El Colegio de Mexico, one of the most renowned academic organisations in the country. The program is delivered by the University's Center for Demographic, Urban and Environmental Studies⁴³ where its official title is the Program of Advanced Studies in Sustainable Development and the Environment.⁴⁴ Both the program Director and Head of Training are part of the University's academic staff and deliver other courses there as part of their job.

LEAD Mexico is not the only LEAD Program to be based in a university (for example, LEAD Southern and Eastern Africa moved to Chancellor College in Malawi after leaving Zambia, having earlier moved out of Zimbabwe for security reasons) but was selected as a case study due to a number of features which make it particularly interesting.

LEAD Mexico's current Director, Boris Graizbord, has been in place since 1995, which may partly explain why this program retains much of the Fellowship Program's original ambitions to train a small group of leaders from developing countries to engage in and influence international negotiations and processes (Graizbord, 2010). The program places a strong emphasis on developing analytical capacity (Graizbord, 2010), which compliments the Systems Thinking components and has been a core outcome

⁴³ Centro de Estudios Demográficos, Urbanos y Ambientales.

⁴⁴ Programa de Estudios Avanzados en Desarrollo Sustentable y Medio Ambiente

of LEAD training for the past decade⁴⁵ (LEAD, 1999c).

Another outstanding feature of the Mexico Program is the large proportion of Fellows originating from the governmental sector, explained by the Director as partly due the difficulty experienced in recruiting from the private sector in Mexico. This difficulty is not unique to this Member Program as Indonesia has experienced similar problems (LEAD, 1998-2006) and the USA Program (which was tried and failed twice before being abandoned) also encountered similar difficulties in recruiting from this sector (Marton Lefevre, 2010).

A final interesting feature of LEAD Mexico is its focus on “reality”, the importance placed on engaging with stakeholders and giving trainees the opportunity to learn directly from on-the-ground practitioners (Graizbord, 2010). This distinguishes the Program from a typical academic course in the sense that it was delivered by practitioners rather than academics and grounded in field experience rather than just academic analysis. This is an interesting point to take into account when considering LEAD Mexico’s approach to leadership. It confirms their belief that change occurs through the leadership of individuals and through their ability to capture information, analyse it and translate it into policy change.

4.1.2 LEAD Indonesia

LEAD Indonesia, like LEAD Mexico, was created in 1991 but differs in the sense that it was created as part of a local Non-Governmental Organisation, Yayasan Pembangunan Berkelanjutan (YPB) established in the same year. In this way, it is one of the few Member Programs that were established in a new organisation rather than an established institution, as originally intended by the Rockefeller Foundation. LEAD Indonesia is just one of a number of programs delivered by YPB and its executive director, Darwina Widjajanti, acts as the LEAD Indonesia Member Program Director. YPB focuses on environmental action at the national and international level through the LEAD Fellowship Program and at the local level through various other projects such as eco-fish farming and community renewable energy projects.⁴⁶

LEAD Indonesia has traditionally been one of the Programs that developed a strong focus on case studies and field visits (Tudela, 1996). Its approach was developed at the national and international level and, like LEAD Mexico, it organised a number of mid-term regional and international training sessions. However the program shifted radically in 2004 with the cessation of Rockefeller funding and the direction provided when a new team, led by Darwina Widjajanti, took over the organisation (Widjajanti, 2010).

Interestingly, from its inception in 1991, LEAD Indonesia witnessed major periods of political and economic upheaval in its country’s history. Due to the high level placement of the program, and the visibility of some of its key members⁴⁷, it appears to have played an important part in some of the events and activities of this transformative period in the country’s history. The annual reports describe in detail the political activity of the Indonesian LEAD Fellows, the vigilance of the network, and the monitoring of the impact of political changes on the environment (LEAD, 1998-2006).

Aside from its interesting domestic operating context, the Program distinguishes itself through the

45 In 1999, at a curriculum review retreat in Phuket in Thailand (LEAD, 1999abcd), most of the Member Programs agreed that the analytical skills were the most important outcome of the LEAD training, this was the only objective that came out as an almost enjoying wide consensus (9 Member Programs out of 11 mentioning it).

46 For more details on those programs consult YPB website: www.ypb.or.id.

47 Pr Emil Salim was for a long time a Director and Board Member of LEAD Indonesia. He also sat on the LEAD International Board. Pr Salim was very involved in Indonesian politics and has held four ministerial positions under Suharto (1971: *Minister of State for the Improvement of the State Apparatus*; 1973-1978: *Minister of Communication*; 1978-1983: *Minister of State for Development Supervision and the Environment*; 1983-1993: *Minister of State for Population and the Environment*) and is still involved as an advisor to the current Indonesian President about environment and sustainable development issues.

dynamism of its team and its willingness to review the curriculum every year. Consistent effort is made to identify key themes, select core staff resources and adapt the training to contemporary issues (Widjajanti, 2010). The Indonesian LEAD Fellowship Program appears to have been successful in developing strategic approaches to its training, engaging business and the general public, with a good record of media coverage (LEAD, 1999b).

4.1.3 LEAD Francophone Africa

LEAD Francophone Africa is the youngest of all the LEAD Member Programs and was never directly funded by the Rockefeller Foundation. It was born out of the efforts of Marie Angelique Savané (an early member of the Board of Trustees) to integrate the French-speaking world into the LEAD Program (LEAD, 1993-2010). The program was developed with the support of the Canadian aid agency (CIDA) and based in Senegal within ENDA Tiers Monde, an international NGO already well established on several continents. The LEAD Francophone Africa Program became a significant part of ENDA and drew on many of the organisation's existing employees for its staff team and Director, Mass Lo (Robin, 2007).

LEAD Francophone Africa (LEAD FA) has proved particularly efficient and ambitious since its inception, achieving double the target number of Fellows trained in its first year (Robin, 2007). This ambition continues with the recent establishment of a partnership to scale up the LEAD Fellowship Program together with the two other African LEAD Member Programs through financial support from the Shell Foundation.

LEAD FA differs from LEAD Mexico and Indonesia in that it has had to adopt a regional focus from the outset, providing a Program for trainees located in numerous distinct countries rather than just one. LEAD FA addressed this issue by selecting three to four different countries each year to recruit trainees from and over time developing a network of Fellows covering all the countries in the LEAD FA region (Dieye, 2010). It is particularly interesting to consider how contextual diversity across these various Francophone Africa nations was taken account of in designing the Program's curriculum.

In terms of the method of delivery, partly in response to the challenge of working across a diverse and geographically dispersed region, the LEAD FA Program has strongly embraced e-learning based training (LEAD curriculum description, 2008). It delivers a considerable amount of its training by distance learning supported through online tools which is surprising given that Africa is the continent with the least internet access globally. As a consequence, this approach has also helped make LEAD FA delivery relatively cost efficient when compared to other Member Programs.

4.2 Comparing approaches to selection and post-training activity

In the rest of the chapter we explore in greater depth some of the similarities and differences between our case study Member Program's and how they have evolved. Firstly we examine how trainees are selected and what happens after the completion of training. These two key areas differ across the Member Programs and reveal key insights into how they have interpreted and evolved LEAD's original theory of change to make them their own.

4.2.1 Selection of trainees

The selection process was viewed by early international staff as key to the success of program (Martin

Mehers, 2010; Marton Lefevre, 2010; Prewitt, 2010). The original selection process, designed in early concept notes (LEAD, 1992a) was relatively homogeneous across the Member Programs (Martin Mehers, 2010) including application forms, selection events and individual interviews. The Member Programs originally received hundreds of applications for each cohort opening (LEAD, 1998-2006) and there is no doubt that the change in the financial situation, forcing the organisation to ask potential trainees to contribute to the cost of the training, radically influenced the selection process. It reduced the financial and human resources available for recruitment processes and placed greater demands on trainee's employers to provide finance as well as time-off for their employees to undertake the training.

While discussing the selection process, it is important to remember that the original rationale for the LEAD structure, which incorporated in-county Member Programs, was to base the Programs in well-respected domestic organisations with credibility and experience in the country that would ensure recruitment of the best candidates (LEAD, 1992a).

LEAD Indonesia is in this regard particularly interesting, having developed one of the more strategic and elaborate recruitment processes of all the Member Programs. Selecting participants according to the current training theme⁴⁸ (Widjajanti, 2010) they identify and approach key organisations (within the public and private sector as well as non-governmental organisations and media), which may have some interest or relationship to the selected theme. Interestingly, the intention of this approach is not primarily to target individuals who will subsequently work together following their training, but rather as a targeted marketing technique to improve recruitment (Widjajanti, 2010). Nevertheless, it is easy to imagine how a number of trainees with shared interest in a common theme undertaking weeks of training together could lead to further post-training collaborations.

LEAD Mexico's selection process pursues a different strategy, building ongoing partnerships with some key organisations in diverse sectors⁴⁹ to provide training for their employees (Boris Graizbord, 2010). Agreements are signed between the LEAD Member Program and key environmental and development organisations (e.g. government ministries and the state owned oil company) in order to formalise the regular participation of their staff in LEAD training. According to LEAD Mexico's Director, this has enabled some institutions to be profoundly penetrated by the LEAD philosophy and approach, in key areas for sustainable development (Graizbord, 2010).

LEAD Francophone Africa has recently been developing a new selection process as part of the LEAD Africa Member Program's collective efforts to harmonize training over the continent. Applicants undertake an interview and test to identify a balance between their current skills and their potential to develop further. Particular consideration is also given to whether applicants will have time available to develop and carry out projects following their training (Mass Lo, 2010).

These examples of some of the different approaches to trainee selection adopted by Member Programs serve to illustrate yet further the diversity with which LEAD Fellowship training is delivered across different contexts.

4.2.2 Post-training activities

Another important area of consideration in our comparison of Member Programs is the activity which takes place following the training. This reveals something of the type of activities encouraged and supported by Member Programs following Fellows' completion of their training and gives us clues to

⁴⁸ As mentioned earlier, in LEAD Indonesia, each cohort dealt with a specific contemporary theme at the national as well as international level.

⁴⁹ With the exception of private sector organizations, which as previously mentioned has been limited.

the type of impact they may go on to have.

Although we focus here on the post-training activity at the Member Program level, the LEAD network also maintains an important international dimension through the LEAD International network. Both international and nationally coordinated networks coexist within the LEAD Fellowship but Member Programs have always been considered as the key contact for Fellows (Mawson, 2010) and so it is on these Member Program networks that we currently focus here.

As briefly discussed earlier, for some Member Programs - such as LEAD Indonesia - post-training activities are not considered the responsibility of the LEAD Member Program and initiatives (if any) are left for the Fellows themselves to decide on and initiate (Widjajanti, 2010). Despite this, acknowledgment is given to the importance of the LEAD network for Fellows following their training, but largely as a professional resource rather than to initiate post-training activity.

Other Member Programs, such as LEAD FA contrast greatly with this view considering the training to be just the first step towards the greater outcome of the program, to engage in post-training activities and develop national associations of sustainability leaders engaged in change (Mass Lo, 2010). Due to the particularity of this program, its regional scope and the focus on impact-driven activities (partly influenced by the civil society background of its staff and host institution), the post-training activities appear to be one of the key features of the training program. Covering an immense and diverse region, the LEAD FA Program encouraged Fellows to establish and build their own national associations following completion of the Program. These independent legal entities with official affiliation to LEAD, bring together Fellows in their home countries enabling development of projects particular to their groups and national context (Dieye, 2010).

The LEAD Mexico perspective on the importance of network activities is equally elaborate and interesting and, as mentioned earlier, the program places a good deal of emphasis on developing strong relationships among the Fellows (Graizbord, 2010). LEAD Mexico's Director has a very clear view on the importance of developing social capital and the value of the LEAD network. He describes the key importance of social connections for an effective society, particularly in the context of poverty and poor quality public services and emphasizes the significance of strong, well-networked social relationships for delivering sustainable development. Consequently, LEAD Mexico's post-training activities have typically included inter-cohort meetings,⁵⁰ and placed a good deal of emphasis on the fun and informal dimensions of the training (a reputation which now precedes them at LEAD International Sessions).

4.2.3 Common and distinctive features in the programs' evolution

Now that we have outlined many of the key characteristics and distinctive features of our case study Member Programs and explored some of the variation between them, we shall finish by reviewing in greater depth some of the common and distinctive features in their evolution.

It appears that some common agreement exists over how all of these programs have evolved with all Directors explaining how the training has "broadened" its focus over time (Widjajanti, 2010; Lo, 2010; Graizbord, 2010). This change in paradigm, from training focused just on international negotiations and processes to a program with diverse focuses and perspectives, is not perceived as a loss in focus or a complete shift but as an expansion of LEAD's domain of action. As described earlier, the reasons for this broad change are diverse and include: the need to diversify activities to secure further funding; a growing trend in the aid community for result-driven programs; and adapting to Member Programs'

⁵⁰ Notably these have reduced in number with more recent funding limitations.

own national development contexts (Widjajanti, 2010; Lo, 2010; Graizbord, 2010).

How the programs evolved in this way can be explained through a combination of factors influenced by their national context and original institutional structure. A key turning point for Indonesia, for example, was the political unrest and economic turmoil of 1998. While the political engagement of the program is highlighted, it seems that the new staff team actually focussed more on the economic challenges of the country. The evolution of the Mexican Program appears intrinsically linked to its host institution. Being located within a university, its Director considered the development of on-the-ground projects as impractical (Graizbord, 2010). That said, a number of workshops, conferences and support for civil society action indicates some degree of broadening in the program's reach. The Francophone Africa Program also provides a good example of how much the evolution of the LEAD Programs was linked to their host institution and the background of their staff. The Senegalese headquarters of the Program had already been involved in the delivery of several projects, linking development and the environment. Therefore incorporating such work into the LEAD Program (particularly given the number of development professional's on the staff team) was a natural way to progress.

Aside from the influence which the political and institutional context appears to have had on Programs' evolution, some other changes appear to be common across all Programs. For instance, the devolution of responsibility for delivering skills modules from the International Sessions to the Member Program's own national/regional sessions is due to the reduction in length and number of International Sessions (Graizbord, 2010). This devolvement presented capacity development requirements at Member Program level that were met by 'training of trainer' sessions for Member Program staff. These were organised regularly from 2000 to ensure the quality of delivery of these modules in the absence of the original international trainers.

All Member Programs, to various extents, also had to reduce the length and number of their sessions. Mexico, Indonesia and Francophone Africa appear to have maintained around 4 to 5 sessions, considerably more than the European Program, which currently now includes only two face-to-face sessions. We noted before, however, that e-learning was incorporated to differing extents for most of the Member Programs and this has increasingly been used in preparation for the International Session, with such preparation now all but gone from the Member Program curriculum (Tudela, 1996; LEAD, 1999b). This might be partly due to the diminishing importance of country groups and position papers within the International Session, together with the reduced importance of this session overall (becoming a non compulsory part of the LEAD Program).

Interestingly, while the organisation has a history of effective coordination and cooperation amongst its Member Programs⁵¹, this cooperation appears to have diminished in the design, delivery and follow up activities with the Fellows (Widjajanti, 2010; Lo, 2010; Graizbord, 2010). The exchange of good practice, which took place in the past (e.g. collaborative events and curriculum retreats), also appears to be very limited nowadays (Widjajanti, 2010; Lo, 2010; Graizbord, 2010).

If context has played a significant part in the evolution of the Member Program's activities then we would expect this to have undermined the consistency of the training across the LEAD Fellowship Program as a whole. However, it appears that some core modules still remain present and coherently delivered in most Member Program curriculum. For example, almost all Directors interviewed mentioned Systems Thinking as an important asset to their Programs (Widjajanti, 2010; Lo, 2010; Graizbord, 2010; Chiotha, 2010). A study of the different Programs' curricula over time and across continents reveals consistent similarities through the inclusion of skills, knowledge, practical experience

⁵¹ We are referring here to the grouped mid-terms session organized by 2 or 3 Member Programs. Those sessions actually being an answer to the lack of collaboration between Member Programs witnessed in the early days of the training (Martin Mehers, 2010).

and self-awareness components. It also reveals an underlying common logic and structure including: Group work; Group projects; Case studies; Field visits; System Thinking and a multi-cultural, multi-sector approach (LEAD Mexico, Indonesia and Francophone Africa Curriculum, 1992-2010).

It is however, important to remind ourselves that LEAD training is now delivered by individuals with quite diverse perspectives and understanding of the LEAD rationale and theory of change. Amongst the Member Program Directors interviewed for this research, one mentioned skills as being the key aspect of the training (Thierren, 2010), while another emphasised knowledge (Graizbord, 2010). Where some emphasised post-training activities and associations (Lo, 2010) others played-down the importance of this aspect ((Widjajanti, 2010). Consequently it is striking how the organisation has maintained such consistency in the core elements of its delivery, despite trainers and staff based in different political, economic, cultural and organisational contexts possessing such varied views over what is most important.

Conclusion

Throughout this paper we have aimed to explore two sets of core questions:

- What are the objectives of the LEAD training process and how do LEAD programs seek to achieve them? How, if at all, does the LEAD training process seek to encourage the creation of developmental networks? And does the process aim to deepen Fellows' understanding of the collective action problems of development and the political means for their resolution in different institutional contexts?
- How have the training philosophies, curricula and practical programs evolved since the inception of LEAD? And what differentiation has occurred between and across national LEAD programs and LEAD International's practices?

We have sort to address these questions through a review of LEAD's archive documents and through interviews with LEAD staff and Fellows. Based on this, we built a picture of LEAD's organisational history describing the key components of its training programs and how they have evolved over time and context.

LEAD's objectives and its theory of change for achieving them originated from a particular understanding of the politics of change. LEAD's architects believed that voices from the developing world needed to be heard more loudly at international level to help better understand and address the unsustainable patterns of development and to articulate efficient responses to address them. The LEAD program was designed to help enable this by cultivating and enabling key individuals from developing countries to participate more effectively in international political processes affecting environment and development.

The rationale was to select individuals with the potential to exert political influence to promote sustainable development in future and with this in mind trainees were broadly selected on the basis of their leadership potential, career trajectory and interest in sustainable development.

The next step was to equip these trainees with the skills knowledge and support they needed to engage and influence these processes. Broadly this included developing their analytical ability, knowledge of sustainable development, leadership skills and personal awareness. Finally they were to be integrated into a network of individuals having undertaken the program. This was to be done through creating a close circle of international negotiators who would introduce the perspectives and insights developed through their LEAD Fellowship. In this way it was hoped that a new generation of sustainable development leaders would be created who, brought together through the LEAD training and network, would inform and influence international processes more effectively.

The curriculum and syllabus of the training reflected those objectives by integrating leadership skills relevant to international negotiations (e.g. negotiation, presentation and problem-solving), and providing them with in-depth analysis to build their understanding of sustainable development (e.g. the interaction between environmental, social and economic factors). Fellows' perspectives and frameworks of analysis were informed by Systems Thinking, delivered in skills modules and applied in real life case studies. Other learning methods were added over time, embracing new technologies and in particular the internet as it became an increasingly valuable virtual learning, project collaboration and social networking tool.

Visions and perspectives across LEAD and its Member Programs have evolved since the inception of the program. Whilst some of the original curriculum remains, the impacts expected are now broader and the content has evolved accordingly. Skills modules are now made relevant for domestic project delivery (e.g. stakeholder engagement and advocacy work) as much as international negotiations and policy work. Knowledge content has also shifted emphasis to include more on-the-ground and practitioner experience as the more conceptual and academic content concerning sustainable development has become increasingly available elsewhere in courses run by other institutions.

In order to promote institutional reform and solve problems of collective action, LEAD has been counting on cultivating and catalyzing the leadership of key individuals. Our conclusion is that nowadays the LEAD approach cannot be summarized within one theory of change. Rather its approach has now broadened and theories of change vary across the organisation's different Member Programs.

The anticipated development impacts of LEAD's efforts are situated at various levels. The impact it was anticipated to have was always that which the Fellows would have after the training, thanks to their newly acquired knowledge, skills and network. The organisation was created with a particular objective in mind, namely increasing the effectiveness of developing world involvement within international environment and development negotiations and policy-making. However it quickly evolved to encompass much broader impact, from on-the-ground projects to policy recommendations. But despite this, impacts on international negotiations still remain an important aspect of the training objectives even today⁵² and developmental networks and coalitions brought about through the LEAD Fellowship are an important part of the processes facilitating this. How this takes place in practice is likely to be through peer support and the development of strong professional relationships, but this remains to be explored further.

Beyond this focus on policy development and negotiations, our understanding of the developmental impact of the network is also informed by the varied advisory, advocacy and academic work that has been undertaken and through the papers, reports, books and other publications which have been produced by LEAD and its Fellows over the years.

Finally, another area of potential impact includes the collective and individual efforts of LEAD Fellows in the delivery of field projects covering a wide range of interventions in the areas of community development, waste management and sustainable agriculture, to name a few (LEAD, 1998-2010).

The impact of the network, the importance of social capital, common language and professional support, remains unexplored. Reviews attest to how active LEAD networks are and how important and relevant they have shown to be through mentorship and peer support and in the development and delivery of successful development interventions (LEAD, 2005). This too provides a rich area to

52 The potential impact of LEAD in that area is reinforced by the organization of formal delegations of Fellows at the Johannesburg summit, for instance, along with the organization of several side events by LEAD (LEAD, 2002). Regional and national sustainable development policies are also an important entry point for Fellows impact.

explore in further research.

A number of factors have influenced the development and evolution of the training, many of them broadly managerial and financial. The difficulty in coordinating a network of host organisations across multiple countries, languages, and contexts is obvious within the LEAD story. Member Programs and the international training team have responded in different ways and with varying degrees of success to the new restrained financial circumstances after the cessation of funding from its original beneficiary. However, many of the factors influencing the evolution of LEAD have originated from the cultural and professional backgrounds of the local and international staff. The training was originally designed by influential professionals and then adapted by Member Program staff to fit their domestic economic, political and cultural situations and needs. Much of the influence also came from the Member Programs' host organisations which informed curriculum training program priorities over the years.

These are the main conclusions we have reached in considering our original research questions. Many uncertainties and crucial inquiries remain however, including:

- What explains the different outcomes between the more and less successful cases?
- How much can be explained with reference to the LEAD process?
- How much can be explained with reference to agential factors, such as the Fellows play?
- How much can be explained with reference to the structural/institutional context in which Fellows' initiatives have been situated?

Opportunities for further research can be easily extracted from this paper. A comparative analysis of the impacts of the original "extensive"⁵³ training sessions compared to the later "reduced"⁵⁴ versions is one example and the RMC Research Corporation report (Frankel, Harris, 2002) provides a useful departing point for such comparative work.

A study of the impacts and functioning of the international network and a number of the national/regional networks also appears to be a rich area for further study. This could provide useful insight into the relative impacts of diverging national/regional approaches such as post training networking, which varies greatly across the Member Programs.

Another area to consider could be the importance of the choice of the trainers and the relative importance of training content (knowledge versus skills for instance). Such research could also seek to understand the importance of cultural and contextual variables and look at some depth into the difference made by the amount of time trainees spend together.

Finally, the question of social capital and its impact on sustainable development seems key to the LEAD network. At a time when the role of social networks (particularly those facilitated by internet and communication technologies) appear to be playing an increasing role in influencing policy, this could also be a rich area for further exploration.

⁵³ Two years, three international sessions.

⁵⁴ This involved less than a year, and only one international session.

REFERENCES

Books and articles

- Baas, L., Brown, H., and Rossi, M. (2000) 'Leaders in sustainable development: how agents of change define the agenda', *Business Strategy and the Environment*, 9:5, 273–286
- Behrens, W., Meadows, D., Meadows, D. H., Randers, J. (1974) *The Limits to growth: A report for the Club of Rome's Project on the Predicament of Mankind* (New York: Universe Books)
- Booth Sweeney, L. and Meadows, D. (2010) *The Systems Thinking Playbook: Exercises to Stretch and Build Learning and Systems Thinking Capabilities* (White River Jct., VT: Chelsea Green Publishing)
- Coleman (1984) 'Professorial Training and Institution Building in the Third World: Two Rockefeller Foundation Experience', *Comparative Education Review*, 28: 2, 180-202
- Fosdick, R. (1989) *The Story of the Rockefeller Foundation* (New Jersey: Transaction Publishers)
- Gladwin, Kennelly, and Krause (1995) 'Shifting Paradigms for Sustainable Development: Implications for management theory and research', *The Academy of Management Review*, 20: 4, 874-907
- Gondor, D., Notaras, M. (September 27, 2010) 'Dennis Meadows: Limiting growth to save the world' *United Nations University Website World 2.0*, [online]. Available at <http://ourworld.unu.edu/en/dennis-meadows-limiting-growth-to-save-the-world/> [Last accessed 14th of November 2010]
- Kapoor, R. (2007) 'Introduction Transforming self and society: plural path to human emancipation' *Futures*, 39, 475-486
- Marton-Lefèvre, J. And Martin Mehers, G. (2007) 'A look at the LEAD program as a transformative experience', *Futures*, 39, 619-624
- Pretty, J. And Ward, H. (2001) 'Social Capital and the Environment', *World Development*, 29: 2, 209-227
- Teltsch, K. (July 24 1990) 'Rockefeller Foundation Starts Ecology Effort' *New York Times Archives Online* [online] Available at: <http://www.nytimes.com/1990/07/24/science/rockefeller-foundation-starts-ecology-effort.html> [Last accessed 14th of November 2010]
- The Brundtland Commission (1987) *Our Common Future* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)

LEAD archives documents

- Binger, A. (1991) *Letter to Steering Committee Members* [Personal communication] (LEAD International Archives)
- Binger, A. (1992) *Correspondence to Member Programs Directors an LDP Curriculum Development Committee* [Personal Communication] (LEAD International archives)
- Binger, A. (1994) *Memorandum to Rockefeller* [Personal Communication] (LEAD International archives)

- Byravan, S. (2001) *The LEAD Fellows Program progress Report for 2001* [Internal Report] (LEAD International Archives)
- Frankel, S. and Harris, L. (2002) *Final Report Evaluation of LEAD International Training program* [Consultant Report] (RMC Research Corporation)
- Glazovsky, N. (1996) *Curriculum Review Comments* [personal correspondence] (LEAD International Archives)
- Hendricks, M. et al, (1997) *Repositioning LEAD International, LEAD International and the Rockefeller Foundation* [confidential report] (LEAD International Archives)
- Institut Gorée (2001) *Rapport d'évaluation Première Session Régionale de formation – Cohorte 9 04 janvier – 03 février 2001* [external report] (LEAD FA Archives)
- Kismadi, M. (1993) *The LEAD Program in Indonesia* [conference paper Cohort I First International Session] (LEAD International archives)
- Kismadi, M. (1996) *Curriculum Review Comments* [personal correspondence] (LEAD International Archives)
- LEAD (1991 March) *The 21st Century Leadership Development Program, Supervisory Structure* [Internal report] (LEAD International archives)
- LEAD (1992a) *LEAD_A Concept Paper for the International Dimension* [internal report] (LEAD International Archives)
- LEAD (1992b) *A Concept paper for the international Dimension* [Internal report] August 13th 1992, (LEAD International archives)
- LEAD (1993a) *A Concept Paper for the international Session* [internal report] (LEAD International archives)
- LEAD (1993b) *Leadership for Environment and Development program Curriculum Guidelines for National Sessions* [staff guidelines] (LEAD International archives)
- LEAD (1993c) *Program overview, First international Session Cohort 1992-1994* [staff guidelines] (LEAD International archives)
- LEAD (1993d) *Leadership for Environment and Development program, Program Structure Document, Final Draft* [Internal report] May 4th 1993, (LEAD International archives)
- LEAD (1993e) *Leadership for Environment and Development program, Program Structure Document, Final Draft* [staff guidelines] May, (LEAD International archives)
- LEAD (1993-2010) *Board Meetings Minutes Book* [Internal Report] (LEAD International Archives)
- LEAD (1996-2010) *Annual Reports* [Internal Report] (LEAD International Archives)

LEAD (1998a) *Workbook First international Session, Stakeholders and Decision-Making: Sustainable Development Through Integrated Water Management, 5-16 October 1998, China* [IS Workbook] (LEAD International Archives)

LEAD (1998b) *DRAFT REPORT 3rd MEETING OF LEAD NIRPDS and LEAD INTERNATIONAL STAFF Xi'an, China, 4 October 1998 And Beijing, China, 17-18 October 1998* [internal report] (LEAD International archives)

LEAD (1998-2006) *Rapport annuels 1998-2006* [internal reports] (LEAD International Archives)

LEAD (1998-2010) *Annual Reports* [external marketing] (LEAD Publications)

LEAD (1999a) *Curriculum Development Process and Advisory Committee* [internal document] (LEAD International archives)

LEAD (1999b) *Documents for the Ninth Meeting of the Board of Governors to be held in LEAD Pakistan May 23 1999* [booklet, internal report] (LEAD International archives)

LEAD (1999c) *LEAD Annex: Common Module: The Basics of Sustainable Development* [internal document] (LEAD International archives)

LEAD (1999d) *Proposal for Common Modules: Individual Program Responses* [internal report in Documents for the Ninth Meeting of the Board of Governors] (LEAD International Archives)

LEAD (1999e) *LEAD Approach and Evaluation plan Draft* [internal document] (LEAD International archives)

LEAD (1999d) *Draft Workshop Report LEAD Curriculum Workshop 31 January – 6 February 1999 Phuket Thailand* [internal report], 4th March, 1999 (LEAD International archives)

LEAD (2000a) *LEAD International fellows Program Policies and Procedures* [internal guidelines] (LEAD International Archives)

LEAD (2000b) *Rockefeller Foundation Proposal 1 October 2000 Section V: Expected outcomes at the end of 2001* [internal document] (LEAD International archives)

LEAD (2000c) *LEAD Approach* [internal document] (LEAD International archives)

LEAD (2003a) *LEAD Training of Trainers Workshop, Facilitators Guide to Cross-Cultural Communication, A LEAD Training Module* [booklet, staff guidelines] (LEAD International archives)

LEAD (2003b) *Using Systems Thinking for transformational Change, A Leadership for Environment and development (LEAD) Course for Envision* [booklet, training manual] (LEAD International archives)

LEAD (2004a) *Summit Survival Kit for LEAD delegates to the World Summit on Sustainable development* [booklet] (LEAD International archives)

LEAD (2004b) *Training Across Cultures, A handbook for trainers and Facilitators working Around the World*

(LEAD Publications)

LEAD (2005a) *LEAD Associate project (LAPs) Guidelines* [booklet, staff guidelines] (LEAD International archives)

LEAD (2005b) *LEAD Europe Training programme on Leadership and sustainable Development Training Manual* [booklet, staff guidelines] (LEAD International archives)

LEAD (2006) *LEAD International Training of Trainers Vol II* [booklet, staff guidelines] (LEAD International archives)

LEAD (September 2008) *Cohort Training Review, More Than Just a Logo* [Internal Report] (LEAD International Archives)

LEAD Africa (2010) *LEAD Africa MP Training Programmes* [marketing document] (LEAD FA Archives)

LEAD Francophone Africa (2000-2010) *Incomplete Curriculum of National Sessions* [internal documents] (LEAD FA Archives)

LEAD Francophone Africa (2001) *Rapport d'évaluation du comité d'orientation scientifique en 2001* [internal documents] (LEAD FA Archives)

LEAD Indonesia (1992-2010) *Incomplete Curriculum of National Sessions* [internal documents] (LEAD Indonesia Archives)

LEAD Indonesia (1999) *Report on LEAD Indonesia Program* [internal report] (LEAD International Archives)

LEAD Member Programs (1995-1997) *Feedback on review of curriculum* [Personal Communications] (LEAD International Archives)

LEAD Mexico (1992-2010) *Incomplete Curriculum of National Sessions* [internal documents] (LEAD Mexico Archives)

LEAD Mexico (1999) *Report on LEAD Mexico Program* [internal report] (LEAD International Archives)

LEAD Mexico (2008) *Annual report* [internal report] (LEAD Mexico Archives)

LEAD Mexico (2008) *Measuring the Impact of LEAD: 15 Years of Making a Difference Analysis of results of online survey and key messages* [marketing document] (LEAD Mexico Archives)

LEAD Mexico (no date available) *LEAD Mexico Presentacion* [available online at http://www.lead.colmex.mx/docs/PROGRAMA%20LEAD_informacion%20pag%20web040609.pdf]

LEAD Pakistan (1999) *Documents for the Ninth Meeting of the Board of Governors* [internal report] (LEAD International Archives)

Li, L.. (1996) *Curriculum Review Comments* [personal correspondence] (LEAD International Archives)

- Martin Mehers, G. (2000) *Report on LEAD Curriculum Review Process* [personal correspondence] (LEAD International Archives)
- Martin Mehers, G. (2005) *NIR Program Staff and resource Person Manual, instructions for Working Groups and the Site Visits, Graduation International Session for Cohort 11, Dakar, Senegal 17-22 August 2005* [booklet, staff guidelines] (LEAD International archives)
- Martin Merhers, G. (1999) *General Impressions: Cohort 6* [internal report] (LEAD International archives)
- Martin-Lefevre, J. (2000) *CEO Annual Report to the Board* [Internal report] (LEAD International Archives)
- McGuinty, D. (1996) *Curriculum Review Comments* [personal correspondence] (LEAD International Archives)
- Osuntogun, A. (1996) *Curriculum Review Comments* [personal correspondence] (LEAD International Archives)
- Prewitt, Kenneth (March 19th 1990) *Discussion Paper: International environmental leadership program Background and overview* [Internal report] (LEAD International archives)
- Ramphal, S. (1993) *Remarks by Shridath Ramphal, Chairman, international Steering Committee at the closing ceremony of the International Session of LEAD* [conference paper Cohort 1 First International Session] (LEAD International archives)
- Rattner, H. (1995) *From Global Perspective to Local Action* [IS workbook 1998] (LEAD International Archives)
- Rattner, H. (1995) *Leadership for Sustainable Development* [IS workbook 1998] (LEAD International Archives)
- Rattner, H. (1996) *Curriculum Review Comments* [personal correspondence] (LEAD International Archives)
- Robin, R. (2007) *Les Programmes LEAD en Afrique, rapport prospectif* [external reports] (LEAD International Archives)
- Rockefeller Foundation (1990) *Draft The Global Network for Environment and Development – results anticipated by 1995* [internal report] (LEAD International Archives)
- Tudela (August 26 1996) *Standard Curriculum development Guidelines, Towards a New Curriculum, Revised version* [Consultant report] (LEAD International Archives)

Conferences:

AtKisson A. (2010) *Believing Cassandra and the Sustainability transformation book launch event*, LSE Hong Kong Theatre, Clement House, London, Tues 23 November 2010

Websites:

- LEAD International Website: www.lead.org , last consulted 08/12/2010
- OneWorld 2.0 United Nation University Website: <http://ourworld.unu.edu/en/>, last consulted 19/11/2010
- Rockefeller Foundation Website : www.rockefellerfoundation.org , last consulted 30/12/2010

List of Interviews Conducted (01/10/10 to 19/11/10)

National Program Directors:

- Chiotha, S. (2010) *Interview of Southern and Eastern Africa National Program Director*. Interviewed by Marine Destrez [Face to face, recorded] Summerstrand Hotel, Port Elizabeth, South Africa, 2.11.2010
- Ginzberg, S. (2010) *Interview of CIS/Russia National Program Director*. Interviewed by Marine Destrez [Face to face, non-recorded] Summerstrand Hotel, Port Elizabeth, South Africa, 7.11.2010
- Graizborg, B. (2010) *Interview of Mexico National Program Director*. Interviewed by Marine Destrez [Face to face, non-recorded] Summerstrand Hotel, Port Elizabeth, South Africa, 7.11.2010
- Lo, M. (2010) *Interview of Francophone Africa National Program Director*. Interviewed by Marine Destrez [Face to face, recorded] Summerstrand Hotel, Port Elizabeth, South Africa, 1.11.2010
- Thierren, C. (2010) *Interview of Canada National Program Director*. Interviewed by Marine Destrez [Face to face, recorded] Summerstrand Hotel, Port Elizabeth, South Africa, 2.11.2010

Board Members:

- Abidi-Habib, M. (2010) *Interview of Board Chair*. Interviewed by Marine Destrez [Face to face, recorded] Summerstrand Hotel, Port Elizabeth, South Africa, 5.11.2010
- Cleary, S. (2010) *Interview of Board Member*. Interviewed by Marine Destrez [Face to face, non-recorded] Summerstrand Hotel, Port Elizabeth, South Africa, 5.11.2010
- Elias, V. (2010) *Interview of Board Chair*. Interviewed by Marine Destrez [Face to face, non-recorded] Summerstrand Hotel, Port Elizabeth, South Africa, 5.11.2010
- Kruper, R. (2010) *Interview of Board Member*. Interviewed by Marine Destrez [Face to face, recorded] Summerstrand Hotel, Port Elizabeth, South Africa, 3.11.2010
- Masood, E. (2010) *Interview of Board Member and past Head of Communications*. Interviewed by Marine Destrez [Face to face, recorded] Summerstrand Hotel, Port Elizabeth, South Africa, 6.11.2010

Training staff, past and present:

- Borrega, N. (2010) *Interview of Head of Training in LEAD Mexico*. Interviewed by Marine Destrez [Face to face, non-recorded] Summerstrand Hotel, Port Elizabeth, South Africa, 6.11.2010

- de Wit, A. (2010) *Interview of International Training Consultant and Cohort 12 Fellow*. Interviewed by Marine Destrez [Face to face, recorded] Summerstrand Hotel, Port Elizabeth, South Africa, 4.11.2010
- Dieye, R. (2010) *Interview of Head of Training in LEAD Francophone Africa and Cohort 13 Fellow*. Interviewed by Marine Destrez [Face to face, recorded] Summerstrand Hotel, Port Elizabeth, South Africa, 5.11.2010
- Huxin, November 2010, *Interview of Head of Training in LEAD China and Cohort 11 Fellow*. Interviewed by Marine Destrez [Face to face, recorded] Summerstrand Hotel, Port Elizabeth, South Africa, 3.11.2010
- Kellow, E. (2010) *Interview of Head of Training in LEAD International*. Interviewed by Marine Destrez [Face to face, recorded] LEAD International offices, London, UK, 15.11.2010
- Martin Mehers, G. (2010) *Interview of Head of Training in LEAD International (1998-2004)*. Interviewed by Marine Destrez [Skype call, non-recorded] London-Geneva, 18.11.2010

Staff, past and present:

- Mawson, P. (2010) *Interview of Head of Communication 2003-2005*. Interviewed by Marine Destrez [Skype call, non-recorded] London, 18.11.2010
- Prewitt, K. (2010), *Interview of ex-Vice President of the Rockefeller Foundation and Founder of the LEAD Program*. Interviewed by Marine Destrez [Skype call, non-recorded] 12.11.2010

Fellows:

- Agarwal, D. (2010) *Interview of Cohort 3 India Fellow*. Interviewed by Marine Destrez [Face to face, recorded] Summerstrand Hotel, Port Elizabeth, South Africa, 2.11.2010
- Joubert, E. (2010) *Interview of Cohort 11 Southern and Eastern Africa Fellow and IS 2010 Facilitator*. Interviewed by Marine Destrez [Face to face, recorded] Summerstrand Hotel, Port Elizabeth, South Africa, 5.11.2010
- Lewis, J. (2010) *Interview of Cohort 13 Canada Fellow and IS 2010 Facilitator*. Interviewed by Marine Destrez [Face to face, recorded] Summerstrand Hotel, Port Elizabeth, South Africa, 3.11.2010
- Phartiyal, P. (2010) *Interview of Cohort 9 India Fellow*. Interviewed by Marine Destrez [Face to face, recorded] Summerstrand Hotel, Port Elizabeth, South Africa, 2.11.2010
- Wafo, D. (2010) *Interview of Cohort 11 Francophone Africa Fellow and IS 2010 Facilitator*. Interviewed by Marine Destrez [Face to face, recorded] Summerstrand Hotel, Port Elizabeth, South Africa, 2.11.2010
- Wiyonoputriin, W. (2010) *Interview of Cohort 1 India Fellow and IS 2010 Facilitator*. Interviewed by Marine Destrez [Face to face, recorded] Summerstrand Hotel, Port Elizabeth, South Africa, 4.11.2010

Appendix 1: Fellows Breakdown

LEAD Mexico	Gender Balance	Professional Background
Cohort I	5 female 7 male	Academia: 4 Private: 1 NGO: 2 Public: 4
Cohort 6	8 female 7 male	Academia: 4 Private: 2 NGO: 1 Public: 6
Cohort 11	10 female 7 male	Government: 11 Business: 2 Academia: 3 Media: 1
Cohort 14	9 female 8 male	Government: 11 Business: 3 Academia: 2
Sum cohort I to 14	45% female 55% male	Government: 38% Academia: 26% Business: 21% NGO: 15% Media: 0-1%

LEAD Indonesia	Gender Balance	Professional Background
Cohort I	2 female 9 male	Academia: 2 Media: 2 NGO: 3 Government: 1 Business: 3
Cohort 6	2 female 13 male	Academia: 5 Media: 2 NGO: 4 Business: 3 Government: 1
Cohort 11	7 female 6 male	Academia: 3 Media: 1 NGO: 4 Business: 2 Government: 3
Cohort 14	7 female 7 male	Academia: 2 Media: 1 NGO: 7 Business: 1 Government: 2 Others: 1
Sum cohort I to 14		

55

LEAD Francophone Africa	Gender Balance	Professional Background
Cohort 9	7 female 8 male	Data not available
Cohort 11	18 female 26 male	Data not available
Cohort 14	data not available	Data not available
Sum of cohort 9 to 14	data not available	Data not available

LEAD Interntional	Gender Balance	Professional Background
Sum of cohort 1 to 15	44% female 56% male	Government: 25% Academia: 22% NGO: 24% Business: 24% Media: 5% Other: 5%

APPENDIX 2. EVALUTATION FORM INTERNATIONAL SESSION 2010

LEAD International Session (IS), Port Elizabeth, 2012: Participant Feedback Form

Your name and programme:.....

Your Working group: please circle your working group

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

1 Introduction

The purpose of this form is to gather your feedback on the key aspects of the IS to help us review the effectiveness of the programme. We would like your feedback on WHAT we covered (content, themes, topics) and HOW we delivered the learning activities (processes and facilitation). You have already given us feedback on the skills modules but please feel free comment further on the skills modules.

2 Overall

a) How would you rate the following out of 10, where 10 is excellent and 1 is very poor?

Overall value of attending (out of 10)	
Quality of discussion (out of 10)	
Choice of panellists (out of 10)	
Format of event (out of 10)	

b) How likely would you be to recommend future LEAD events to others, where 10 is definitely recommend and 1 is definitely not recommend?

Likely to recommend (out of 10)	
---------------------------------	--

c) Were you aware that Shell is associated with the International Session?

Yes	
No	

d) How do you feel about Shell being associated with LEAD, where 10 is extremely positive and 1 is extremely negative?

Shell association (out of 10)	
-------------------------------	--

e) What other topics or improvements would you like to see LEAD offer in the future?

3 The Case Studies

Please tell us about your experience of the case studies. How did they help your understanding of leadership and sustainability challenges and solutions? How could we improve them?
I liked...
The case studies would have been better if...

4 The Thematic Panels

Please tell us about your experience of the thematic panels. How did they help your understanding of leadership and sustainability challenges and solutions? How could we improve them?
I liked...
The panels would have been better if...

5 Site visits

Please tell us about your experience of the site visit How did the site visit help your understanding of leadership and sustainability challenges and solutions? How could we improve them?
I liked...
The case studies would have been better if...

6 The Working groups (WG)

Please score each of the statements below where 1 is low and 6 is high

6.1 The WGs encouraged participants to share knowledge and learn from each others' experience	1 (low)	2	3	4	5	6 (high)
6.2 The WG has made me more confident in my ability to lead a culturally diverse team	1 (low)	2	3	4	5	6 (high)
6.3 The WG has made me more confident in my ability to communicate my ideas in a culturally diverse team	1 (low)	2	3	4	5	6 (high)
6.4 The WG has made me more confident in my ability to give constructive feedback in a culturally diverse team	1 (low)	2	3	4	5	6 (high)

6.5 Comment box: Please write your comments about the working groups here:

--

7 Other key sessions

How useful were the following sessions in helping you to explore the leadership and sustainability challenges? Please circle a number below for each session where 1 = "Not useful" and 6 = "Very useful".

Other Key sessions	Not useful.....Very useful					
Session 12 Networking Fair	1	2	3	4	5	6
Session 16 Visit to Red Location	1	2	3	4	5	6
Session 18 and 23 Take the LEAD (participant led sessions)	1	2	3	4	5	6
Session 21 Open Space Session	1	2	3	4	5	6
Sessions 27-29 Africa Leadership Day	1	2	3	4	5	6
Session 29 In conversation with LEAD fellows	1	2	3	4	5	6
Session 30 Joining the LEAD Network	1	2	3	4	5	6
Please tell us what you liked or how we could improve these sessions.						

8 Logistics and learning resources

8.1 I am satisfied with the level of support from the event team before the IS	1 (low)	2	3	4	5	6 (high)
8.2 I am satisfied with the level of support from the event team during the IS	1 (low)	2	3	4	5	6 (high)
8.3 The IS website contains useful information to download	1 (low)	2	3	4	5	6 (high)
8.4 The workbook is a good guide to the IS	1 (low)	2	3	4	5	6 (high)
8.5 The hotel offered a pleasant learning environment	1 (low)	2	3	4	5	6 (high)
8.6 The hotel is 'environmentally friendly'	1 (low)	2	3	4	5	6 (high)
8.7 The information displays were helpful	1 (low)	2	3	4	5	6 (high)
8.8 The newsletter will help me to remember what we learned during the week	1 (low)	2	3	4	5	6 (high)
Comment box: Please use this box for additional comments						

9 The facilitation team

Please comment on how the facilitators worked with the group and with each other.

10 What will you tell your friends /family / colleagues about the IS?

11 The main aims of the IS: were they achieved?

How far did we go towards achieving the main aims of the IS? Please circle a number below. If you have scored 3 or less, please use the comment box to tell us why.

The main aims of the IS	Not achieved.....Achieved					
1 To provide a core group of emerging leaders from across the world with action orientated learning on key areas of population, climate change and development by exploring leadership and sustainability challenges and opportunities in Port Elizabeth.	1	2	3	4	5	6
2 To provide an opportunity to learn in a cross cultural cross sectoral environment to enable understanding of interdependency and the need for concerted and co-ordinated action by government, civil society, business and other stakeholders	1	2	3	4	5	6
3 To build and strengthen networks linking together individuals and institutions to support exchange of experience in responding to the challenges of population, climate change and development	1	2	3	4	5	6

Other Feedback: Please use this space for additional comments

DLP Publications

Research Papers

1. Jo-Ansie van Wyk (2009) "Cadres, Capitalists and Coalitions: The ANC, Business and Development in South Africa".
2. David Sebudubudu with Patrick Molutsi (2009) "Leaders, Elites and Coalitions in the Development of Botswana".
3. Eduard Grebe with Nicoli Nattrass (2009) "Leaders, Networks and Coalitions in the AIDS Response: A Comparison of Uganda and South Africa".
4. Deborah Brautigam with Tania Diolle (2009) "Coalitions, Capitalists and Credibility: Overcoming the Crisis of Confidence at Independence in Mauritius".
5. Jo Beall with Mduduzi Ngonyama (2009) "Indigenous Institutions, Traditional Leaders and Developmental Coalitions: The Case of Greater Durban, South Africa".
6. Adrian Leftwich (2009) "Bringing Agency Back In: Politics and Human Agency in Building Institutions and States".
7. Junji Banno & Kenichi Ohno (2010) "The Flexible Structure of Politics in Meiji Japan".
8. Marine Destrez & Nick Harrison (2011) "Leadership Training and Network Formation: The evolution of the LEAD process"

Background Papers

1. Adrian Leftwich & Steve Hogg (2007) "Leaders, Elites and Coalitions: The case for leadership and the primacy of politics in building effective states, institutions and governance for sustainable growth and social development".
2. Adrian Leftwich & Steve Hogg (2008) "The Politics of Institutional Indigenization: leaders, elites and coalitions in building appropriate and legitimate institutions for sustainable growth and social development".
3. Heather Lyne de Ver (2008) "Leadership Politics and Development: A Literature Survey".
4. Heather Lyne de Ver (2009) "Conceptions of Leadership".
5. Adrian Leftwich & Steve Hogg (2010) "The Leadership Program: Overview & Objectives".
6. Adrian Leftwich (2010) "An Overview of the Research in Progress for the Leadership Program: Developmental Leaders, Elites and Coalitions".
7. Isabelle van Notten (2010) "Integrity, Leadership, Women's Coalitions and the Politics of Institu-



The Developmental Leadership Program (DLP) addresses an important gap in international thinking and policy about the critical role played by leaders, elites and coalitions in the politics of development. This growing program brings together business, academic and civil society partners from around the world to explore the role of human agency in the processes of development. DLP will address the policy, strategic, and operational implications about 'thinking and working politically' - for example, about how to help key players solve collective action problems, negotiate effective institutions and build stable states.

The Developmental Leadership Program

E: info@dlprog.org

W: www.dlprog.org