Landscape Analysis of Donor Trends in International Development

By Anne Whyte

Landscape Analysis of Donor Trends in International Development

By Anne Whyte

Contents

Foreword

The **past 20 years** have given rise to one of the most massive accumulations of knowledge and information in human history. Digital information and communications technologies have revolutionized the ways in which knowledge and technical know-how move around the world. Genetics and biotechnology are ushering in a new epoch of innovation in the fields of agriculture and human health. And the emergence of new finance and investment models, like social enterprise and venture capital, has helped turn knowledge into unprecedented wealth.

Yet this proliferation of knowledge and expertise threatens to widen the gap between rich and poor throughout the world. In 2004, the 10th anniversary of the Internet becoming widely available to the public, 75 percent of Americans had regular access to the Internet; in Africa, Internet market penetration was below 1.2 percent. Further, one wonders about the content of what is being transmitted. Without the ability to access, produce, transfer and disseminate information, universities, research centers, service organizations and small start-up private enterprises in the developing world are at a distinct disadvantage in a knowledge economy.

If we are to take full advantage of the soaring knowledge economy, with its proliferation of different types of information providers, we must change how we think about training, organizational functioning and organizational interaction. Economies are lifted by investments in the best individual minds, the best-functioning institutions and the latest smartly utilized information technology. Not only are poor countries and weak organizations ill-equipped to compete in international markets; worse, they are unable to respond successfully to demands by local clientele and communities.

Recognizing that capacity building is central to achieving economic growth, reducing poverty and equalizing opportunity, foundations and bilateral and multilateral funding agencies have taken a newfound interest in this fundamental area. The timing seems right. Not only is the information

revolution upon us, but trends towards democratization, government decentralization and economic liberalization have profoundly reshaped how universities, nongovernmental organizations and other public-interest organizations do their work, presenting them with new challenges and opportunities. National governments, for example, play a much smaller role in developing policy and delivering services than they once did. With less public funding, public-interest organizations must have a strong concept of a relevant knowledge-based economy, and they must have a greater market orientation—not necessarily as commercial entities per se, but rather as organizations attuned to issues once considered the purview of business: management, finance, innovation, customer service, marketing, and the capacity to help clientele themselves acquire and communicate knowledge.

There is now an opportunity for funding agencies and others to play a more active role in stimulating strategic thinking and bold innovation in the field of capacity building. Traditionally, the type of capacity building supported by many funding agencies has focused more on professional skills rather then on building institutional competence. It has emphasized technical and analytical tools over problem solving and policy relevance. It has looked more to the pipeline production of professionals than to their career tracks and skill utilization. And it has promoted the strengthening of individual institutions over the sort of coordination among multiple, differentiated institutions that can propel and sustain entire professional fields.

By contrast, capacity building in the new millennium will have to contend not only with the challenges presented by new national, regional and global contexts, but also with the increased scale of knowledge accumulation. Developing human and institutional competencies will require a systems-oriented approach to change. Skilled persons do not operate in a vacuum: their ability to accomplish tasks is strongly influenced by the larger environment in which they work. Individual performance is affected at the very least by opportunities for meaningful work, shared professional norms, mentoring, opportunities for joint action, incentives to expand skills and a sense of mission. Indeed, many analysts of human capacity building now argue that effective priority setting, sharing information and strengthening organizational culture have a greater influence over individual performance than additional training does.

While institutions or organizations are the docking units for individual professionals, many development tasks require coordination across different types of entities. Examples include the coordination of those who set policy with those who implement it, harmonization between training agencies and organizations that need to hone the specialized skills of staff, and the synchronization in the case of service delivery or extension between the center and the field. By building skills systematically across local organizations, and among organizations in different countries, funders help facilitate an environment of inquiry, entrepreneurship and experimentation. That environment, in turn, makes individuals and organizations more effective—and improves conditions in their countries.

Like many other foundations and bilateral and multilateral funding agencies, the Rockefeller Foundation recognizes that if we are going to contribute to the building of more just and equitable societies, we need to start thinking differently about the task at hand. Success now depends on our ability to marry knowledge and execution. This means supporting new types of training configurations. It means linking training to the broader goal of building organizations and institutions that are well-managed, strategic and stable. It means strengthening organizations that are flexible and nimble enough to adapt to new technologies, changing political conditions and market opportunities. And it means connecting the dots across institutions for mutual reinforcement.

Between 1995 and 2003, the Rockefeller Foundation devoted $384 million, an average of 32 percent of its grant portfolio, to capacity-building activities. Given the scale of this investment, we felt last year that the time had come to reassess our recent human and institutional capacity-building initiatives. Our definition of human and institutional capacity building was evolving, becoming at once more fluid than in the past, and yet potentially more robust. As we looked at the external environment, we saw that in addition to understanding new global and national contexts, we needed to get a better handle on several other salient trends and questions. What fresh approaches to program development are essential to the demands of the new millennium; especially ways of quickly sharing know-how that enables nations and communities within them to benefit from the most learning gained elsewhere and adapt it to local conditions? Which are the most effective pathways to skill development, lifelong learning and connectivity across a diversity of institutional arenas that are already eclipsing standard capacity-building processes? What creative approaches are needed that expand capacity building beyond formal training and the operations of individual institutions and trigger systemic change through various professional channels? How might public-interest organizations best coordinate with one another to become problem-solving networks that reinforce one another's strengths? We also saw a proliferation of more and different players in the capacity-building field. These included national governments, bilateral agencies, multilateral development banks, private philanthropies and new actors from the public, commercial and nonprofit sectors.

In short, we wanted to find a new yardstick for assessing our work. In addition to our internal assessment, we asked a pair of researchers to analyze the external landscape. We wanted them to identify not just trends, policies and practices, but to give us a sense of what other foundations and multilateral and bilateral funding agencies were doing in this space. One paper, focused on the United States, would cover the fields of community development, workforce development and social enterprise. The other would analyze trends in international development. By examining what others were doing, we sought to better design and evaluate our own programs and to position ourselves more thoughtfully in the international funding community. We also hoped the review would uncover areas for potential partnerships with other funders.

The landscape analyses were simultaneously heartening and disconcerting. On one hand, our researchers found widespread agreement among funders about the need for and importance of capacity building. Funders at both the national and international level clearly recognize the scale of the challenges at hand. They understand, too, that if we are serious about meeting the world's challenges, solutions must be devised and executed by those most directly affected by the problems. In both the national and international arenas, funders have a growing taste for experimentation and boldness. On the other hand, capacity-building concepts, language and frameworks are fragmented and unclear.

The Foundation recognizes that the field's possibilities will not be realized nor tensions resolved by study alone, but rather by risking and experimenting. To that end, the Foundation hopes to further advance the field in coming years by investing in a publication series that will feature case studies of creative solutions to challenges and productive responses to new opportunities. For now, we offer the following report, "Human and Institutional Capacity Building: Landscape Analysis of Donor Trends in International Development," by Anne Whyte, as a prologue to what we hope will be an ongoing conversation among funders, grantees and other interested parties on the future of human and institutional capacity building.

Joyce Lewinger Moock
Associate Vice President
The Rockefeller Foundation

Executive Summary

Almost a quarter of Overseas Development Assistance (ODA) is devoted to capacity building, yet there is concern that donors may be undermining local capacities as fast as they are building them, especially in Africa. This review is a landscape analysis of some of the international donors involved in human and institutional capacity building and the different approaches that they have adopted. The review looks at donor organizations and the different capacity-building tools that they use, and links the two in terms of donor "cultures" and the assumptions that underlie their capacity-building strategies. The review is not an evaluation of donor activities but seeks to raise issues that the Rockefeller Foundation might consider in designing its future strategy for capacity building. The review found that other donor agencies are also taking stock of past investments in capacity building and considering how to be more effective in the future.

The report is divided into four parts:

1 **An overview of historic trends in donor support and the evolution of ideas about capacity building among donors (1960–2003);**
2 **A review of the principal modalities used by donors to build professional competencies with examples drawn from the donors reviewed;**
3 **A review of some of the main donor agencies active in building professional capacities organized by multilateral organizations, bilateral donors, foundations and others;**
4 **A concluding section on some issues raised by the landscape review and some emerging principles for capacity building to provide an agenda for discussion by the Foundation.**

While each donor is different, their approaches to capacity building tend to group them into their natural constituencies—multilateral organizations, bilateral donors, foundations and others.

Interagency agreements such as under the United Nations Administration Committee for Coordination (UN-ACC) for the multilateral agencies and the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development's Development Cooperation Directorate (OECD-DAC) for the bilateral donors tend to reinforce these similarities. The foundations, especially the U.S. foundations, have experience of working together on many initiatives, and have degrees of freedom that make their operating style and strategies different from both the multilateral and bilateral agencies.

Donors appear to learn slowly from experience, taking a decade or more with one modality of support before changing it for another. One reason is that each modality has merit in certain situations, even though it may now be considered outmoded. Another reason is that donors have paid relatively little attention to monitoring and evaluation of capacity-building activities, which are often embedded in other programs and so are not tracked separately. Capacity building is a long-term process that is not easily attributed to one intervention or even to a particular donor. As one observer put it—capacity building is messy without neat boundaries.

There has been a gradual evolution in donor support for capacity building and in the flagship concepts that have led the way. In the 1960s the focus was on building public-sector institutions and providing graduate training in Northern universities. Today the focus is on the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), the use of Information and Communications Technologies (ICTs), support to regional networks, and participatory approaches (Table 1). Capacity-building initiatives have been shaped by changes in the external-development environment such as the globalization of economies and societies, the HIV/AIDS epidemic, and national reforms in governments and universities. They have also been influenced by changes within the donor community, including new models of delivering development assistance [sector-wide approaches (SWAps), poverty reduction strategy papers (PRSPs), program-based approaches (PBAs)], and reduced financial resources.

Some of the key lessons learned over the past four decades are that earlier indicators used by donors to measure success such as numbers of people trained were less useful than the kind of training provided and what the trainees were able to do with it. Questions of sustainability became more important as donors found that the organizations they had been supporting failed when external support was withdrawn, and further analysis showed that factors such as leadership, local ownership and nonviable business models must be taken into account.

Donors vary in how far they have articulated an organization-wide policy for capacity building and in the terms that they favor (*capacity building, capacity development* or *capacity enhancement*). The review sets out some of the donor definitions of capacity and capacity building, which reflect the underlying values of the donor agencies (Box 1 and 2). Capacity building is more than just another program area for most donors—it lies at the heart of their philosophical approach to international development and development assistance.

Table 4 shows the different modalities used by donors to build professional competencies. Broadly they fall into training and award programs; study tours and conferences; twinning arrangements; Centers of Excellence; research or training networks; and institutional support to libraries, ICT, infrastructure, etc. Earlier capacity-building models tended to be built around one or two modalities. Today it is more common to include a portfolio of different modalities within a single capacity-building initiative that is funded by multiple donors. These compendium approaches, such as African Economic Research Consortium (AERC), allow different donors to somewhat pick and choose what fits with their own priorities and hopefully provides opportunities for synergies and economies of scale. The downside is that each of the compendium programs is more expensive and thus there are fewer of them. In effect, donors are putting their capacity-building eggs in fewer baskets.

Chapter 5 reviews some of the multilateral organizations, Chapter 6 the bilateral donors, and Chapter 7 the U.S. foundations and other organizations like International Development Research Centre (IDRC). Each section provides a summary of the main approaches to capacity building used by the donors and gives examples of capacity-building initiatives, especially in sub-Saharan Africa and to a lesser extent in the Greater Mekong Region—both geographic areas of special interest to the Rockefeller Foundation.

Chapter 8 discusses donor strategies for ICT—both capacity building for ICT as a sector and the use of ICT for building professional competencies. Different donors have been involved in both approaches but all donors are seeking to mainstream information and communication technologies in their development assistance programs. Most donors have deliberately built their ICT strategies on partnerships with other donors and many have also reached out to the private sector. Support to ICT is expensive and it is a fast-moving sector so that there appears to be greater willingness by donors to learn from others' experience, so that they get it right the first time. In many ways capacity building for ICT has forced donors to apply lessons that would have been valuable in other areas of development assistance—up-front situation analyses, attention to system-wide change, concern with long-term sustainability and having donor exit strategies. Donors are more likely to have articulated strategy papers for ICT than for capacity building.

ICT is a transformative intervention in many sectors including higher education. Donors are interested to use ICT to expand access and improve quality in higher education generally, and there have been many projects supported in distance education, including the African Virtual University. Other donor capacity-building initiatives such as regional networks are dependent on communication through the Internet. Analysis of donor ICT capacity-building activities shows that many fail the tests of scalability and sustainability. Initiatives with the most impact tend to be those that have approached development problems in a holistic manner, not just with a focus on providing ICT, and those that have a sound business plan where the interests

of key stakeholders are broadly aligned with each other and with the goals of the intervention.

Among the issues raised by the landscape review in Chapter 9 are the impact of decentralization on capacity-building initiatives—about 80 percent of developing countries are undergoing some form of government decentralization—and the need for systems thinking about the wider environment in which organizations and governments operate. Donors have also tended to create new organizations, especially for the capacity-building networks that they support, which require long-term funding and may never be self-sustaining.

The increasing concern with results-based management among donors raises some major challenges for long-term success in capacity building. One of the effects has been to support disciplines for which there is more demand among students, such as applied courses in business and agriculture to the detriment of basic sciences and humanities. Another is to "tailor" Ph.D. topics to perceived societal needs. Within higher-education reform, donors have been concerned to increase access to women and to a greater diversity of students. Success has been greater at the student level than for faculty. The need for more and better evaluation of capacity-building investments remains an issue.

While there are some emerging "principles" for capacity building (Chapter 10), most of them have been known for at least a decade and the question is not so much "what" but "how"? Too often the principles are enunciated in general terms (Box 13) that give little guidance for how to implement them. One of the challenges is for donors to change their own practices—some donors bypass bureaucratic bottlenecks and inefficient procedures to get their project effectively implemented instead of taking the time to build administrative capacities to improve the situation. In these ways donors can undermine the very capacities that they are supposed to be building.

In many ways, donor approaches to capacity building are central to their values and organizational cultures as development assistance agencies. Capacity building lies at the heart of what most donor agencies do and thus debates about modalities and approaches to capacity building are debates about the mission of the donor agency and the nature of its staff and programs. The donor landscape is characterized by agencies that are presently very engaged in rethinking their policies and strategies for capacity building and an openness to discuss these issues with others.

1 Introduction

Almost a quarter of Overseas Development Assistance goes to support capacity building, mainly through technical assistance. Despite improvements in the policy environments in many developing countries and in the ways donors interact with them, development outcomes are still falling short of expectations, especially in Africa. Much of this shortfall is attributed by donors and by countries to inadequate development of local capacities. In reviewing the failures of capacity-building efforts, the influential Berg report (1993) commented that:

> In few areas of policy are the costs of inaction or misguided action more far-reaching.…Almost everybody acknowledges the ineffectiveness of technical cooperation in what is or should be its major objective: achievement of greater self-reliance in the recipient countries by building institutions and strengthening local capacities in national economic management.[1]

The generally negative assessments of technical cooperation in the early 1990s led a former Vice President for Africa of the World Bank to conclude that:

> Donors and African governments together have in effect undermined capacity in Africa; they are undermining it faster than they are building it.[2]

In the 10 years since these evaluations were made, many international development funding agencies have reassessed their capacity-building activities and are beginning to more fundamentally rethink their whole approaches to development assistance within a capacity-development framework.

The Rockefeller Foundation is also assessing its initiatives in human and institutional capacity building and has established a review process that will:

■ **Explore how recent changes in program direction and strategy have influenced the Foundation's work in building professional competencies in its fields of interest; and**

■ **Examine the current situation and trends in the provision of training and the related challenges and opportunities.**

One component of the review is a set of three landscape analyses of trends in human and institutional capacity investments by other donors, including foundations, multilateral agencies and bilateral agencies. This landscape analysis is one of the three. It covers recent capacity-building initiatives funded in the developing world with a focus on sub-Saharan Africa and the Greater Mekong Region of Southeast Asia.

The other two landscape analyses cover capacity building for management competencies (a) within the United States; and (b) in transnational communities across the United States, Mexico and Central America.

Terms of reference
The landscape analysis is to:

1 Provide an overview of the key funding agencies engaged in capacity-building initiatives in developing regions in areas of interest to the Rockefeller Foundation and the assumptions and concepts that underlie their strategies for capacity building;

2 Map and review the main professional capacity-building activities sponsored by funding agencies including the types of institutions and sectors involved, innovations in strengthening tertiary learning institutions, and the arrangements made both between recipient institutions and between donors;

3 Identify emerging principles of capacity building for high impact and sustainability.

In further discussions with the internal Steering Committee for the overall capacity building review process,[3] it was agreed that the design of donor programs and the thinking behind them, together with broad trends in capacity building were more important to capture in the landscape analysis than a list of donor capacity-building activities. Instead, some examples of capacity-building activities would be identified that would merit further examination at a later stage.

While the landscape analysis might be of interest to other donors, the main rationale for undertaking it is to shine a light on current Foundation thinking and to help shape future programs to make the Foundation's efforts in capacity building more effective and more sustainable. The landscape analysis is not an evaluation of donor activities but is a basis for raising issues and questions.

Study approach
The approach to the landscape analysis has been shaped by the terms of reference; the amount of time allocated for the review; and the unit of analysis— which is the major international-development donor organizations. The steps taken in the review are to:

■ Identify the key donors supporting capacity building in developing countries;

■ Review their Web sites to see what is posted on them about capacity building, including a search for policy documents, information on major activities, etc.;

■ Carry out interviews with staff members in the donor agencies able to speak about capacity-building policies and initiatives;

■ Obtain internal documents relevant to the landscape analysis;

■ Conduct an analysis of the interviews and the documentary material to prepare the report.

During the process of doing the landscape analysis, a number of challenges emerged, including:

■ The topic of capacity building is conceptually broad, open-ended and difficult to frame;

■ For many donor agencies, capacity building is embedded in other program activities and therefore is not tracked separately;

■ The material posted on some donor organization Web sites is not very helpful to a search on capacity building;

■ The organizational structure of many donor agencies is such that the person best able to discuss the donor's capacity-building strategy and trends is not the person(s) familiar with details of capacity-building program activities. Program staff are specialized by region and sector (agriculture, health, education), and the ICT specialized staff are often in another unit.

The review comes at a time when a number of donor agencies are reviewing their own support for capacity building and considering new approaches and policies. There was a major meeting on the topic hosted by the Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA) in Tokyo in February 2004. Thus, the Foundation initiative is timely and of considerable interest to other donors. The current period of interagency discussions and internal stocktaking also means that some donors are not yet ready to articulate their strategy for capacity building, but may be able to in the coming months.

Organization of the report
This report is divided into four parts:

■ An overview of historic trends in donor support and the evolution of ideas about capacity building among donors (1960–2003);

■ A review of the principal modalities used by donors to build professional competencies with examples drawn from the donors reviewed;

■ A review of some of the main donor agencies active in building professional capacities organized by their natural constituencies (multilateral, bilateral and foundations and others);

■ A concluding section on some of the issues raised by the landscape review and some emerging principles for capacity building to provide an agenda for discussion by the Foundation.

This review has benefited from the input of all those listed in Annex I who kindly gave interviews and/or sent information or comments on earlier drafts. Particular thanks are due to Joyce Moock, Associate Vice President of the Rockefeller Foundation and David Court, formerly of the Rockefeller Foundation and World Bank, based in Nairobi.

The review has only been able to skim the surface of the donor landscape—the review of specific donors and of capacity-building initiatives is inevitably highly selective, and tends to be focused on sub-Saharan Africa. Annex II lists the references either directly cited in the report or used as background information.

The limitations of the landscape review notwithstanding, I hope that the analysis provides some helpful insights into past and current patterns and trends in donor support to capacity development, and the thinking behind the strategies that donors adopt. I also hope that the issues raised, especially for donor support to higher education and to developing professional competencies, provide a useful agenda for further discussion by the Rockefeller Foundation.

2

Trends in Donor Approaches to Capacity Building

The trends in donor support to capacity building reflect a combination of realizing that the old approaches are not working and a response to new realities in the external and internal environments in which donors operate.

A slow learning curve for donors?

One characteristic of these trends is that the lessons learned by donors from experience are learned slowly in terms of institutional change. In the past, lessons seem to have taken a decade or more of experience with one modality of capacity building to produce a change in a donor's way of doing things.

Thus in the 1970s and 1980s donors provided grants to train thousands of developing-country scholars in North America and Europe at master's and doctoral levels, only to find that without also strengthening the universities and other organizations from which they came, many of the newly minted M.A.s and Ph.D.s either stayed in the North or returned to their countries for only a few years before leaving again, often frustrated and disillusioned. Of Africans who studied for their Ph.D.s in North America between 1986–96, 40 percent did not return to Africa.[4]

In practice, three generations of African scholars can be distinguished. The first generation were trained outside of Africa in the 1950s and '60s and returned to form the core of the African faculty for the new universities and colleges. The second generation in the 1970s and early '80s were also trained outside Africa but unlike the first it failed to return to Africa because of conflict and civil wars and deteriorating infrastructure and work conditions. The third generation in the late 1980s and '90s was largely trained in Africa.[5]

Other bilateral donors such as Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (SIDA) have used twinning of universities in the South and North as a key modality for capacity building for more than 20 years, despite signs that it may no longer fit with their new policy on capacity building.

One of the reasons for this slow learning on the part of some donors is that they have paid relatively little attention to monitoring and evaluating their support to capacity building. In the early decades, this was true of most of their programming—whether capacity building or not. However, as more effort was put into program monitoring and evaluation for other areas, capacity building was not, and is not well tracked by donors. Capacity building is often embedded in other programs so that it is difficult to separately identify. Another reason is that the outcomes produced by the newer modalities of capacity building are long term and not easily attributable to one intervention or even one donor.

That being said, donors have not set out clear indicators for what would measure success beyond simple output measures of numbers of graduates produced. Even today, most agencies do not have clear benchmarks or progress indicators for capacity building; they do not track capacity building separately; and we are a long way from such information being shared across donor agencies. For example, the United Nations (U.N.) has the responsibility for collecting statistics on development indicators for the MDGs, including the related capacity goals. The multilateral agencies within the U.N. system have discussed the need for U.N.-wide indicators for capacity building in several meetings, without yet arriving at a common evaluative framework.[6]

However, there are major efforts afoot among the development funding agencies to translate past experience more rapidly into lessons for future action. Many of the multilateral agencies and the bilateral donors under the OECD-DAC are sharing experiences and holding interagency meetings on capacity building. Under the DAC umbrella, a multiagency Task Force was set up to work out a framework for donor involvement in capacity development leading to conceptual and operational guidance on how to implement capacity-building strategies. Surveys, including one of bilateral donors by UNDP, as well as some major cross-donor studies are under way. There has been a series of international meetings of donors to discuss capacity building: Manila (January 2003 supported by UNDP/WB/CIDA/JICA); Berlin (German Technical Cooperation, GTZ, July 2003); Tokyo (JICA, February 2004).

The foundations are less involved in this process but have started their own initiatives to share experience and to coordinate major new capacity-building activities, such as the Partnership for Higher Education in Africa and the Joint Learning Initiative (JLI) for Health Systems (which also includes bilateral and at least one multilateral agency).

Evolution of capacity building for development
Table 1 summarizes the broad evolution of capacity-building approaches and associated development "buzzwords" from the 1960s to the present. Behind these trends are a mix of pendulum swings in donor support for particular sectors such as higher education and an evolving conceptualization of the development process itself against a background of

political, economic and social changes in the external environment globally, regionally and nationally. Essentially, a re-examination of past experience and changes in the political, economic and social environments in developing regions, especially in Africa, led to an evolving problematique for how capacity building should be done. None of the influences were really separate. They coexisted and led to what donors are doing today. Some donors are farther along in the change process than others but they all seem to be on more or less the same trajectory.

Donors, especially bilateral and multilateral agencies, can exhibit somewhat of a pack mentality when an influential organization like the World Bank leads the charge. For example, overall donor support to higher education fell dramatically in the late 1980s and 1990s following the World Bank pronouncement that basic education provided higher and more immediate development returns, such as declining birth rates, infant mortality and improved nutrition.[7] This was contrasted with the higher costs of higher education that was seen as ivory tower, elitist and not relevant to pressing development needs. The reform process in higher education initiated by a number of universities and national governments, together with advocacy from the foundations, the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), and the Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation (NORAD) encouraged the World Bank to see the catalytic role that higher education must play in nation building, from building a democratic civil society to training the school teachers needed to achieve "Education for All." Other donors are also coming back to provide more targeted support for the higher-education sector—but only slowly.

The expense of training graduates by exporting them to Northern universities and the losses incurred through brain drain has won the cost-benefit argument in favor of basic education for the past 20 years. The neglect of higher education is still apparent among many bilateral donors who are focusing their capacity building on basic education. At the same time, there is recognition that without training the trainers in higher education, the human resources for training the teachers in the primary-education system will—if it has not already done so—begin to die out. The rapidity of this human resource wastage has been hastened by the scourge of the HIV/AIDS epidemic.

Table 1
Evolution of donor approaches in capacity building for development[8]

Decade	Terminology	Capacity Building Approaches
1960s	Institution building	Provide public-sector institutions
		Design functioning organizations
		Focus on individual organizations
		Models transplanted from North
		Training in Northern universities
1960s–1970s	Institutional strengthening/development	Shift to strengthening rather than establishing
		Focus still on individual organizations
		Provide tools to improve performance
		Training in the North
1970s	Development management/administration	Reach neglected target groups
		Improve delivery systems and public programs to reach target groups
1970s–1980s	Human resource development	Development is about people
		Education, health, population key sectors to target
		People-centered development emerges as concept
1980s–1990s	New Institutionalism	Structural adjustment, policy reform, governance paradigm
		Capacity building broadened to sector level (government, private, NGOs)
		New focus on networks
		More attention to external environment and national economic behavior
		Shift from project to program focus
		Concern with sustainability of capacity-building efforts
1990s	Capacity development	Reassessment of technical cooperation
		Donor discussions on capacity building
		Coalescing of different ideas around capacity building
		Emergence of importance of local ownership
		Participatory approaches seen as key
2000s	Capacity development/ knowledge networks	Millennium Development Goals become key driver
		Increased participation in capacity building
		Spread of ICT-based knowledge networks
		Emphasis on ongoing learning and adaptation
		Systems approaches and emerging talk of complex systems
		Balancing results-based management and long-term sustainability
		More emphasis on needs assessment/analysis
		Increased donor coordination
		Concern with how to secure long-term donor investments

Major changes in the external development environment

■ Globalization of economies and societies, together with information and communication technologies, is the change in the external environment most frequently mentioned by donors. It is the overarching change process.

■ Globalization is not only intensifying the need for developing countries to compete in a global economy but is allowing Northern interests to enter areas such as higher education in Africa and compete directly with local universities for students.

■ If developing countries are to be competitive and involved in the global economy, then capacity development is needed in some critical areas, first and foremost in ICTs. Hence the strong move among donors to support capacity building at all levels from universities to communities in ICT connectivity and content development.

■ As a corollary, the promise of ICTs is enabling new forms of capacity building, such as regional training institutions (e.g., AERC) and the creation of knowledge networks.

■ Competition for resources and declining funds from donors and elsewhere has led organizations such as universities and NGOs to consider pooling resources and accepting reforms that otherwise might have taken much longer to achieve.

■ The development paradigm shifted in the early 1990s toward one emphasizing participation and inclusion of groups beyond central government, especially NGOs and civil society. This paradigm was best articulated at the Earth Summit sponsored by the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED) in 1992 and influenced many donors.

■ Establishment of the MDGs in 2000 required national governments to play a central role in directing their countries' development and re-emphasized their need to be capacitated.

The MDGs have profoundly influenced how the U.N. and bilateral donors approach development and capacity building.

■ Democratic processes are unfolding, especially in Africa, and are opening up policy spaces for capacity building, not only in the public sector but also in strengthening civil society and NGOs.

■ HIV/AIDS epidemic has led to the loss of a generation of adults, including the teachers and leaders of today and tomorrow and thus the need to educate a new generation, especially (but not only) in Africa.

■ Decentralization and devolution of government services to local offices of central government and to local authorities is a process that donors are increasingly taking account of in supporting capacity building within the public sector. Although there was some decentralization in the 1950s and 1960s as the British and French administrations prepared their colonies for independence, many newly independent states in Africa and Asia promptly recentralized government services in order to bolster national unity. In the late 1970s and early 1980s it re-emerged as a way of making government services more relevant and more accountable to local needs and to give local people more participation and ownership. As decentralization proceeded, the need for more capacity building at local level became obvious, not least to deal with problems of corruption as well as a better provision of government services.

■ Initiatives like the New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD) are not able to implement their action plans because most member countries don't have the capacity to implement the provisions such as peer-review mechanisms for public administration and budgetary systems.

■ A new acceptance by governments of (a) the importance of higher education and universities in a strengthening democracy and (b) the human resources that countries need to compete in a global economic environment. This is linked to a recognition that there are not enough people qualified and trained to engage in some of the debates surrounding new policies, and that knowledge *generation* should not be left just to Northern researchers.

■ The emergence of a new generation of leaders in government and civil society, including within the universities, some of whom who have returned from the African and Asian diasporas, with whom donors feel they can do business.

■ Partly due to new leaders and partly from external pressure, organizations such as universities are willing to engage in reforms at the organizational level, such as improving access, transforming their curricula, improving quality and relevance of education, and mainstreaming gender and equity within their systems.

Changes in the donor community

Some key processes in the donor community that have influenced capacity building are:

■ Changing models of implementing ODA have put capacity building at the center because of the greater roles accorded to national governments (SWAps, PRSPs, PBAs) means that job number one is to enable governments to play their roles well;

■ Sector-wide approaches (SWAps) in practice range from a list of projects relating to a sector with some policy processes linking them to a more hands-off core support to a sector budget in which the government is expected to assume full responsibility for setting priorities, allocating donor resources within the sector, implementation, and monitoring and evaluation. Clearly this is a major challenge for weak governments and capacity building in all these areas is concomitant on the donors;

■ As donors rely more on governments to define how ODA will be spent within countries, not only must governments be capacitated but also the need for in-country situation assessments, analyses and research is increased. This is leading a few donors to rethink the role of research underpinning policy change;

■ Reduced financial resources for capacity building, as main OECD countries cut their budgets for ODA and the downturn in the stock markets that reduced the availability of philanthropic funds for international development. This meant that less-expensive models for training and for capacity building generally were more closely examined;

■ Major new donors on the scene such the Gates Foundation whose support to health rivals that of the largest bilateral donor for health—the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID).

Key lessons and new challenges

Despite the lack of attention to systematic evaluation of their own performance, donors have learned some key lessons from their experience in capacity building. These are:

■ Donor experience of the Structural Adjustment Programs (SAPs) revealed that part of their failure related to inadequate government ownership and this was linked to a lack of capacity in the public sector and in civil society. Governments needed to be more accountable for managing their national economies and thus they needed to be capacitated;

■ Training people in Northern universities was not only costly but did not always provide training that was relevant, and led to significant numbers of graduates not returning to their home countries where they had felt frustrated and underpaid, especially in the public sector and universities;

■ Training that was open-ended and focused more on numbers of trainees rather on how useful their training was to their home countries and organizations did not contribute as well as it should to achieving development outcomes. As donors became more problem-focused in their program support,

they also became more focused on the need for certain kinds of expertise and began to address issues of whether training should be disciplinary or interdisciplinary;

■ Questions of sustainability became paramount as donors found that organizations that they had been supporting failed the minute external support was withdrawn. Analysis of why this was happening showed a combination of factors from lack of ownership, to a nonviable organizational model or business plan, to risk factors such as leadership, political interference not being taken into account, to a lack of clarity about the donor's exit strategy. All of which have influenced donors to put *sustainability* at the center of their present capacity-building efforts.

The climate is more favorable to donor partnerships and alliances than in previous decades; partly because of the whole philosophy of participation that underpins development assistance today; partly because pooled resources are needed to combat the scale of some of the challenges if the Millennium Development Goals are to be achieved within the time frames set (and many won't be); and partly because inter-organizational communication is made rapid and easy by electronic communications.

Experience in investments in the higher-education sector have also identified some of the key challenges that countries face in strengthening institutions and educational systems to provide professional capacity building that is both sustainable and responsive to national needs (Table 2).

What is left out of this table is perhaps as interesting as what it highlights. It does not, for example, suggest that private educational institutions are a challenge in low-income countries, whereas the interviews for the landscape analysis suggest that this is a growing factor in sub-Saharan Africa. It also does not address regional initiatives in higher education, as exemplified in AERC's training of African economists or network models-based regional hubs (Centers of Excellence). These networks can differentially strengthen the participating universities compared to those not selected in the initial cut.

Competition from private educational providers can be seen as both a challenge and an opportunity, depending a little on where you are sitting. On the one hand private institutions can help to raise standards in public institutions but they may also "cherry-pick" the best students and the most profitable (i.e., high demand) programs leaving the public institutions to struggle with the challenges of equity in student composition and providing basic disciplinary training in the natural and social sciences and humanities. In some countries, the combination of public and private works well, such as in Mozambique where scholarships funded with public money through a World Bank loan can be used at private universities, either because the courses are not available elsewhere or are seen as of higher quality.[10]

Table 2
Capacity-building issues for higher education in low-income countries[9]

Coverage	Need more diversified system
Equity	Open access
	Student aid
	Affirmative-action programs
	Tuition for poorer-performing students
Quality and relevance	Strengthening of existing programs
	Need evaluation and accreditation system
	Need more diversified system
Sustainable financing	Insufficient public financing
	Resource mobilization (institutional level)
Governance	Accountability mechanisms
	National policy body
	National management-information system
	Outside representation on boards
Strategic vision	Reform of system
	Institutional leadership
Institutional diversification	Short duration programs
	Open or virtual universities
Science and technology	Capacity for strategy formulation, monitoring and evaluation
	Promotion of research in priority areas
	Capacity for metrology, standards, quality testing, intellectual property rights
ICT infrastructure	National access and pricing policy
	Support for institutional-level investment

3 Capacity Building—Is It Still a Black Box?

One of the findings of this landscape analysis is that while most donors are talking about new approaches to capacity building, when it comes to being clear what they mean or developing some operational principles on which to go forward, few donors have gone beyond some general policy statements. The assumption seems to be that we all know what we mean.

> The term *capacity* appears to resist definition or the formulation of any sort of operational principles. It seems to exist somewhere in a nether world between individual training and national development.[11]

A focus on professional capacity building does not escape this angst about capacity building in general. There is a good amount of discussion and some research currently under way into how capacity development as it is presently undertaken, is underpinned by various theories of change. These draw on concepts taken from a range of social sciences from the psychology of the individual to the sociology and political science of societies—all woven together with ideas from organizational development and management theory. No overall theory of capacity building yet exists.[12] Instead donors can turn to their choice of models and hypotheses about how individuals and

organizations and larger systems behave, before, after and during capacity building.

Perhaps this is why some donors tend to execute pirouettes around whether to describe what they are doing as *capacity building, capacity development* or *capacity enhancement.* A cynic might say that some donors are more concerned to finesse the differences between these three terms than to tackle the bigger and more fundamental question of what theory of change underlies their new awareness of capacity development and participatory approaches in providing ODA and technical cooperation.

Capacity building and *capacity development* tend to be used interchangeably by most donors, except the agencies in the U.N. system—which use *capacity development* as the accepted term and the World Bank, which favors *capacity enhancement.* For the U.N. multilateral agencies, the distinction is that capacity *building* is the exogenous process that leads to capacity *development.* That is, donors are involved in capacity building for countries that are undergoing (and in charge of) their own ongoing process of *capacity development.*

Because the term *capacity building* came into common use earlier, *capacity building* has more connotations of earlier modalities of donor support—training courses in the North, technology transfer and technical assistance. It is described on the UNDP

Web page as implying an *engineering approach* to the creation of new capacity. On the other hand, SIDA uses the term capacity building for activities that are anything but an engineering approach.

For these reasons, it has suggested that it would be clearer if donors used the expression *capacity development* to refer to the endogenous process that needs supporting and *capacity building* for the exogenous process that donors are engaged in. However, various groups, including the U.N. Inter-Agency Workshop on Capacity Development[13] and this study did not find any correlation between the use of the term building versus development and whether the process described was seen as *endogenous* or *exogenous*.[14]

Does it matter what term to use? In the long run, no. But the debate underscores the reality that *capacity building* has a lot more significance for most donors than just another approach in the donor tool kit. For many, the discussion about *capacity building* is a touchstone for their philosophical approach to development assistance and how they see global issues like poverty, equity, trade and security.

It is also relevant that the multilateral and bilateral donors have, or are trying to come up with, their own definitions of capacity and capacity building. In Box 1, the four definitions of *capacity* reveal some-

what different emphases on the values underlying their approaches. For the United Nations the goal of having capacity is to pursue one's own definition of sustainable development (another term that defies precision). For the Netherlands, the notion of equity is added (individuals *from all sectors of society*) and for Swedish SIDA, the importance of different approaches for different situations is stressed. As discussions with these donors revealed, these qualifications to the definition are not added lightly but signify important elements in the donors' strategic approaches to capacity building. These underlying values come out more strongly in the donor definitions of *capacity building* and *capacity development* (Box 2).

For example, the OECD-DAC approach is to emphasize local ownership of the capacity-building process and an orientation to the Millennium Development Goals. This umbrella approach has influenced many of the bilateral donors. CIDA emphasizes participation and its strategy is built around participative approaches and methodology. The Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs (DGIS) issues a warning that capacity development is more than donor inputs.

One feature that all donor strategies for *capacity building* share is that they conceptualize capacity building as a process that encompasses a hierarchy of levels from:

- ■ **Individuals,**
- ■ **Communities and organizations,**
- ■ **Institutions and inter-organizational networks,**
- ■ **Country, society, region, and**
- ■ **The overall enabling environment.**

Donor strategies vary in how many levels they divide this hierarchy into and more importantly, where their main entry points for intervention are, but there is a common recognition among them that as far as capacity building is concerned, they are dealing with a nested hierarchy of levels from the individual to society. Donor strategies also all recognize that these levels for intervention are systemically interlinked. Thus providing training to individuals will affect the capacities of their organizations; and the capacity of those organizations and the "fit" with individual capacities will influence how well the trained staff can function and how likely they are to stay.

The term *system* is used somewhat loosely in many donor agencies, as in "we are taking a systems

---

Box 1
Donor definitions of capacity

UNDP (2003)
Capacity is the ability of individuals, organizations and societies to perform functions, solve problems, and set and achieve goals.

U.N. (2002)
Capacity refers to the ability of individuals, communities, institutions, organizations, and social and political systems to use the natural, financial, political, social and human resources that are available to them for the definition and pursuit of sustainable development.

Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs (2000)
Capacity refers to values, contacts and organizational and technical skills enabling countries, institutions, organizations and individuals from all sections of society to perform their tasks and achieve their development objectives.

SIDA (2000)
The concept of capacity is an overall concept for the conditions that must be in place—for example, knowledge, competence, and effective and development-oriented organizations and institutional frameworks—in order to make development possible. These conditions can change and the concept must therefore provide concrete content from case to case.

Box 2
Donor definitions of capacity development

UNDP (2003)
Capacity development entails the sustainable creation, utilization and retention of capacity (as defined above), in order to reduce poverty, enhance self-reliance and improve people's lives.

United Nations (2002)
Capacity development or building is the process by which individuals, institutions and countries strengthen capacities or abilities. The United Nations and other external actors can assist this endogenous process, by:

- Focusing on enhancing the skills, knowledge and social capabilities available to individuals, institutions, and social and political systems, but also by
- Supporting their integration into the knowledge networks that help to sustain these capabilities, as well as
- Contributing to material and financial support necessary to apply the skills, knowledge and social capabilities.

UNICEF (1996)
Capacity development is any support that strengthens an institution's ability to effectively and efficiently design, implement and evaluate development activities according to its mission.

OECD-DAC (1999)
Capacity development is the process by which individuals, institutions and societies develop abilities to perform functions, solve problems as well as set and achieve goals. It is premised on ownership, choices and self-esteem. The Millennium Development Goals, which target significant human development progress by 2015, create a critical framework for the outcomes of capacity development.

Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs (2000)
Capacity development refers to approaches, strategies, methods applied to increase the capacity of organizations and/or institutions. Capacity development is concerned with how to improve processes. This entails more than just defining inputs to which many donors still limit themselves.

CIDA (2002)
Activities, approaches, strategies and methodologies that help organizations, groups and individuals to improve their performance, generate development benefits and achieve their objectives over time. It often involves broad participation, building on local interests and expertise, offering opportunities for learning and linking at micro, meso and macro levels to build ownership and sustainability.

GTZ (2003)
GTZ sees capacity development as the process of strengthening the abilities or capacities of individuals, organizations and societies to make effective use of resources in order to achieve their own goals on a sustainable basis.

approach." In practice, this can mean anything from focusing on the connections between different levels in the system (such as: individuals–organization–network); to a more fundamental analysis of the nature of the system to be capacitated, including how the system functions and where it is most useful to define its boundaries.

It is likely that donors tend to follow the former approach rather than the latter, since a more detailed grasp of how a system works requires more up-front research than is often carried out, or for which local capacity is available. The World Bank, in its report, Constructing Knowledge Societies: New Challenges for Tertiary Education (2002), emphasizes that education must be seen as a:

> Holistic and global system including not only the human capital contribution of tertiary education, but also its critical humanist and social capital building dimensions, as well as its role as an important international public good.[15]

Capacity building for what?
Development funding agencies generally describe capacity building as an *approach* or *process* toward an objective such as poverty reduction or a sustainable organization. It is also sometimes defined as the development objective itself, implying that if capacities are developed, the other development *objectives* will naturally follow and can be left to the countries or organizations to sort out. Increasingly, capacity development is expressed as if it *were* the goal itself. Thus, the United Nations talks about capacity development as a central mission of development cooperation. Local ownership is a sine qua non.

One feature of donor approaches for capacity building is that they are goal oriented. At the most general level, they respond to the question "capacity building for what?" by referring to ownership, empowerment and sustainability. For the United Nations, the outcome is to achieve sustainable development. For UNDP it is to reduce poverty, enhance self-reliance and improve people's lives. For the OECD-DAC agencies, it is to meet the Millennium Development Goals. While no one refers explicitly to social change, changing social order and political change are often the two bottom lines to capacity development.

In any case, these high-order goals need to be translated into lower-order objectives in order to make a donor policy operational for in-country activities and here some donor strategies appear to

come up wanting. What we find is that there is a gap between capacity building as described in general donor policies (and in headquarters) and capacity building in programs at field level. It is more likely that donors will articulate policies for capacity building within a particular program sector or country program even where they have no overall organizational policy at this stage. It is at these levels that indicators and performance measures are most likely to be identified and measured.

Time lags
Even where a donor has developed an approach to capacity building that is based on new policies about participation and local ownership of the process, its programs on the ground may still be framed within older ideas about capacity building as technical cooperation or sending people to Northern countries to be trained. There is a time lag between the development of a new policy and its implementation in the field and its integration into the organizational culture. This is especially true for the larger funding agencies that are organized geographically and/or by

sector. It is also true for foundations such as the Ford Foundation, which is highly decentralized.

The policies that emanate from the agency's Policy Branch or from senior management take some time to permeate through to field programs and the organizational culture may encourage differentiated approaches at regional and country levels. SIDA has found it more difficult than expected to establish its new policy on capacity building into its programs on the ground. In other bilateral agencies, regional staff was found to be almost antagonistic toward "newfangled policies and jargon" coming out of their desk-bound policy branches. There are clearly tensions in some organizations that slow down the process of implementing new approaches to capacity building in the field.

However, agency-*wide* policies for capacity building are being adopted and these inevitably frame how donors approach professional capacity building (Table 3). Some donors included in this review have already established such agency-wide policies for capacity building. A second group is in the process of establishing such policies through internal discussion of draft documents. The degree to which the strategy has been elaborated and incorporated into programming varies, and can include one or more of:

■ **Working definitions of terms such as capacity (Box 1),**
  ***capacity building* or *capacity development* (Box 2);**

■ **A description of the capacity-building approach, strategy**
  or policy;

■ **The principles or rationale on which the strategy is based; and**

■ **Guidelines for implementing the strategy.**

Based on the findings of the landscape review, multilateral organizations are most likely to have an agency-wide approach to capacity building in place. Bilateral donors present a spectrum from those that have already developed policies for capacity building, such as Swedish SIDA, to those who are currently working on such policies (DFID U.K.) and others that have no agency-wide documented strategy, such as Finland, Denmark and USAID. Some bilateral donors have developed capacity-building strategies for certain regions, particularly for Africa (DGIS) and many donors have capacity-building strategies for their work within specific sectors such as health or education. The foundations generally do not have foundation-wide capacity-building policies, strategies or definitions at the level of the organization, although they may within particular program initiatives.

Table 3
Status of donor agency-wide policies for capacity building[16]

	Agency	Has agency-wide policy
Multilaterals	ACBF	Yes
	NEPAD	Under development
	OECD-DAC	Yes, for governance/trade
	World Bank	Yes
	United Nations	Yes
	UNDP	Yes
	UNESCO	Yes
	UNICEF	Yes
Bilaterals	CIDA Canada	Yes
	DFID U.K.	Under development
	DGIS Netherlands	Yes, for Africa
	Denmark	No
	Finland	No
	GTZ Germany	Yes
	JICA	Yes, for health sector
	NORAD Norway	Yes
	Swiss SDC	No
	Swedish SIDA	Yes
	USAID	No
Foundations	Carnegie Corporation	No
	MacArthur	No
	Ford	No
	Hewlett	No
	Rockefeller	No
Other	Lemelson	No
	IDRC	No
	AAAS	No

4

Building Professional Competencies

The earliest donor approach to building professional capacities was what the World Bank calls *Substitution Technical Cooperation* in which consultants and advisers (either from other countries or other organizations) substitute for missing professional capacity by filling the gaps for short- or long-term periods, and provide role models and mentoring for local professionals. There are five main ways in which donors have traditionally provided technical cooperation:[17]

■ **Long-term and short-term advisers and consultants (foreign or local);**

■ **Formal and informal training (long- and short-term) within country and abroad;**

■ **Provision of equipment and supplies needed for training including computers, software and training materials;**

■ **Twinning arrangements between recipient and donor-country organizations; and**

■ **Research, studies, policy dialogues, workshops.**

Earlier models of professional capacity building tended to adopt one or two approaches within a single project. Increasingly today we are seeing donor strategies for building professional competencies that include a suite of different modalities within the same program. Consider, for example, the many different modalities by which professional competencies are strengthened for participants in AERC or the Partnership for Higher Education in Africa. In practice, these compendium approaches allow different donors to somewhat pick and choose the components that fit their own organizational priorities and protocols. Table 4 shows the range of different modalities used by donors to build professional competencies.

The advantage of a more holistic approach is obviously the built-in synergies that can take place and in some cases, economies of scale. The downside is that each of the multimodality programs is more expensive and longer term and thus there are fewer of them. In practice, donors are putting more of their eggs into fewer baskets and they tend to focus on the highest potential "winners"—defined either by individual institution (e.g., Makerere University) or well-performing country (e.g., Uganda). Inevitably therefore the capacity-*built* landscape is becoming more unequal—with islands of institutional resurgence surrounded by areas of deteriorating capacity. This is a question that donors need to consider more unless they repeat the mistakes of the past—and substitute the creation of isolated strong universities for the earlier isolated strong departments.

Table 4
Modalities used by donors to build professional competencies

Main modality	Variants
Advisers, consultants, resource persons	International/regional/national/same institution
	Long term/short term
	Face to face/telephone/online linkage
	Mentoring/on-the-job role "apprenticeship"
Training programs	Sandwich programs
	Degree/certificate/noncertificate
	Long term/short courses
	International/regional/national location/sandwich model
	Competitive entry/restricted group/open market
	In class/on the job/distance learning
	Disciplinary/interdisciplinary
	Management/administration
	Leadership/entrepreneurship
	Training of trainers
Workshops/meetings/ Conferences/summer schools	Training workshops
	Conferences for presenting results
	Meetings for networking, collaborative research
	"Biannual workshops" for thesis peer review
	Leadership forum
	Policy dialogues
Study tours	International/regional/national
	Individual/group programs
Twinning arrangements	International/regional/national scope
	Universities/NGOs/private sector/public sector
	Units within organizations/whole organizations
	Relationship to donor—one university contracted to provide services/university supported to buy services/ third-party arrangements
Centers of Excellence	International/regional/national
	Hub/spoke or network model
	Virtual universities
Schools Without Walls	Regional networks
Networks	International/regional/national
	Disciplinary/multidisciplinary
	Universities/NGOs/private sector/public sector
	Central secretariat/hosted in member organization
	Separate legal status/program status under host organization
	Governance—member organization, donor board, steering committee of experts, mixed models
Research	Collaborative research
	Research assistantships
Awards, scholarships, fellowships, internships	Small grants programs
	Young scientist awards
	Graduate training awards—M.A., Ph.D., postdoctoral
	Awards for thesis, fieldwork internships
Libraries, resource centers, field stations	Update holdings, staff training
	Botanic garden as education and research center
Equipment, infrastructure, connectivity, benchmarking	Everything from buildings to desks to computers to pencils
	Software, training materials
	Internet connectivity/broadband purchase
	Calibration and certification of equipment to international standards
Publications	Access to hard copy and online journals
	Bibliographic resources
	Support for publishing by trainees
	Direct support to journals

Recent trends

Donors have internalized their learning from experience since the 1960s leading to some new approaches being tried and some important strategic shifts. Among the most important changes are:

■ **Greater linkage between training of individuals and institutional strengthening so that the two reinforce one another;**

■ **More training in country and in the region rather than sending trainees to the donor country or elsewhere in the developed world;**

■ **The beginnings of more South-South exchanges for capacity building;**

■ **More targeted and more short-term training initiatives such as summer schools for young scientists;**

■ **Centers of Excellence in the South being used as regional hubs for building the capacities of individuals and institutions in the surrounding countries;**

■ **Innovations in the *focus* of the training, away from disciplinary training toward more interdisciplinary training and new themes such as fund raising or entrepreneurship;**

■ **Greater emphasis on leadership training and on training of leaders (and the two may not be the same);**

■ **More concern with the good administration of institutions and thus providing training for financial and administrative professionals;**

■ **More attention to the gender and equity dimensions of training and fellowship schemes and related access issues;**

■ **Civil-society organizations and small business moving more into center stage as targets for developing professional competencies;**

■ ***Upstream capacity building*—more emphasis on building professional competencies for capacity building—that is, building local capacity to undertake the needed upstream studies for situation analyses and other research in the planning of capacity-building interventions;**

■ **A renewed interest in strengthening inter-organizational networks, and an evolution to the support of knowledge networks—both underwritten by ICTs;**

■ **Broadening of the scope of capacity building to encompass broad social systems with a focus on governance, democracy and civil society;**

■ **A major investment in participatory approaches and creating local ownership of the capacity-building process from start to finish.**

Training programs

Sandwich Programs

The common model for sandwich programs is that students take their first year of graduate studies at their home university and then go overseas to take advanced courses and prepare their thesis proposal, returning home to do the fieldwork and write the thesis. The degree is awarded by the home university. This modality is cheaper than supporting students full time at a university overseas and encourages them to return home, particularly since donors usually do not pay for family members to accompany the student abroad.

One difficulty with the sandwich-program approach is that there are few incentives for faculty members at the overseas university to provide the guidance and support needed, especially if the student will be undertaking the research back home. It has been proposed that students have two thesis supervisors—one from each of the sandwich-program universities, and that donors pay for both supervisors to participate in the planning, execution and evaluation of the thesis work.

The University Science, Humanities and Engineering Partnerships in Africa (USHEPiA) Program funded by the Rockefeller Foundation, Carnegie Corporation of New York and the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation is a sandwich program designed to strengthen the teaching and research capacity of seven participating universities in Eastern, Central and Southern Africa by providing faculty with fellowships to study at the University of Cape Town in South Africa, mainly to obtain Ph.D.s in the sciences, engineering and humanities. The fellowships are limited to permanent faculty at the partner universities who can obtain their degrees at either their home university or at the University of Cape Town. Fieldwork takes place in their home country and their time at the University of Cape Town is limited to 24 months. Over 50 fellowships have been awarded since 1996. USHEPiA also funds a small grants scheme for successful fellows and annual meetings of the vice chancellors and representatives of the participating universities on the USHEPiA steering committee.

Summer Institutes

Summer Institutes providing intensive-training programs usually over one to three months are proving to be a flexible and cost-effective way to upgrade knowledge and skills in specific areas. They can draw students on a national, regional or international basis and are commonly run on a competitive entry basis with students' academic, living and travel costs provided by donors. Their flexibility extends to the theme of the summer institute, which can be changed according to need/demand and the availability of faculty, the frequency and the location.

Summer institutes are increasingly popular mechanisms for drawing together the best and the brightest young scientists so that they can interact and begin to form their own knowledge networks. They are particularly useful in fields that are multidisciplinary and/or emerging fields and where professional networks (that are strongest within disciplines and professions) are poorly developed. The International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis (IIASA) has hosted several international summer institutes for young scientists to work together on global-change research. Box 3 gives an example of a summer institute sponsored by the International Human Dimensions Program (IHDP) and the Inter-American Institute (IAI).[18]

Twinning arrangements

Within the education sector, twinning of universities has been a common modality for bilateral donors, as it also brought clear benefits to the donor country and could attract a powerful academic constituency to support the donor agencies on their home turf. In university-linkage projects, one university (usually in the North) is contracted by the donor to assist a developing-country university through the provision of a range of resources including long- and short-term technical assistance, training, scholarships, exchange of students and faculty, etc.

The many twinning arrangements in the 1960s and 1970s between U.S. universities and institutions like the University of the Philippines at Los Banos, produced some early successes. But the experience has been less stellar for USAID over the past 20 years. European donors have funded twinning arrangements for long periods. SIDA supported capacity building in Ethiopia through twinning arrangements for over 25 years and NORAD provided U.S. $30 million to support a similar program in Tanzania between 1973 and 1991.

Box 3

IHDP-IAI Summer Institute on Globalization and Food Systems, National University of Costa Rica, Oct. 24–Nov. 6, 2004

Scientific workshop followed by two-day science-policy forum.

Targeted participants:
- Natural and social scientists working on the topic with a record of peer-reviewed publications and interest in multidisciplinary research who expect to continue to work in the research area;
- Decision makers and professionals in government, NGOs, civil society and private industry working in the policy-planning process;
- Up to 25 participants on the basis of merit with overall regional, thematic and gender balance;
- Researchers must be within five years of their last degree;
- Decision makers must have at least three years relevant working experience;
- Be affiliated with developing country or emerging economy;
- Have proficiency in oral and written English and computer skills;
- Application on basis of curriculum vitae, written essay, and two reference letters demonstrating applicant's qualifications and linkages to home country scientific or policy community.

Box 4

Twelve characteristics of successful university linkage projects

- At least 10 to15 years of organized cooperation.
- High levels of partnership and mutual trust and respect.
- Continuity of dedicated and skilled leadership and effective leadership succession.
- Strong and active support of senior leadership of the institutions.
- Critical mass of people trained (professors, postdoctoral researchers, graduate students).
- Creation of an institutional vehicle through which skills/knowledge were applied or extended (project unit, degree program, institute, clinic, etc.).
- Close ties to local and provincial governments, institutes and enterprises.
- Systematic spreading of innovations and models across sectors, municipalities and provinces.
- Mobilization of significant additional resources.
- Leverage on policy through conferences and publications and through senior scholars advising government.
- Multigenerational participants from senior scholars, mid-career academics, junior professors, researchers and students.
- Multiple activities from teaching, professional training, student supervision, research and policy outreach.

For projects whose goal is capacity building, the linkage project has been found wanting as a delivery mechanism. Not least is the problem of sustainability—although the relationship between the two universities usually continues after the end of the project, the sustainability of improvements in capacity was less self-evident. The problem is that while individuals benefit from the linkage, there is difficulty in institutionalizing the benefits within the developing-country university. It is also hard to imagine that the two universities are really equal partners when only one of them (usually the donor country one) is the one contractually accountable to the donor and inevitably drives the process.

Along with other donors that have long supported university linkage projects as a modality for building the capacities of individuals, faculties and universities, CIDA has done some heart-searching about how effective the modality is and how it might be strengthened. One consideration is that universities are very different from other executing agencies. They have a subculture that is unique and in which loyalty of the key players—the faculty—is more to the discipline/profession and thus to the *department* rather than to the university as an institution. The initiative for pursuing a linkage project usually comes from individual faculty members backed by their department head rather than from the top leadership of the university. In practice, many university linkage projects are at the level of linking *departments* rather than universities whatever the project name might imply. In one case, a Canadian faculty member moving from one university to another took "his" CIDA linkage project with him, apparently approved by CIDA.[19]

These challenges to effective linkage projects have led donors to experiment with different arrangements to manage the relationship between the donor and the two universities, including having the developing-country university be the contracting partner and having the resources to "buy" services from the other, and umbrella arrangements where a third party independent of either university manages the program funds.

A review of 20 years experience in university linkage projects between Canadian and Chinese Universities covering 50 projects funded by CIDA 1981–2001 provided some insights into the strengths and weaknesses of twinning as a funding modality.[20] One finding was that it was the contacts and knowledge formed in these exchanges that built the capacity

in China for CIDA to be able to fund more advanced projects in environment, governance and other projects. On the downside, projects were often expensive with multiple levels of overhead and rarely had any impact on national policy or gender equality (two important considerations for CIDA). Box 4 gives the 12 characteristics of successful university linkage projects found by Jackson in his review.

Networks
In the context of capacity building, networks pose an interesting phenomenon. Some networks are clearly closer to being organizations while others, including some of the Knowledge Networks supported by the World Bank and others straddle the fence between organizations (or inter-organizations) and institutions without much organizational structure.[21] Networks such as the knowledge networks supported by the World Bank, IDRC and other donors are increasingly the focus of donor capacity-building efforts. However, there is some debate within the World Bank and elsewhere about whether knowledge-sharing networks are really capacity building, other than in the very broadest sense.

Building professional competencies through regional networks has demonstrated some major successes, not least the African Economic Research Consortium, which has been the model for a number of other initiatives. Many donor-funded networks with a major training component start out life as network training projects and over time and with a successful track record behind them become institutionalized and legal entities in their own right—as did AERC.

Among the reasons for employing the network modality is cost-effectiveness, especially where capacity (and demand) is widely dispersed and no single institution is likely to reach a critical mass in terms of high-quality teachers or students. This was classically the case for graduate training of economists in sub-Saharan African and the AERC model evolved to combine teaching of basic courses (using a common curriculum) at student's home universities and bringing students together at a Joint Training Facility for summer schools where more specialized courses were taught by specialists.

Some of the characteristics of successful training networks are that they are mechanisms for providing a suite of support mechanisms to the professionals being trained. These can include graduate training programs (at both Ph.D. and M.A. levels in the case

Box 5
SISERA: A sub-Saharan African economic network

SISERA started life as an IDRC initiative and was designed to complement AERC and the RPI (Réseau sur les Politiques Industrielles). Like AERC, its approach is to capture the synergies between research and training and between research and policy and to do so through a network. SISERA's particular approach to the network concept is to support a limited number of sub-Saharan African economic institutions over the long term. It concentrates on two relatively homogeneous groups of centers: strong performers known as Partner Institutions with the aim of making them international centers of excellence and weaker centers known as Emerging Centers.

The institutions received a package of support including core institutional funds, collaborative thematic research, assistance in institutional networking and management. To be effective, the suite of interventions has to be tailored to each institution. The overall package includes support for researcher training and networking and for disseminating research outputs. Core grants are the main modality for supporting the stronger institutions while seed grants are given to the weaker institutions that have less absorptive capacity. SISERA also provides support for centers to upgrade their connectivity and study visits for researchers to work in policymaking agencies and government officials to visit research centers.

SISERA has a Steering Committee including USAID, ECA, AfDB, AERC, IDRC and AAU.

Box 6
EEPSEA's package of support for building competencies in environmental economics

Biannual workshop—thesis peer review, researcher networking, presentation skills.
Mentoring and peer review by resource persons.
Small grant competitions—by research themes, up to $25K to $30K.
Ph.D. coursework—University Göteborg, Sweden.
Regional short courses—advanced environmental and resource economics.
Workshops on methods and special topics—e.g., contingent valuation and choice modeling.
Ph.D. and postdoctoral awards.
Support for doctoral fieldwork.
Support to journals.
Information on publications, conferences, grants.
Facilitated networking online.
Research experience in field (economics of forest fires in Indonesia).
Access to literature, online journals.
Special topics—how to write research proposals.
Policy dialogue.

Restricted to nationals of Thailand, Malaysia, Indonesia, Philippines, Vietnam, Cambodia, Lao PDR, China, Papua New Guinea and Sri Lanka.

of AERC), mentoring of young researchers by involving them in research networks, providing support for meetings where senior and junior researchers present papers and interact, and supporting publications and more specific training (such as how to write a research proposal). The donor investment in these networks is high and thus the successful ones have loyal core donors supporting them over decades or more, with other donors joining the group to support specific projects. Networks are commonly supported by a number of donors that can include foundations and bilateral and multilateral agencies. Once these training networks become established, sustainability becomes a key question and leadership capacity and fund-raising skills become part of the capacity-building equation.

CIDA and IDRC both consider their support to regional networks among their most innovative activities in strengthening professional capacity. CIDA has supported a number of regional capacity-building networks including AERC and its Francophone parallel network for the M.A. Collaborative Program (PTCI[22]); the Consortium for Social and Economic Research in Peru (CIES), and the Secretariat for Institutional Support for Economic Research in Africa (SISERA)—most of which developed from IDRC initiatives (Box 5).

CIES is a national network rather than a regional one but has similar aims to link young researchers in the provinces, to fund research projects and networking activities, to disseminate research results and provide training to less-experienced research centers. The aim, as for better-known capacity-building networks like AERC, is to inject into policy dialogue and debate, well-researched policy formulation on major issues, including in the case of Peru, macroeconomic and regulatory policy, social service delivery, credit and enterprise development, environment and natural-resource management. The modality is similar to that well tested in AERC—research networks on specific topics such as macroeconomics and research competitions underpinned with training in research methodology and economics and support to publication and dissemination of research results (but without full-fledged graduate training programs). CIDA is providing nearly $4 million 1999–2003.

SISERA, supported by USAID, African Development Bank (AfDB), and IDRC has taken a different approach from AERC by intervening

primarily at the institutional level (African economic-research centers—both stronger Centers of Excellence and weaker ones) and providing a package of assistance to them including professional training to make them better able to attract and retain talented economists (Box 5).

AERC has been the role model for other successful network-training programs outside of sub-Saharan Africa. One successful training network for economists in Southeast Asia was deliberately modeled on AERC—the Economy and Environment Program for Southeast Asia (EEPSEA). It was established in Singapore in March 1993 and operates in Thailand, Malaysia, the Philippines, Papua New Guinea, Vietnam, Cambodia, Lao PDR, China and Sri Lanka. Originally funded by IDRC, it has been supported by more than 10 donors including bilateral donors (SIDA, CIDA, NORAD, DANIDA, DGIS), multilaterals (UNDP), Foundations (MacArthur) and the private sector. EEPSEA's objectives are to support research on the intersection of economy and environment, to provide a package of support to researchers modeled on AERC (network meetings, peer review, newsletters, resource persons, access to literature); to provide training to network members to increase their capacity as researchers, teachers and policy analysts; and to disseminate the results of EEPSEA research projects to policymakers (Box 6).

EEPSEA has received high evaluations in terms of its effectiveness and efficiency. It has managed to keep its personnel and administrative costs (including travel in an expensive region to cover) down to 30 percent of its expenditures so that it can allocate 27 percent of its budget to research projects, 23 percent to training courses, and 15 percent to regional meetings and workshops. One characteristic of EEPSEA is that it is always innovating and improving the package of support provided. In 1996 it introduced a system of advisers to support trainees between research meetings. It introduced development support for several universities and curriculum-development workshops and is proposing to offer support for "prestige" chairs in the universities that would receive a small payment and deliver a high-profile paper.

5 Multilateral Organizations

In many ways, it is the multilateral organizations that have led the evolution in thinking about capacity development in the last decade. Within the U.N. system, UNDP is a leading agency for conceptualizing capacity building for development and for thinking about how to implement capacity-building activities—so much so that the Report of the Secretary-General chided other U.N. organizations for assuming that capacity building is a UNDP responsibility rather than incumbent on all U.N. system organizations.[23] UNDP prepared guidance for its staff on how to design *institution building* projects as early as the 1970s and during the 1990s it sponsored several studies on capacity building.[24]

United Nations

In 1999 the U.N. General Assembly called for more systematic attention to capacity building by all U.N. agencies and again in 2001, it stressed the importance of capacity building and its *sustainability* as a goal of technical cooperation. More importantly, it requested U.N. agencies to report to U.N. Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) on their efforts in support of capacity building.[25] This meant that the U.N. agencies must pay greater attention to monitoring and evaluation of their capacity-building activities

In 2002, the World Bank and UNDP both produced major evaluation reports relevant to capacity building. The World Bank report looked at 50 years of technical cooperation and the evidence for success and failure.[26] UNDP published the results of its reviews of capacity development.[27] Both stocktaking exercises emphasized the highly contextual nature of capacity building and the difficulty of achieving sustainability. The U.N. agencies were again urged (by ECOSOC in 2002) to analyze their experiences, to come up with better indicators for monitoring capacity building, and to share their data and experiences more effectively across the U.N. system.

The U.N. system has therefore paid considerable attention to capacity building over the last few years and sought to harmonize the approaches of its different agencies. For the United Nations, capacity building is seen first and foremost as supporting member states to achieve the Millennium Development Goals and other internationally agreed development goals.

The U.N. rationale for its approach to capacity building is structured around four premises:

■ **The external environment in which developing countries must now operate and compete is rapidly changing;**

■ **The Millennium Development Goals implicitly require countries to have the capacities to take charge of their own development;**

■ **The United Nations has a special relationship with its member states;**

■ **U.N. organizations have specific mandates for assisting countries although they all are part of the overall U.N. system.**

The United Nations sees globalization as the major factor in the changing environment that demands that countries develop their capacities. Global markets and new institutions such as the World Trade Organization (WTO) require countries to meet international standards for their exports. New technologies such as biotechnology and ICTs mean that developing countries must acquire new capacities or fall even farther behind. New problems like the HIV/AIDS epidemic also demand new capacities, including the training of a new generation of people and organizations to deal with ruptured demographics.

The second element in the U.N. approach is that the Millennium Development Goals have implicit requirements for capacity building because countries are to lead their own processes to achieve the goals. Thus, the United Nations sees *national ownership* of capacity building from the design to the evaluation phase as a necessary condition of success:

> Capacity-building required to pursue those objectives [MDGs] is linked to national ownership, because only if there is adequate domestic capacity can those development objectives be achieved and remain sustainable. If domestic capacity is not adequate, national ownership is just not possible or is only apparent. Development processes cannot be owned if there are not enough capacities at the national level to conceive, design, formulate, implement, monitor and evaluate development policies and the corresponding operational activities (programmes and projects).[28]

The third premise in the U.N. approach to capacity building is that the United Nations has a unique relationship to its member states that sets it apart from other funding agencies. It is a convener at national, regional and global levels for countries to agree on development commitments. If countries do not have the capacities to implement those commitments, it is the responsibility of the U.N. system to (a) assist countries to acquire them, and (b) to advocate for the pursuit of globally agreed goals. This combination of roles is unique to the U.N. system. Somewhat strangely, the Secretary-General's report also argues that:

> Therefore the assessment of the effectiveness of the operational activities for development of the United Nations system in terms of capacity-building impact is also unique. Broadly accepted standards applied to bilateral cooperation activities in terms of capacity-building impact do not necessarily apply to the effectiveness of the United Nations development system. This is not an argument that the United Nations system should not be subject to scrutiny and evaluation, or that the system should be judged any less rigorously than any other actor on the international scene. But the fact is that the system's work is particular to its multiple role and the impact of its operational activities on national capacity development should be monitored and evaluated "sui generis" using appropriate indicators and measures.[29]

The fourth element in the U.N. rationale is that while the U.N. organizations each have a particular mandate with respect to assisting member states, there is a need for more consistent approaches across agencies and for more sharing of experience and data. This includes the requirement that all organizations in the system should put a stronger focus on explicit capacity-building mechanisms with realistic objectives and indicators related to capacity-building outcomes and that they regularly report on what they are doing through the Secretary-General. Looking at the array of approaches and achievements of the U.N. organizations, one can see that some are way ahead of others in implementing this system-wide "doctrine" on capacity building.

UNDP
UNDP has carried out extensive studies of capacity-building needs and has conducted major capacity-building programs in the areas of governance, poverty eradication, gender and policy development. In 2001 it launched a review of capacity development "fundamentals" including focus studies and electronic discussions. It has developed a capacity database containing hundreds of Web-based resources as well as three important books. UNDP has been a leader in thinking about capacity development and has been influential with other multilateral and bilateral donors. The UNDP Web site, www.capacity.undp.org, is a valuable source of ideas and information on capacity development.

UNICEF

UNICEF has developed its own approach to capacity building. In 2000 it integrated a rights-based approach to programming and this perspective frames its support to capacity development. Essentially, unmet MDGs are seen as unfulfilled rights, so the moral imperative to support capacity development to reach the MDGs is seen as correspondingly greater if they are an entitlement rather than a need. In practice, UNICEF contributes to national capacity through its traditional support to national statistics and surveys, social mobilization, planning, and training of health workers.

UNESCO

UNESCO has developed a framework for priority action for capacity building in higher education that was adopted by the World Conference on Higher Education in October 1998. The perspective is to balance the mission of higher-education institutions according to the needs of society, to recognize students as the center of attention, and to preserve academic freedom and institutional autonomy. At the national level, the key areas where capacity building is seen as needed are:

- **Legislation, policy and financial frameworks for reform;**

- **Expanding access on the basis of merit and especially to women;**

- **Reinforce links between higher education and research;**

- **Review the interface with technical and professional secondary education;**

- **Curriculum and evaluation reform;**

- **Flexible entry and exit points within the system to accommodate lifelong learning.**

U.N. organizations are generally making capacity building a more explicit part of their program strategies but there seems to be a lag in implementing the program changes needed to ensure that all of the principles of the U.N. approach are followed. Those in this category seem to include UNFPA, World Food Programme, FAO, IFAD, ILO, UNESCO, WIPO, WMO and WHO.

International Monetary Fund

The World Bank and the International Monetary Fund (IMF) have also taken a new approach to capacity building and have sought to apply the U.N.

Principles in their programs. The IMF initiated broad-based medium-term technical cooperation action plans to address the capacity-building needs of countries and is strengthening its programs to increase national ownership and improve its own coordination with other funding agencies and civil-society organizations. It has adopted the UNDP capacity-building framework including the requirement that countries take ownership of the process. The IMF works at all three levels identified by UNDP and believes that all three levels should be strengthened together:

- The *individual* (through IMF Institute training);

- *Organization or entity* (such as the government or one of its ministries) through technical assistance and Financial Sector Assessment Programs (FSAPs);

- *System or enabling environment*—meaning that countries have the capacity to develop and implement their own development strategies using their human resources and institutional structures. This is achieved through IMF programs and consultations, standards and codes, PRSPs and FSAPs.

World Bank

The World Bank has been reviewing its approach to capacity building since the 1997 World Development Report; the State in a Changing World. An important follow-up study was Reforming Public Institutions and Strengthening Governance: A World Bank

---

Box 7
World Bank: Capacity-building priorities in tertiary education

Sub-Saharan Africa
- Educational quality and relevance,
- Financial sustainability of the tertiary-education system,
- System expansion and system differentiation,
- Role of the polytechnics,
- Decentralization,
- Institutional leadership,
- Limits to privatization, and
- Distance education—improved quality, greater access, cost-efficiency.

Greater Mekong Region
- Expansion of universities to meet demand,
- Access and equity issues including regional equity,
- Role of private institutions,
- Financial sustainability for universities—cost recovery mechanisms, and
- Staff upgrading.

World Bank Loans and IDA Credits for Tertiary Education, 1995–2004 in Sub-Saharan Africa and Greater Mekong Region[30]

Fiscal Year	Project	Loan Amount, U.S. $Million
Sub-Saharan Africa		
Guinea 1995	Higher Education Management Support ■ Institutional reorganization ■ Accreditation and evaluation procedures ■ Upgrading information and communications technology ■ Improve budgetary programming and monitoring	6.6
Mauritius 1995	Higher and Technical Education Project: University of Mauritius ■ Institutional strengthening—staff upgrading ■ Science, engineering, management, graduate quality ■ Curriculum reform to address labor-market needs	16
Senegal 1996	Higher Education: University Cheikh Anta Diop ■ Library services and expansion of central library ■ Upgrading of teaching and research ■ Strengthening of management capacities and systems	26.5
Eritrea 1997	Human Resources Development ■ External technical assistance ■ Foreign training mostly M.A., but some B.A. and Ph.D. ■ Institutional strengthening—human resources, computers	15.2
Cameroon 1998	Higher Education Technical Training ■ Introduction of training options relevant to local industry ■ Addition of new disciplines and system coherence ■ Institutional development, evaluation and policy sustainability	4.8
Madagascar 1998	Education Sector Development (including higher-education component of $5 million) ■ Competitive fund for institutional modernization	65
Gambia 1998	Third Education Sector Project (with higher-education component of $1.5 million) ■ Improved tertiary education quality and relevance	75
Guinea 2000	Education for All Program (with higher-education component of $32.2 million) ■ Improved educational quality and relevance ■ Develop central university library ■ Curriculum review ■ Competitive research fund	70
Uganda 2001	University Training Pilot ■ Strengthening of Makerere University capacities to train district-level administrators for decentralized service delivery	11
Mozambique 2002	Higher Education Project ■ Strengthening higher-education institutions (academic quality, infrastructure) ■ Sector-level management and policy reform; Management Information Systems ■ Accreditation system: academic award system ■ Pilot scholarship fund ■ Strengthening of Ministry of Higher Education	80
Lesotho 2003	Second Education Sector Development Program (includes higher-education component of $400,000) ■ Analytical studies and higher-education policy development	21
Ghana 2004	Ghana Education Sector (higher-education component of $33 million) ■ Innovation fund for teaching and learning ■ Strengthen system-support agencies ■ Improve quality and relevance of selected university postgrad programs and polytechnic education ■ Strengthen institutional leadership and management ■ Use of ICTs and distance learning ■ HIV/AIDS prevention and management	78
Mauritania 2004	Higher Education Project ■ Improved educational quality and relevance ■ Strengthened management information systems ■ University autonomy under performance contracts ■ Increased income-generation capacities	15

Table 5 (continued)

World Bank Loans and IDA Credits for Tertiary Education
1995–2004 in Sub-Saharan Africa and Greater Mekong Region

Fiscal Year	Project	Loan Amount, U.S. $Million
Sub-Saharan Africa (continued)		
Ethiopia 2004	Post-Secondary Education Project ■ Institutional development grants for universities ■ Strengthening of three system-support agencies ■ Innovation fund for undergraduate education, graduate programs and institutional management	40
Tanzania 2005	Education Rationalization Credit (with higher-education component) ■ Management of higher- and technical-education sector ■ Rationalization of post-secondary institutions and funding ■ Transfer of authority to one agency ■ Increase relevance of higher education to labor market ■ Equity: increase enrollment and expand access	TBD
Uganda 2005	Millennium Science Initiative ■ Competitive funding for centers of research excellence ■ Improved undergraduate science education ■ Partnerships for technology transfer	TBD
	Subtotal for higher education only	***$287.3***
Greater Mekong Region		
Thailand 1997	University Science and Engineering Education ■ Improving quality of undergraduate education ■ Short-term overseas training for academic and support staff ■ Technical assistance and academic support services	143.4
Vietnam 1998	Higher Education ■ Institutional development, ICTs ■ Quality improvement in selected higher-education institutions on competitive grant basis ■ Administrative support for project implementation	83.3
China 1999	Higher Education Reform ■ Science and engineering quality improvement ■ Staff upgrading; ICTs ■ Innovative cooperation networks and partnerships ■ Projects to support institutional capacity for change	70
Cambodia 1995	National Higher Education Action Plan ■ Restoration of higher-education sector through 10-year plan ■ National policy and legislation ■ Review of academic programs ■ Policies and procedures to improve access	$295,000*
Cambodia 1999	Legal/regulatory framework for higher education ■ Technical assistance to government ■ Training and consensus-building workshops	$252,000*
Cambodia 2002	Higher Education Development ■ Upgrading of staff ■ Incentives for reform of higher-education system ■ Establishment of credit system	TBD
	Subtotal	***$297.25***

*Actual $ amounts, not millions

Strategy (2000). It has been part of the ongoing discussions between the multilateral and bilateral donors that are leading to an emerging consensus about capacity building.

The Bank's approach lays particular emphasis—as one might expect—on the importance of monetary and nonmonetary incentives to shape the demand for capacity. It posits that incentives linked to governance structures that enable civil society to hold governments accountable for performance will help to sustain the availability of national capacity within countries and reduce losses through brain drain or institutional roadblocks that frustrate entrepreneurship. The World Bank also subscribes to the importance of strong leadership, local ownership of the capacity-building process and a systems approach in its thinking about capacity building.

The Bank has gone some way in operationalizing these shifts in its thinking about capacity building. It is working with countries and with the IMF to improve the accountability of governments with respect to their expenditures so that, for example, poverty-related spending can be tracked. It has also, through partnerships with ACBF-PACT, strengthened the capacities of parliaments and civil society in Africa to hold governments more accountable. A working group has been established across the Bank including the WBI to develop a framework for incorporating capacity building more systematically into bank lending in Africa.

One of the challenges in capacity building that the Bank is examining is how to scale up from specific local successes. This requires learning from experience and extracting lessons that can be applied in other situations. The WBI has reviewed successful cases of capacity building where there were dramatic improvements in organizational performance and is currently documenting with local researchers, policymakers and practitioners what it takes to achieve large-scale

poverty reduction at country level. The results were reported in May 2004 and should be useful not only to the Bank in its own interventions but also to provide model experiences for other countries.[31]

In the education sector, since 2000 the World Bank has placed more emphasis on investments in higher education for countries *at all income levels*, at least in part because it has received more requests from low-income countries for tertiary education projects after it published with UNESCO the report by the independent Task Force on Higher Education and Society.[32] President James Wolfensohn endorsed the conclusions of the report that tertiary education is critical to build capacity and to reduce poverty. Prior to 2000, it was middle-income countries that were more likely to request (and receive) World Bank loans for higher education. This turnaround from a priority focus on basic education in low-income countries to a renewed interest in their higher-education systems underscores the two-way influence between the World Bank and governments of both donor and recipient countries.

Since 1999, the World Bank has been active in stakeholder dialogues on tertiary education reform, which have identified the main issues that capacity-building initiatives need to address (Box 7). Table 5 summarizes the Bank's projects in higher education for sub-Saharan Africa and the Greater Mekong Region 1995–2004.

The Bank has also invested heavily into networks that will foster South-South learning such as the Gateway, the Global Development Learning Network (GDLN) and the Global Development Network (GDN). These are discussed in the section on ICT-related capacity building. Within the Bank, it is reported that the capacity-building initiatives involved in the ICT-based knowledge networks are not well integrated into the other capacity-building program strategies, which they eventually need to be.

6 Bilateral Donors

As a group, bilateral donors share many similarities in their approaches to capacity building and yet exhibit distinct differences. This paradox is due to their falling into line when it comes to avowing common donor policies in international fora such as the OECD-DAC, and then having to modify their individual responses when they get home in response to their own national situations. The OECD-DAC has provided a venue for discussing strategies for capacity building. It has conducted a survey of donor strategies[33] and is currently supporting a major study on capacity development.[34]

The bilateral donors are driven to be more consistent in their approaches to capacity building because they have endorsed the move from donor projects to sector-wide approaches (SWAps) to program-based approaches. Program-based approaches do not just mean less earmarking of funds by bilateral donors but demand that capacity building is front and center in everything that the donor does, because governments must now take ownership for allocating donor aid among different priorities (Box 8). Thus, capacity building, and especially professional competencies, is job number one. Hence the recent interest among bilateral donors to develop agency

policies and frameworks for capacity building.

One early result from this major (and ongoing) transformation in how aid is delivered has been a move away from long-term expatriate advisers and a move toward using local consultants. Norway and Sweden have led the way, with Canada (a donor that has traditionally relied on Canadian consultants) and the Netherlands also increasing its use of local consultants. It was perhaps easier for Norway and Sweden to change their use of consultants because they were less reliant on using their own national consultants than most bilateral donors. Also, compared to some other donor organizations, they enjoy considerable autonomy within their national governmental system. Interestingly, DANIDA has bucked the general trend and has gone in the opposite direction since 1996, with increased use of Danish consultants.

Both Japan and the United States differ from the other DAC donors for different reasons. Japan's approach to development assistance is to posit that since it was a recipient of aid in the last 50 years, it understands the recipient country's perspective and thus is in a unique position to share experience with developing countries. The Japan International Cooperation Agency thus still makes use of Japanese experts to carry out the capacity building. USAID channels much of its aid through private voluntary

organizations and thus they play key roles in the
capacity-building transfers.

CIDA: Canadian International
Development Agency

A capacity-building approach to development assis-
tance has a long history in CIDA. As early as 1975
its policy was to support countries to engineer their
own development and in 1987 capacity development
was established as one of four pillars in Canada's
development assistance charter.

   CIDA has put a lot of effort into developing an
agency-wide approach to capacity building by pro-
viding policy, operational tools and monitoring
implementation. It has a good Occasional Paper
Series devoted to Capacity Development, which is
available on its Web site. The agency has internalized
capacity building as an integral part of the participa-
tory and systems approach to programming that
emerged within CIDA in the early 1990s.

   More recently, the trend towards program-based
approaches (PBAs) has underscored the need to
mainstream capacity building as both a means and
an end to development assistance, since PBAs are
predicated on the capacity of developing country

government institutions to plan, allocate and manage
the pooled aid funds it receives. It is expected that
two-thirds of CIDA support to sub-Saharan Africa
will be through PBAs by 2006. This means that
there will be a more (passive) and collective donor
responsibility for capacity building through PBAs.
Since governments will decide on the priorities,
some costs that governments would formerly have
covered—like textbooks and salaries—may now be
built by governments into the pooled funding.

   For CIDA, capacity development is thus a major
programming strategy. CIDA estimates that up to
74 percent of its projects and programs have major
capacity-building components and that this repre-
sents a major increase over the last decade. Its tool
kits recognize four levels for capacity-building inter-
ventions—individual, organizational, sectoral/network
and the enabling environment. However, most of
CIDA's capacity building effort is focused at the level
of organization. Interventions to shape the broader
social and political environment are less common
and generally individual capacity building is a second-
order consideration, especially within the framework
of the Canadian Partnership Program.

   CIDA's main focus for the past decade has been
basic education with much less support going to
the tertiary education sector. This was partly a reflec-
tion of the general donor move toward support for
basic education but also in CIDA's case, because
of a deterioration in the relationship between the
agency and the university sector in Canada which
saw the universities' share of Canadian ODA grants
and contracts decline through the 1990s while that
of Canadian NGOs rose—meaning that CIDA
was using NGOs as its Canadian partners rather
than universities.

DFID: U.K. Department for
International Development

DFID does not have an agency-wide strategy for
capacity building but the debate is alive and well
within the organization. Capacity building is seen as
needing a holistic approach that involves a full range
of policies and processes and should empower those
whose capacities are being built. The importance of
an equitable and effective higher-education system to
achieving the Millennium Development Goals is
accepted, as is the need for developing countries to
be able to contribute more to science and innova-
tion. DFID stresses that one approach cannot fit all

and that the best modality for building capacities can be very location specific.

Two current debates within DFID are around (a) building individual capacities versus strengthening institutions; and (b) providing training in-country versus bringing scholars to the United Kingdom. There is also discussion about Intellectual Property Rights and how these restrict access to materials and data for developing-country researchers. Some modalities for professional capacity building such as twinning arrangements between research institutions or providing training in developed-country institutions with access to protected research materials might be preferred where IPR presents barriers to effective capacity building.

Typical capacity-building activities supported by DFID are strengthening research centers (e.g., Nepal Forest Research Centre, Kenya Agricultural Research Institute (KARI), and strengthening the capacity of users to inform and interact with researchers in order to make their research better address national and local needs. Thus DFID provides a suite of support activities to a research institution including staff training, infrastructure, research support, access to databases (e.g., national plant genetic databases, land resource use systems) as well as improved statistical and analytical systems; better libraries and better links to policy processes. DFID also support projects (e.g., Bangladesh Agricultural Support Services, Namibia Farming Systems Research and training) that are designed to strengthen the service delivery systems between research and the users. It provides staff training in both the public and private sector delivery systems that includes ICT and more traditional forms of communication and organizational management.

JICA: Japan International Cooperation Agency

JICA's approach to capacity building is framed within the overall OECD-DAC approach but with some particular Japanese distinguishing features.[35] A major concern is maintaining Japanese public support, especially in the context of the single-year budget system in Japan. The general trend among bilateral agencies to pool resources within program-based approaches and sector-wide approaches inevitably means that the visibility of the contributions of individual donors is reduced, as is the ability for donors to show their own governments and public what impact their own taxpayers' contributions to Overseas Development

Assistance have made. This is particularly a concern for projects in Africa where PBAs and SWAps are most far advanced as implementation mechanisms.

For JICA, the pooling of bilateral donor funds is added on to the considerable proportion of Japanese ODA that is passed through multilateral organizations—about 20 percent of ODA currently. In addition, another 27 percent of Japanese ODA is in the form of yen loans from the Japan Bank for International Cooperation of which 60 percent is untied. Japan faces considerable difficulty therefore in (a) untying its technical assistance portion of ODA (29 percent) or its grant aid (19 percent) in terms of public support, or (b) entering in the pooled-fund approach of the other donors. This is one reason why Japan is considering a Japanese NEPAD fund for Africa, which will allow partner governments to take the lead in identifying the priorities but will also provide for JICA to showcase its work. In 2003 JICA did support pooling of funds on a very restricted basis. Otherwise, it contributes to the goal of more coordinated donor support by ensuring that its projects are consistent with partner government-sector strategies and by sharing information on its projects with other donors.

A second element in the Japanese approach to capacity building is the notion that Japan has a special status as a donor country because it was a developing country only 50 years ago and was the recipient of aid itself. Thus the Japanese experience of development and the proven models and systems on which it was built are particularly relevant to share with today's

developing countries ("engagement" policy). This is the rationale for using Japanese experts and Japanese firms as key modalities for transferring experience and building capacity. Public support for ODA is predicated on the expectation that Japanese civil society can participate as partners in development and that development assistance means not only the transfer of yen but the sharing of values and experiences.

At the same time, Japanese aid has traditionally included some features that are consistent with current "new" approaches to capacity building. For example, local ownership has been a key feature of Japanese ODA since its outset. This is achieved in several ways:

- **The partner government is responsible for project identification and it is reviewed within the context of the partner government's national-development plan and sector strategy;**

- **JICA does not establish project implementation units within ministries for its technical-assistance projects but requires the ministry to be solely responsible for implementation;**

- **JICA-supported experts are integrated into existing ministry structures and serve as advisers and mentors to local staff as their capacity is enhanced;**

- **The consultant in charge of project monitoring for Japan reports to the relevant ministry in the partner government;**

- **Japan does not support recurrent costs so the partner government becomes a funding partner at the outset.**

The key modalities used by JICA to support capacity building of professional competencies are shown in Box 9. They tend to fall in what we would see as more traditional modalities, with their dependence on the dispatch of JICA technical cooperation experts (both short and long term) and bringing trainees to Japan for training. But their use of volunteers at all levels underscores their philosophical "sharing of experience" approach and this has translated into more regional training for South-South sharing of experience.

Most of Japanese capacity-building support is to the public sector and JICA emphasizes that the role of the Japanese expert is not to get things done as quickly as possible but to share experiences and to facilitate the transfer and internalization of both knowledge and skills with the counterparts whose capacities are being strengthened. JICA has also more recently begun to adopt a regional (as opposed to bilateral) approach to sharing experience and is supporting Partnership Programs with a number of

countries including Thailand, Singapore, Philippines, Chile, Brazil, Argentina, Egypt and Tunisia for them to provide developing-country training opportunities. It sees regional approaches as cost-effective and particularly important for areas such as environment and health management that go across national borders.

The mix of modalities varies depending on whether the capacity building is seen at national systems level (such as the health system), institutional level or individual level. In the case of national systems level, large-scale technical-cooperation projects are the main modality. For institutional-level capacity building, the Partnership Program is used to link universities, NGOs and local governments. For individual-level capacity building, training courses in Japan, or more recently, selected other countries, and the use of both experts and volunteers as teachers and mentors are the two preferred means.

In both the health and education sectors, JICA is still focusing on primary and secondary service levels rather than the tertiary sector, and in agriculture (particularly in Africa) the focus is on small-scale agricultural production systems. Given Japan's strength in rice production, JICA is considering providing more support to the research and dissemination of New Rice for Africa (NERICA) developed by the West Africa Rice Development Association (WARDA). Along with these emphases on basic health and education and small-scale agricultural production, JICA is planning to focus its capacity-building initiatives in Africa at local levels, including support to government administrations undergoing decentralization.

SDC: Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation

The Swiss SDC is very involved in capacity building in the Greater Mekong Region (GMR) where it has been working since the 1970s, starting with support to regional institutions located in Thailand. In 1990, SDC opened a Coordination Office for the region in Bangkok and began to work in Lao PDR and Vietnam. It was going to develop a country program for Myanmar but pulled out in 1988 after the military coup. The Swiss were therefore well placed when the 1991 peace process in Cambodia encouraged donors to be more active in the country and ODA started to increase in the GMR. In Vietnam, cumulative ODA commitments during 1993–2001 amounted to nearly U.S. $20 billion and the donors and government of Vietnam came to a new agreement in May 2001

about how ODA should be delivered and harmonized, including joint strategies for sector policies. It included new rules for project approval and project monitoring and evaluation. More generally, donors are better coordinating their ODA activities in the region and the Swiss are active in the "like-minded" donor group actively promoting ODA harmonization.

Swiss ODA is aimed at supporting the fundamental structural transition processes in Vietnam, Laos PDR and Cambodia. Its main strategic orientations are governance and human and institutional development. Its work on governance is focused on capacity building within civil society, and strengthening public administration including its transparency, accountability and awareness of the rule of law. SDC has identified weak institutions and the general lack of professionals trained in new management and education approaches as key constraints to development. Its program now covers the Mekong Riparian States with the exception of China (Vietnam, Laos PDR, Cambodia, Myanmar and Thailand).

In addition to country programs (except in Myanmar), SDC has tried to:

■ **Search for a more consistent "regional approach" with improved synergies between regional and country-based programs;**

■ **Shift from a project approach to a more strategic program-and-partnership approach linking projects to policy dialogue;**

■ **Integrate capacity building into all its projects in all sectors.**

SDC's four major fields of cooperation in GMR are:

■ **Urban governance and infrastructure,**

■ **Private-sector development,**

■ **Integration into world economy, and**

■ **Natural resources management.**

SDC is not working with the higher-education sector in the region directly but is concerned with building capacities in the public sector, among urban managers, small and medium entrepreneurs, and managers of natural resources. It is also concerned to promote institutional arrangements that will enable disputes over natural resources to be negotiated among stakeholders. In terms of the capacity-building modalities that SDC uses, they include short-term training tailor-made for the target groups, "learning by doing" and, for more senior

professionals, study visits, executive training sessions, training of trainers and academic exchanges.

SIDA: Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency

SIDA, like its homonymous sister agency, CIDA has put considerable effort into its strategy for capacity development. It has elaborated an agency-wide policy for capacity development and developed guidelines on needs analysis for capacity development for its staff and consultants.[36] SIDA's (1995) mission statement emphasizes that:

Sida's task is to make sustainable development possible and thus make development cooperation superfluous in the long run. Our principal method is capacity and institutional development.

For SIDA, capacity development comes from the *combined* outcome of activities at three levels of intervention:

■ **Development of the knowledge and competence of individuals;**

■ **Development of organizations or systems of organizations;**

■ **Change and strengthening of institutional frameworks (both formal laws and policies, and informal cultural and social contexts) within which individuals and organizations operate.**

Box 10
SIDA's priorities for capacity building

- Improve its cooperation with its Swedish partners.
- Give more support financially and professionally to national systems of education, training and research.
- Increase its support to developing international competence in Sweden.
- Make SIDA better equipped to work in partnership with others in capacity development.
- Integrate a clearer focus on capacity development in all programs and projects.
- Develop its role as a catalyst in development of networks that aim at wider sharing of professional experience between countries, organizations and individuals.
- Improve coordination within SIDA between support to basic education and higher education and research, and develop a more comprehensive approach.
- As far as possible participate in sector-wide and program-based approaches.
- In Africa provide more support to development of universities and independent research institutions and networks, and the training of government employees.
- Develop the capacity to perform analyses and evaluation and IT policy.

SIDA's problematique (termed "analytical frame-work" in the policy documents) for capacity building is thus placed more squarely in the context of building institutional frameworks for democracy, equity and cooperation than for most donor agencies. SIDA's policy also distinguishes between *transfer of knowledge* and *development of knowledge*—the latter involving active give and take between partners leading to creation of new knowledge—and being what SIDA is aiming for. One important tenet of SIDA's approach is that capacity building needs different interventions in different places, but what is also needed is a greater focus on how systems as a whole are being strengthened through these multiple local interventions. SIDA also reports that after more than 30 years of experience of support to capacity development, it still comes in for criticism from developing countries—although is regarded as a leader by other donors.

Based on its internal reflections and its policy statement, SIDA has established a number of priorities to guide its capacity-building activities (Box 10).

SIDA has moved its focus from support to individual units to supporting national systems such as for health and education. While its policy is to focus more at the level of national systems and enabling environments, many interventions are still targeted at training individuals, twinning arrangements between Swedish partner institutions and those in developing countries, and some direct support to network institutions like the Council for the Development of Social Science Research in Africa (CODESRIA) and AERC. There was an intensive phase of rethinking in the late 1980s and early 1990s that was inspired by the Nordic evaluation of technical assistance which led to SIDA abandoning its experts program. The twinning arrangements and short-course programs continue, as well as support to training individual scholars in Sweden, often through sandwich programs and short courses.

In 2003 SIDA sponsored some 60 short courses in English of three-to-eight weeks duration each with 20 to 30 participants. The topics ranged from conflict resolution and human rights, to health-systems development, forest certification, public broadcasting for radio managers, small and medium enterprise management, remote sensing, management of Parliaments, International Board and Directors Seminar, air-pollution management, risk management in banking and the U.N. Convention of the Rights of the Child.

USAID: United States Agency for International Development

USAID is a major player in providing ODA but tends to go its own way in terms of delivery mechanisms. Like JICA, it does not get much involved in bilateral pooled funds.

Although it invests about double the amount in supporting basic education as it does tertiary education, USAID has long targeted higher education for its capacity-building efforts and has done this historically through training thousands of students from developing countries in the United States. From 1950s into 1980s, USAID, together with the Ford and Rockefeller Foundations were the global leaders in training students from developing countries in the United States. Over two-thirds of the trainees over a 20-year period were from Asia and Latin America with the remaining one-third divided more or less equally between Africa and the Middle East.

In 1990, USAID began to search for more cost-effective modalities through partnerships and networks and entered into a series of policy roundtable discussions with the U.S. higher-education community about the role of higher education in development. This led to the identification of seven priorities for capacity building (Box 11).

As a response to shrinking training budgets, USAID has shifted away from long-term academic training in the United States to increased emphasis on short-term, primarily in-country, technical training. It sees these programs as not only less expensive but also more flexible for trainees, more able to respond to local skill needs and less likely to suffer from losses due to brain drain. USAID also sees ICTs and distance learning as a key mechanism for implementation and is contracting private-sector firms in the United States as well as universities and colleges.

In 1997 the Global Bureau Center for Human Capacity Development implemented a program based on partnerships between higher-education institutions in the United States and developing countries. The partnership program is implemented through the Liaison Office of the U.S. Higher Education which represents 2,700 higher-education institutions in the United States. By the end of 2003, the program had established 87 partnerships in 36 countries involving 90 universities and community colleges in the United States and 87 in developing countries. It has also established seven regional higher-

<div style="background:gray">

Box 11
USAID priorities for building professional competencies

- Improve higher-education leadership and administrative transformation.
- Improve workforce development systems with community colleges.
- Improve human and institutional capacities in agriculture and resource management.
- Improve human and institutional capacity impacted by HIV/AIDS pandemic.
- Improve the quality of teacher training.
- Improve capacities for leadership in private and NGO sectors.
- Improve higher education's role in public administration and management.

</div>

education networks involving 25 institutions in 14 developing countries and 60 U.S. institutions. These partnerships have developed new degree *programs* in public health and natural-resources management in Laos PDR, Nepal, Mexico, Uganda, Colombia and Uzbekistan. In other countries, new or improved curricula have been the focus.

In 2000 a new Fellowship Program was established to involve the best of American junior scientists and professionals in overseas development. These Fellows work with experienced USAID officers in development programs. In 2002 two new programs were added to the package—leadership training and technical-skills upgrading targeted at both semiprofessional levels and unskilled/unemployed youth and adults.

Within the agricultural sector, USAID has long supported an integrated approach to capacity building linking research, training and outreach within its Collaborative Research Support Programs. These have built agricultural research capacity in developing countries at the level of national systems. The precipitous decline in USAID's support for long-term train-

ing of professionals in the United States that took place over the last decade has led to renewed calls for a reassessment of USAID's approach. In 1990 USAID funded nearly 10,000 students from developing countries to train in the United States. By 2000 the number had dropped to 1,200.

The threat now is that many of the research, training and extension institutions in developing countries will collapse as a generation of trained professionals retires and is further decimated by HIV/AIDS, and the decline in professional relationships between researchers and educators in the United States and these institutions weaken what supportive networks there once were. The Board for International Food and Agricultural Development (BIFAD) has recommended that USAID renew its investment in capacity building generally and in long-term training specifically as a matter of urgency.[37]

BIFAD argues for a "Second Generation" capacity-building program that strengthens public and private institutions in developing countries to train students and carry out research themselves, and to achieve this through a Competitive Academic Partnership between U.S. universities and those in developing countries. Its approach would be predicated on the recognition that capacity building must be locally owned and led to be effective and sustainable. BIFAD also urges USAID to design its intervention in the light of what other donors are doing and should start with two to three regional programs in Africa and scale up from there. The recommended modalities are summer schools combining teachers from the United States and local scholars, sandwich programs that combine basic coursework in local institutions and advanced courses in either the United States or elsewhere, thesis research in their home countries, and a heavy reliance on ICT technologies.

7

Foundations and Other Organizations

Most foundations active in international development are U.S. foundations. Philanthropic foundations have some particular advantages over multilateral and bilateral aid agencies when it comes to support for capacity building. Although foundations are less significant in terms of the total dollars they provide to development assistance in general[38] and capacity building in particular, they provide something that is arguably more important than dollar amount—the capacity to provide small amounts of seed money when that is all that is needed and the ability to stick with funding initiatives over the long term. Sustaining support for 10 to 25 years has been cited by reviewers as a critical factor in the success of several different modalities—whether twinning universities or mounting regional network activities like CODESRIA or AERC. Staying with capacity building over the long haul requires two essential ingredients:

- **The long-term vision at the outset and accepting the greater uncertainty and risks that go with long-term thinking;**
- **Staying power on the part of foundation boards, presidents and senior staff when new ideas come tantalizingly over the horizon.**

This is not to say that foundations are immune to changing fashions in development assistance. One finding of this review is the influence of incoming foundation presidents on first, instituting a foundation-wide stocktaking, followed by the launching of major new initiatives. Thus foundation programming appears at least partly to reflect the terms of presidents, anchored by the experience of senior staff and framed within the overall direction provided by foundation boards.

Much foundation work is characterized by a strong scientific or research basis. Foundations (together with IDRC) have tended to recruit program officers who combine strong academic backgrounds with field experience and an aptitude for program management (if not prior experience). These program officers know the subject fields in which they are operating and they have their own professional networks. Many come from a scientific or academic background and take a research approach to project development. They are generally well respected by the research people with whom they work in developing countries. However, there is a risk that program officers who have substantial discretionary authority in funding decisions will make judgments that are influenced by their personal perceptions of grantees. Some senior local professionals feel that foundation program staff can lack adequate accountability for their decisions.

Another aspect of the respect and trust with which foundation staff are held, may be that there is less turnover of foundation staff than in the bilateral agencies, which often rely heavily on an ebb and flow of consultants to do the work that is done by staff in foundations. This in turn leads to the problem of intellectual renewal for long-term foundation staff—a topic that has also engaged IDRC management. Some of the foundations, especially Ford and Rockefeller, share with IDRC a genuinely international staff, many members of whom have experience in the organizations in developing countries that they are supporting. This can create tensions for donor agencies to ensure that their staff does not cross the line in capacity building and encroach on the role of the grantee. As donors encourage grantees to take more responsibility for the design and evaluation of projects as well as their implementation, the role of the donor program staff inevitably changes. Some donors, including IDRC, are beginning to reassess whether their program staff should have stronger communication and policy skills as well as more traditional scientific and program management qualifications.

Foundations (and IDRC) are able to work directly with organizations in developing countries and do not need to go through the prism of the country agreement. This gives them great flexibility compared to multilateral and bilateral donors. This comparative advantage is probably increasing in the context of the SWAps and PBAs that are framing donor coordination for ODA, particularly in Africa because governments are more in the driver's seat for directing which institutions will be supported and for what roles.

One of the challenges facing the foundations is how to achieve the balance between (a) working with governments within their priority frameworks and (b) providing support for needed discourse and airing of alternative views within countries through supporting research institutions and think tanks that may not be looked on with favor by the government in power.

Historically this has been a role played by foundation support to networks like FLACSO (Latin American Faculty of Social Sciences) and CLACSO (Latin American Council of Social Sciences) (again with IDRC) during the period in power 1970s–'80s of the military regimes in Latin America, and it was the survival of think tanks and research networks

through those period which laid the intellectual groundwork for the emergence of stronger democracies in the 1990s. In South Africa, it was external support to the African National Congress (ANC), the trade unions and civil-society organizations from donors like the Ford Foundation and IDRC that laid the policy groundwork for the ANC when democracy came in 1994.

Among the reputed strengths of the foundations is their ability to tolerate risk of failure. This is one of the guiding principles of the Carter Foundation and has been cited as one of the reasons for the success story of Carnegie's capacity-building support for the Community Foundation for the Western Region of Zimbabwe—"We let them make mistakes."

The OECD-DAC has suggested that foundations are incubators for new development ideas and a testing ground for what works and doesn't work. If the foundations also see themselves in this light, how does that influence their agendas for capacity building? One important initiative is the Partnership for Higher Education in Africa among four foundations, one of whose goals is to demonstrate that major renewal of higher education institutions is possible and to encourage other donors to support the sector. The decision to enter this partnership and the experience to date has in turn influenced each of the foundations' strategic thinking about capacity building. Therefore the Partnership for Higher Education in Africa is discussed first and then the four participating foundations, followed by other foundations and organizations.

Partnership for Higher Education in Africa

The Partnership for Higher Education in Africa was launched by the four foundation presidents of Carnegie, Ford, MacArthur and Rockefeller in April 2000 with a commitment to provide $100 million over five years. About 10 percent of the funds are joint funding for analytical and strategic studies, regional networking and central coordination, and the rest are allocated by individual foundations within in the overall framework of the Partnership.

The problematique behind the Partnership is to help universities and countries engaged in reform to be the vanguard of a wider movement of reform for higher education in Africa. Thus the goal is multifaceted—to support individual institutions to perform better and thus to play a leading role in the development of their countries, to strengthen national systems

**Funding elements in partnership
for higher education in Africa**

Individual awards

Training programs
- Ph.D. Program (AERC)

Research support

University programs
- Support to individual departments in different universities

Library
- Online access to journals and purchase of journals
- Digitizing libraries

Staff development
- Staff development and doctoral training for teaching and
  research staff
- Staff exchange programs
- Social plan for retrenched university staff

University administration
- Strategic planning and policy reviews
- Development of fund-raising capacities
- Refurbishment and upgrading of teaching and research facilities

ICT
- Strategic planning for ICTs
- Campus computer-systems development/LANs
- Negotiations to obtain bandwidth

National/regional university systems
- National quality-assurance system for South African universities
- Ministry of Higher Education fellowship program
- Research on higher-education institutions/systems/finance
- Human-capacity development and research needs of government
  decentralization
- Database development of university dissertations (AAU)
- Consultations between universities to develop collaborative research
- Consultations between university vice chancellors
- Training for mitigating impact of HIV/AIDS on ministries of education

Higher education as academic field
- Enhance capacity for study of higher education as field through
  master's program
- Support for new Journal of Higher Education in Africa (CODESRIA)

for education through the universities, and to
encourage and inspire other universities to adopt
reforms in education. The Partnership is thus
involved in both demonstration and advocacy to
influence university leadership, national governments
and donors that the higher-education system in
Africa can be taken to a new level of competence,
quality and effectiveness.

The Partnership has allowed the foundations to
provide multiple complementary approaches both
within and across universities so that individual grants

reinforce one another, an approach which is seen as a
key success factor in capacity building (Box 12).

The Partnership influenced the four foundations to
think more strategically about higher education as a
system that links to basic education, to labor markets
and to how government itself functions. The decision
was therefore made to focus efforts on countries
whose governments were already demonstrating a will-
ingness to strengthen democracy and social and eco-
nomic equity, and that showed support for universities
and for market economies. At the university level, the
selection was also made in the light of the commit-
ment of the university to quality education, equity of
access and good leadership. In other words, based on
analytical case studies undertaken by national research
teams, the Partnership decided to select both countries
and universities where conditions and leadership
augured that success would be most likely.[39]

Carnegie Corporation of New York

Carnegie's approach to capacity building in Africa
builds on its founder's commitment to build self-
reliant individuals and institutions able to participate
fully in the development of their countries in the
then-British colonies of the 1920s.[40] Since then the
approach has been shaped by the Corporation's
boards and presidents. In the 1960s it was to take
account of the independence movements in the
1960s, when Carnegie provided Africans with train-
ing opportunities in the United Kingdom and United
States, and supported training in African studies for
Americans, together with grants to strengthen univer-
sity libraries in Africa. Capacity building in commu-
nications was identified by a major review in the
1960s as an area neglected by most other donors.
Carnegie therefore concentrated on communications,
education linked to economic development and the
role of women in development. By the late 1980s
until 1997, these themes were focused on women's
health and development, science and technology for
development, and transitions to democracy in Africa.

In 1999 the incoming president initiated an exten-
sive review of higher education and library services in
Africa and an internal review of lessons learned from
the earlier Carnegie program work in Africa. This led
to the establishment of the International Development
Program and a new initiative to focus on strengthening:

> …a limited number of Commonwealth African universities
> to serve as models of successful transformation, assist the

cause of women's higher education there, and position
selected African public libraries for the information age.[41]

The thinking behind the new program, which
evolved into Carnegie's participation in the
Partnership for Higher Education in Africa with the
Ford Foundation, Rockefeller Foundation and the
MacArthur Foundation, was that:

■ **It should build on the successes and failures of past
Corporation experience,**

■ **It would need at least 10 years' commitment to allow
sufficient time for individual and institutional capacities
to be built,**

■ **The funds would go to a limited number of universities in
a limited number of countries to ensure that there was
adequate support in different areas to have real impact,**

■ **Networking between the grantees would serve to increase
cross-learning and synergy, and**

■ **The benefits of the support provided by the Corporation
would be maximized within the framework of a Partnership
with other foundations.**

The underlying theory of change for Carnegie's
approach to capacity building and that of the
Partnership for Higher Education in Africa is that by
strengthening higher-education institutions like uni-
versities and libraries, they can help lead the eco-
nomic and social development of their countries, by
producing leaders and trained people and by provid-
ing fora for innovation and intellectual discourse.
The corollary is that the leaders of those institutions
must take ownership of the transformation process—
it cannot be imposed from outside but only negotiat-
ed and facilitated by external support.

Carnegie Corporation works in Uganda, Tanzania,
Ghana, Nigeria and South Africa. Within its tradi-
tional areas of university and library strengthening,
communications and enhancing women's opportuni-
ties, it is currently focusing on access to ICTs, train-
ing of institutional leaders and managers, and
promotion of gender equity, as well as increasing
knowledge and sensitivity about coping with the
effects of HIV/AIDS. Its expectations are somewhat
different for the libraries and universities. For the
libraries, it is hoping for demonstration effects as
they share enough similarities that one library can be
seen as model for another. For the universities, they
are each so different, that the expectation is less for
replication than for "spillover" effects.

One outcome of the approach of Carnegie and
that of the Partnership for Higher Education in
Africa is that the capacity building of individuals is
largely determined by the role they play in the insti-
tution—as vice chancellors, bursars, etc. Another is
that earlier training in specific disciplines has been
replaced by institutional capacity development so
that the specific university department or subject
matter being targeted changes with the situation.

Despite the fact that the Corporation developed
their current strategy to capacity building in a reflec-
tive way with staff reviewing their experience back to
the 1950s, it has not produced a "think" paper about
the approach and the principles behind it. Carnegie
may want to consider doing so, and test its ideas in
the light of experience, especially since it is investing
much more in capacity building for universities and
libraries since 2000 and will probably do so for at
least 10 years.

Ford Foundation

The Ford Foundation is the most decentralized foun-
dation in terms of its programming and this has
major implications for its approach to capacity
building. Ford's current program structure dates
from 1996 when the incoming president clustered a
number of existing programs into three worldwide
programs that cut across domestic and international
activities.[42] Thus, at about the time that Carnegie
was establishing a new International Development
Program, the Ford Foundation was eliminating its
International Division.

Each of the 12 overseas offices carries out a version
of the three global programs within their regions
that is influenced by the staff in those offices and in
some cases also by the local organizational cultures,
since some offices have been established for 40 or
50 years and have developed their own traditions.
All Ford offices have a high degree of autonomy. At
headquarters three vice presidents and senior staff
members oversee the global programs, and staff offi-
cers in the overseas offices are members of the pro-
gram teams as well as the overseas offices teams.
Thus each officer has a double line of accountabil-
ity—to the program teams and office teams, provid-
ing for some creative tension. Eliminating the
International Division also meant removing the three
Regional Directorates so that the overseas offices
have even greater autonomy now.

This organizational preamble helps to understand

the culture of the Ford Foundation, which has essentially allowed both headquarters and each overseas office to arrive at its own approach to capacity building and, for the most part, has also enabled individual officers to determine what types of grant will be made. The result is that there appears to be many highly individualistic initiatives coming from different offices and officers. Some officers focus more on capacity building in applied skills such as agriculture or health. Others want to help build an indigenous network of scholars in areas such as using African languages for intellectual discourse, or building cohorts of mathematicians and astronomers in Africa.

The approach allows for some interesting innovation and experiments in grantmaking but perhaps less systematic capacity building and synergy except where a deliberate effort is made to do so. One such effort is the Partnership for Higher Education in Africa. Another is the International Fellowships Program, which is separate from the three global programs and has its own independently incorporated structure, advisory body and implementing partners in the regions.

The income of foundations is dependent on the stock market and the wealth created around 2000 enabled the Ford Foundation to launch its largest single-grant program, the International Fellowship Program (IFP). This 10-year program costing more than $300 million plans to support more than 3,000 Fellows in graduate programs (master's and doctoral) throughout the world. By the end of 2003, more than 1,100 Ford IFP Fellows from 22 countries had been named and enrolled in some 200 universities in Canada, the United States, the United Kingdom and Western Europe as well as in their home countries. The IFP builds on the earlier Fellowship Programs supported by Ford in the 1960s and 1970s with some additional features. It is highly competitive with over 40,000 applications in the first three years. The selection process is not based only on traditional academic criteria but also on attributes such as leadership potential and membership of disadvantaged groups.

In addition to university training, the IFP Fellows can increase their prospects for longer-term academic success by up to one year of pre-university training in language, research and computer skills. IFP brings Fellows together to encourage networking and provides them with leadership training in weeklong intensive institutes. After graduation, IFP will keep its alumni engaged with the IFP community and help them to stay connected with each other and to help in the selection of future Fellows. Alumni are encouraged to get engaged in local advocacy and leadership for social justice. The future careers of IFP Fellows will be tracked to help evaluate the program and improve it.

IFP shares some of the elements of the Leadership for Environment and Development (LEAD) Program launched by the Rockefeller Foundation in 1991 and some of the compendium approach of initiatives like AERC and EEPSEA. It provides a package of support for its fellows over the longer term. In this it is much more than a straightforward graduate grant program. Rather, it seeks to establish itself more as an institution, a network, a corpus of trained people from around the world who share an experience and identify themselves as alumni. According to one informant, there was no major discussion or debate within the Foundation about the merits of a fellowship program versus other strategies for investing in capacity building. The establishment of the IFP was based on a judgment on the merits of earlier fellowship programs, with some lessons learned and embellishments added.

At the same time that IFP was started, a parallel initiative was launched with $50 million called Pathway to Higher Education (PHE). Whereas IFP supports individuals directly, the Pathways program provides grants to secondary and tertiary educational institutions to enhance their capacity to support students, especially those that are educationally disadvantaged. The PHE makes approximately $5 million per year for 10 years from 2001 to support projects that increase access and graduation to help disadvantaged students with assistance in preparing for study programs academically and financially and making it through to graduation.

The timing of both of these major capacity-building initiatives was influenced by internal factors such as more money available to disburse and a new president; and external factors including a general return by donors, including the Ford Foundation, to supporting universities in the recognition that strong higher-education institutions are keys to democratic transition, economic development and social equity. In some countries, such as South Africa, the Ford Foundation did provide ongoing support throughout the 1990s to the higher-education system in order to maintain it during the transition to majority rule and open it up to previously excluded groups.

The Foundation seems to have undertaken some major initiatives in capacity building in the last few years without having undergone some of the organization-wide rethinking and policy articulation about capacity building that have characterized some of the multilateral and bilateral agencies. It is clear that Ford's implicit problematique for capacity building embraces individuals, the particular needs of individual institutions and higher-education systems as part of national public institutional "goods." It also includes disciplinary networks and the need to build supporting infrastructure for regional networks like CODESRIA and the AAU. At the national level, Ford, like the other foundations, is choosing to invest in countries where there is a reasonable prospect for substantial social and economic change for the better. It is an eclectic mix that may become more focused if available funds are further reduced.

John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation

When it was founded in 1978, the MacArthur Foundation first became known for its MacArthur Fellows Program, which continues to this day. This unusual capacity-building program backs known quantities and supports them generously for five years with no strings attached and no output or report required at the end. Individual Fellows are selected for the originality and creativity of their past work and the assumed potential to do more in the future. Candidates are nominated, evaluated and selected through a confidential process. No one may apply for the awards, nor are any interviews conducted with nominees before they receive the surprise telephone call. It is limited to citizens and residents of the United States.

MacArthur is one of the four foundations in the Partnership for Higher Education in Africa and this seems to be one of its main activities in building professional competencies and training in developing countries. MacArthur shares the strength of the other foundations reviewed here (perhaps with the exception of the Hewlett Foundation) in that it can take the long view and be persistent in providing the long-term support that is needed for capacity building of institutions:

> We take the long view in our work, first trying to get the questions right through research and analysis....MacArthur itself is not on the front line; we rarely influence a situation in the very short run, certainly not acting alone.[43]

The focus of the Foundation in higher education in Africa is to strengthen individual institutions. Building individual competencies is seen mainly as instrumental to the goal of institutional strengthening, and there is no specific focus on improving the facilitating environment of target institutions.

As in the other foundations reviewed, capacity building is implicit in MacArthur's work. It does not have policy documents or working definitions of capacity building and does not track capacity-building activities separately, except for the MacArthur Fellows so there little evaluative feedback on what works or doesn't work. MacArthur program strategy sees capacity building as more effective and sustained if it is built into larger projects with other goals. Its support to the higher-education sector has increased over the last 10 years and is expected to remain high for the coming five years at least. Most of the international work in this sector is in Africa and in the countries of the former Soviet Union.

Within the framework of the Partnership for Higher Education in Africa, MacArthur focuses on Nigeria, especially the Universities of Ibadan, Kano, Amadhu Bello and Port Harcourt. It has an explicit focus for capacity building in financial and administrative management through a grant to KPMG in West Africa to work directly with bursars to put in place a new accounting system and to strengthen their own competencies. The Foundation sees the emphasis in the Partnership to allowing the program priorities to be set by the universities themselves as innovative and so far, as successful. MacArthur believes that the experience of collaboration with other foundations through the Partnership has been an enriching experience for the Foundation.

The other current capacity-building activity is the Fund for Leadership Development within the Population and Reproductive Health Program. This provides fellowships to young people and indigenous women working on projects related to sexual and reproductive health and rights. The fellowships are intended to nurture a new generation of leaders in the field, while working to improve the sexual and reproductive health and rights of young people and to decrease maternal death rates.

MacArthur subscribes to the theory of change shared by the Partnership that strong universities are powerful agents for social reform and democracy—a theme that has been strong in its programming over the past 25 years.

Rockefeller Foundation

Among the foundations, Rockefeller has the reputation of being more reflective about what it is doing than most and at the same time seeking to be innovative and prepared to take risks. Under the presidency of Gordon Conway it adopted a problematique approach to program development:

> At the Rockefeller Foundation we tackle this challenge by carrying out a "problematique analysis" that tries to understand the structure and dynamics of a problem and to place it in a context.[44]

The Rockefeller problematique approach involves:

- **Scoping the problem, including who else is working on it and what their experience tells you;**

- **Visioning the desired end state and the key obstacles on the road to achieving it;**

- **Developing the case for why and how the Foundation should address the problem and what its comparative advantages are;**

- **Specifying inputs, outputs, outcomes and impact, together with the risks involved and the underlying theory of change—a less formal logical framework analysis.**

For its problematique approach to capacity building, Rockefeller considers three levels of entry:[45]

- *Individual*—skill building;

- *Institution*—building skills systematically within an institution;

- *Sector or system-wide*—lifting an entire field through incentives and support to retain talent and achieve appropriate division of labor.

The underlying theory of change includes the processes of democratization, economic liberalization and governmental decentralization that characterize the countries where the Foundation has selected to work and that provide new opportunities—and needs—for human and institutional capacity building. Within the higher-education sector, the problematique takes account of developments in ICTs; a new and academically qualified leadership in many universities; the influence of the market on demand for more applied disciplines; and on the increasing emphasis on the private-goods component of higher education which works against opening access to university education to groups such as the poor and women generally. The design of the Partnership for

Higher Education in Africa shares many elements of the Rockefeller problematique analysis for human and institutional capacity building.

In the decades of the 1960s to the 1980s, the Rockefeller Foundation invested heavily in graduate training and with others, notably USAID, supported the training of the first post-independence generation in many developing countries. Another successful innovation was the twinning of U.S. Land Grant Universities to work with developing-country universities for faculty and student exchange and sharing of library resources, especially in the agricultural sciences. The postgraduate fellowships familiarly known as the Rocky-Docs supported the best and the brightest students in social sciences and agricultural economics, part of which was to do an internship in the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR) Centers. These capacity-building initiatives, while successful, also were costly and did not adequately address the challenges of institutional strengthening within developing countries.

In the late 1980s and 1990s, Rockefeller played a leading role in several innovative programs that better addressed the needs for capacity building within developing countries. One of these is the African Economic Research Consortium, which combines the advantages of allowing students to take their basic graduate training courses in their home universities and providing a regional training facility for the range of more specialized courses that no one university could hope to mount. AERC began as an IDRC project to provide young African economists (mainly working in ministries of finance, central banks and universities) with a forum to present their research; senior economists to provide peer review and mentoring; and an African regional network to exchange ideas and experiences. It evolved into a joint master's program in economics between first, Anglophone universities and then Francophone universities in Africa. This year it is launching a collaborative Ph.D. program across selected African universities. Many other donors now support AERC but it was the Rockefeller Foundation and IDRC that led the way. AERC has been the model for a number of other regional collaborative training initiatives.

Another Rockefeller-led initiative is the FORUM (Forum on Agricultural Resource Husbandry) which is a regional program involving 13 universities in five countries that provides grants to a Principal Investigator to support two master's students. The

FORUM supports networking of all the PIs and students to review one another's work. It has been spun off to Makerere University where a FORUM secretariat and a regional advisory body from the participating universities will be established with the support of several donors.

In the health sciences, Rockefeller founded the Public Health Schools Without Walls (PHSWOW) in 1992. The program combines field-training-through-service approach and academic training for health professionals who will work as technologists and managers to run increasingly decentralized health systems. The first PHSWOW Master's in Public Health was launched in Zimbabwe, followed by Uganda and Ghana. The success of the program has led to the Network of African Public Health Institutions (NAPHI), a regional network of graduate-level public-health institutions in Africa and a similar approach being followed in Asia. CIDA is using the PHSWOW as a delivery mechanism for the third phase of its Southern Africa AIDS Training Program (SATIII), integrated with a management-support component and Capacity Development Fund. Rockefeller also started the USHEPiA training program for strengthening faculty in participating universities in Africa (see description on page 29).

New initiatives in capacity building being spearheaded by Rockefeller include a collaborative Master's in Agricultural Economics (modeled on AERC) in Africa, and an exploration into Human Resources for Health and Development: A Joint Learning Initiative (JLI). Each of these capacity-building activities is characterized by considerable up-front analysis of what is needed and then building on past experience. Many initiatives involve networking and regional advisory bodies. They often have a life cycle that starts as a Rockefeller-led and managed activity which is enlarged into a multi-donor funded project, and is then spun off, either as an independent organization or to another host institution. Throughout this process, which may take a decade, Rockefeller provides long-term support. The LEAD Program is a multiregional leadership training program that went through a similar evolution and is now operating on its own from its London-based headquarters.[46]

In 1992, Rockefeller initiated another "compendium" program—the Forum for African Women Educationalists (FAWE— which was registered as a pan-African NGO in Kenya in 1993 and now has 33 National Chapters in Anglophone, Francophone and Lusophone countries across sub-Saharan Africa. FAWE is aimed at reducing gender disparities in education through advocacy about the social and economic advantages of girls' education; demonstration projects, monitoring of policies and practices that affect girls' education; and through partnerships with governments, donors, universities and others to improve education for girls. The Forum is composed of women ministers and deputy ministers of education, permanent secretaries in education ministries, directors of education and prominent educationalists as full members and male ministers of education as associate members.

Looking at the approach embodied in Rockefeller's current capacity-building activities compared to the past, they reflect the trends of other donors' learning experience—more capacity building is done in the developing countries rather than sending trainees to the North; there is more value-added beyond the classroom setting through practical experience, or peer-review, or mentoring; and there is more direction exercised in providing more applied training for national needs rather than a more open-ended approach to university education. Rockefeller is more concerned with how to influence system change than in the past and thus how to identify those parts of the system where a direct intervention will have maximum leverage on the system as a whole. This requires more up-front situation analysis, research and planning, and a willingness to support different kinds of institutions, including smaller NGOs.

Rockefeller has also regionalized its own organization with regional programs established in sub-Saharan Africa and the Greater Mekong Region. In these regions, it has a focus on cross-border, regional thematic issues, such as biotechnology in agriculture and HIV/AIDS.

Perhaps more than most donors, Rockefeller has approached capacity building as a multifaceted goal that requires complex solutions. Its program officers tend to become more closely involved in the capacity-building initiatives it supports, perhaps because they tend to be larger, fewer and more complex programs and because there are no term limits for program officers with the Foundation. Rockefeller has championed the compendium approach to capacity building that is exemplified by AERC and the Partnership for Higher Education in Africa. It has created new institutions, such as AERC or LEAD. And in most cases, the Foundation has also found other agencies

to join with it in donor consortia to expand and
sustain the initiatives that Rockefeller has initiated
and nurtured.

William and Flora Hewlett Foundation

The West Coast-based Hewlett Foundation, founded
in 1966, does most of its work within the United
States and with Latin America. Its four large pro-
grams, Education, Environment, Population and
Performing Arts, do not have a major focus on inter-
national capacity building although some large
grants are made to U.S. higher-education universi-
ties. In contrast to the Carnegie Corporation, there
does not appear to have been any strategic discus-
sions around approaches to capacity building or any
Foundation-wide policy on capacity building elabo-
rated, when the new president took office.

Decision making is decentralized with program
directors controlling their own budgets. Directors
have limited terms of six years so that they essentially
have to make their mark within that time frame and
then must move out of the Foundation. This has
probably been to the detriment of supporting capacity-
building initiatives in developing countries in gener-
al, since they require a longer-term commitment
than the directors' terms; and especially makes insti-
tutional reform initiatives difficult to support.

The main capacity-building strategy in developing
countries so far has been to support individuals
rather than institutions. For example, the Population
Program funds Ph.D. training in the United States
and Canada for qualified applicants from developing
countries. It is also looking at ways to encourage
newly minted Ph.D.s to return to their countries and
is considering institutional strengthening of NGO
think tanks in Africa. In the future, the Foundation
may do more work in institutional capacity building.
For example, there are plans to build onto the work
of the Partnership for Higher Education in Africa by
supporting the social sciences in Makerere University
(Uganda) and the Cape Coast University in Ghana.

Given the relative autonomy of the program direc-
tors and their limited tenures, it would appear to be
more difficult for the Hewlett Foundation to achieve
strong synergies for capacity development across pro-
grams or over longer time frames in the current orga-
nizational setting.

Lemelson Foundation

The Lemelson Foundation, established in 1997, has
a particular focus on capacity building for creative
people who are inventors and innovators. It works
both in the United States and internationally and
has just elaborated a strategy for supporting inven-
tion for sustainable development. It does not fund
unsolicited proposals but relies on a small group of
advisers to help it identify worthy individuals and
institutions for support. This approach probably
means it is the better-known organizations, such as
the M. S. Swaminathan Research Foundation, that
will be recognized as grantees.

The Foundation's approach to capacity building is
to recognize and encourage people who are already
identified as creative entrepreneurs by providing them
with support to work on a specific invention; and to
provide mentoring and support to dissemination of
their ideas. Most of the grants so far appear to be
more focused on support to institutions to continue
the work that they are doing but at least one falls
more into the capacity-building rubric. This is to the
Earth University based in Costa Rica, specializing in
training promising entrepreneurs from developing
countries in agriculture and natural resources.

The Lemelson Foundation is supporting the Earth
University to create a hub-and-spoke regional net-
work for Latin America starting with academic, pri-
vate sector, NGO and governmental institutions in
Central America to support student and grassroots
inventors. The idea is to provide decentralized sup-
port to develop inventions and provide business skills
and mentors. The Lemelson Foundation has a spe-
cific target group of entrepreneurial inventors but it
does not appear so far to have any clear strategy for
how to build institutions that could foster creativity
and innovation—which would be an interesting
direction to pursue.

African Capacity Building Foundation (ACBF)

The African Capacity Building Foundation (ACBF),
based in Harare, Zimbabwe, is an important mecha-
nism for mobilizing and channeling resources into
capacity building in Africa. It is an independent
and nonprofit organization built on a partnership
between three major multilateral donors (the World
Bank, the African Development Bank and UNDP);
10 bilateral donors[47]; and the governments of 15
African countries. ACBF was established in 1991
with the objective of building human capital and

institutions in sub-Saharan Africa. In 1999, the Partnership for Capacity Building in Africa (PACT) was integrated into the ACBF and led to an expanded mandate that included capacity building at three levels:

■ **A regional framework for capacity building in Africa;**

■ **Building a partnership between donors and African govern- ments that allows for effective coordination of capacity- building interventions and strengthens African ownership;**

■ **Developing a participatory and inclusive approach to capacity building among all stakeholders at national level.**

Its problematique is that capacity building is necessary for sustainable development and poverty reduction. It sees the strengthening of African institu- tions as a key driver in improving the effectiveness of development programs and the quality of services coming from the public sector, private sector and community-based organizations. Given its central mis- sion, ACBF has developed an organization-wide approach to capacity building. This approach empha- sizes demand-led initiatives and national ownership. ACBF therefore provides only about 30 percent of the funding needed for any initiative so that the govern- ment has to care enough about the activity to find the remaining 70 percent of funds needed. ACBF also stays with its recipients for an average of eight years.

ACBF is currently working to strengthen both institutions and national systems. Its five project areas are:

■ **Economic policy analysis and management.**

■ **Financial management and accountability.**

■ **Public administration and management.**

■ **Public/private sector—civil society interface.**

■ **Strengthening national parliaments.**

It has been supporting the Kenya Institute of Public Policy Research and Analysis (KIPPRA) since 1995 and the Centre for Economic Policy Analysis (CEPA) in Ghana since 1993 to build capacity at the level of individual staff members and at institutional levels to support national government with economic policy analysis and advice. ACBF is also supporting AERC and considers it to be one of its success stories.

American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS)

The AAAS is an example of an organization focused on capacity building in science. It takes a broad view of science education from kindergarten to university and its programs in capacity building include training programs, building institutional capacities for research, supporting networks of scientists and link- ing science to policy. It also sees the need to build capacity within civil society to understand science, and the public communication of science. AAAS works mainly in the United States but had some international programs, including in Africa and the Greater Mekong Region that were mainly funded by USAID and the Foundations. There has been recent retrenching from these international activities, based on a realization that AAAS was supporting many training activities in different countries that lacked synergy with one another or were unable to be scaled up to have an impact. Ten years ago the AAAS pro- grams for developing countries were competitive grants programs in areas such as agriculture, energy, water and marine resources without much strategy for building institutions or for linking the research being supported to either national needs or national policy.

AAAS was influenced by the discussions on capacity development at the U.N. Conference on Environment and Development in 1991 when the implementation program, Agenda 21, focused attention on capacity development. ICSU (the International Council for Science) helped to bring the capacity-building message of UNCED into the scientific unions and through them into the AAAS.

AAAS does not have any policy or "think papers" about its approach to capacity building in science but it is presently developing in collaboration with UNESCO a new Workforce and Capacity Development Program that is to address the scientific capacity-building needs for achieving sustainable development. This program will be based on a serious rethink of approaches to capacity building. In addition, AAAS has supported targeted capacity building for Women in International Science Cooperation. So far, its AAAS Fellows Program is restricted to U.S. nationals but there may be some cooperation with the Third World Academy of Sciences in the future.

One of the big questions facing AAAS and others concerned with capacity building in science is whether to focus on traditional disciplinary training,

which is still seen as the building blocks of capacity in science, or to give more priority to interdisciplinary training and new approaches like participatory and action research that have more resonance and immediacy for some of the practical needs of development.

International Development
Research Centre (IDRC) Canada

IDRC is a Canadian federal Crown Corporation with its own Act of Parliament (1970) that establishes its mission:

> To initiate, encourage, support and conduct research into the problems of the developing regions of the world and into the means for applying and adapting scientific, technical and other knowledge to the economic and social advancement of those regions.

IDRC has long argued that everything that it supports is capacity building since its approach to research is through strengthening indigenous research capacity. There are countless examples of capacity building of professional competencies through its research projects. One health project that attracted international recognition is the Tanzania Essential Health Interventions Project (TEHIP) with the Tanzanian Ministry of Health.

TEHIP is developing and testing innovations in planning and resource allocation at the district level in the context of the decentralization of government services. One of the major obstacles to reform of the health-care system was found to be the weak management capacity of the district health teams. TEHIP experiments with user-friendly tools which can be scaled up for use in all districts in the country. In the first stage of the project, obvious weaknesses were tackled such as ICT training and proficiency in accountancy. The next phase produced the highly acclaimed evidence-based tool for assigning health priorities—the Burden of Disease Tool, together with a Budget Matrix Tool. These tools allow the District Health Management Teams (DHMTs) to present realistic budget requests based on the local prevalence of disease. Success in strengthening the DHMTs made other weaknesses apparent such as the Health Centers' ability to coordinate the work of different DHMTs. This has led to the development of new management tools to support the Health Centers. Thus the TEHIP project has combined research to develop innovative methods with a learning process that looks at health-

services delivery systematically, combined with a commitment to the project for a decade.

One of IDRC's distinguishing features is that, within its overall program priorities, research institutions and researchers in the South set the agendas and make key decisions regarding the areas of research and specific research questions to be addressed. This was articulated in its 1991 program strategy "empowerment through knowledge" and in subsequent program frameworks. For 2000–2005, the first goal of IDRC's mission is that:

> IDRC will strengthen and help to mobilize the indigenous research capacity of developing countries especially directed at achieving greater social and economic equity, better management of the environment and natural resources and more equitable access to information.[48]

In practice, IDRC has witnessed an evolution in its approach to capacity building over recent decades that reflects its own experience and mirrors that of other donors. The flexibility afforded IDRC by its Act has allowed it to experiment and it has often partnered with the foundations, as well as with some bilateral donors like SIDA/Department of Research Cooperation in funding innovative capacity-building initiatives. For example, AERC began as an IDRC capacity-building project in the 1980s, as did SISERA and EEPSEA in the 1990s.

IDRC is also more analytical of its own approaches than many other donors. It has a strong evaluation unit that has pioneered new methods to assessing organizational strengthening and evaluating the outcomes of research projects and programs. Interestingly, IDRC does not have an agency-wide policy or even an agreed definition on capacity building. It is a core concept but the approach is defined by individual programs. Since IDRC is focused on research, capacity building is seen as strengthening the environment for research—whether at the level of the individual, the institution or the external environment. Most capacity building is achieved through field-based programs such as the Community Based Natural Resources Management (CBNRM) or the Acacia project on ICT in Africa.

Pressures to demonstrate results, in particular policy impact, have influenced IDRC to work with stronger researchers and research organizations now than in previous decades. This inevitably changes the nature of the capacity building toward picking

winners rather than those that will require more time, more investment and higher risk of failure. It is more difficult to commit support for a decade or more to a struggling NGO than it was in the past although experience has shown that IDRC's success stories in capacity building are those where support has continued for at least a decade. IDRC stayed with the social science think tanks in the Southern Cone of Latin America throughout the turbulent 1980s and then went on to support capacity building of the democratic movement in South Africa in key policy areas in the six years prior to the elections in 1994 that brought the ANC to power. Each of these success stories required a combination of long-term commitment and a unique Act that gave IDRC the flexibility to operate directly with universities and NGOs rather than through government.

While IDRC has never had large sums of money to invest, a more constrained fiscal environment has meant that it has largely moved away from funding Ph.D. programs that are too expensive for its limited program budget, and moved toward shorter-term training or "on the job" training of individuals through its projects. The former "Fellowship and Awards Division" was merged into a broader division on special projects and Canadian partnerships in the early 1990s. Some training programs aimed at individuals continue, such as the support to dissertation research in urban agriculture (Agropolis Awards) and IDRC supported the Canadian national program of the Rockefeller-funded LEAD Program.

In the last 10 years, IDRC has increasingly taken a more holistic view of institutional capacity development for research and has on occasion funded infrastructure, especially in the case of ICT, provided core grants for operating costs, sabbatical study leaves, procurement of journals, and the training of non-

research, administrative and financial staff. There have also been changes in the focus of the research capacity building from disciplinary to multidisciplinary capacities and from traditional to participatory research methodologies. IDRC is providing more support downstream from the research process, by helping researchers "close the loop" to reaching policymakers through well-written policy briefs, making presentations to policy audiences, developing Web sites for different audiences—and even in how to raise funds for action research from other donors.

IDRC has long worked to develop research networks and much of this work has focused on capacity building, whether formally in networks of universities collaborating with AERC to deliver master's and doctoral programs in economics or through the many regional and international research networks that it has initiated and nurtured. Its anticipated review of capacity building will doubtless have as one of its foci, the regional network.

IDRC also supports capacity building in evaluation (especially outcome mapping) and organizational self-assessment. Self-assessment is seen as a capacity-building tool in itself, as it engenders learning in the organization being strengthened. This is linked to IDRC's concern that capacity development is not only limited to improving operational efficiency and effectiveness but is also strengthening the *adaptive* capacity of organizations to learn from experience and to evolve in a changing environment.

For a learning organization itself, IDRC currently does not track its capacity-building activities well—capacity building seems to be the default descriptor for almost all the projects in its database. IDRC plans to undertake a major review of its capacity-building experience in 2004 to provide lessons learned for future strategy.

8 Donor Strategies for Information and Communication Technologies (ICT)

All donors are seeking to mainstream information and communication technologies (ICT) in their development-assistance programs, some much earlier and more than others. Among the early adopters is IDRC which has had a focus, first on information systems and then on ICT almost since its founding in 1970. Today IDRC spends over one-third of its budget on ICT for Development (ICT4D) and is active in capacity building.

ICT capacity building requires a multilevel approach that mirrors that of capacity building in other sectors but because the whole field is relatively new, the need for simultaneously working at different levels is more obvious—or at least, this lesson has been transferred to ICTs by most donors. Although they may focus on one or two levels in their own programs, there is a recognition that developing capacities at one level will not go very far unless the other levels are also being strengthened or these other levels will simply become roadblocks. The four levels are:

- **■** *Individual capacities*—**technical, management and advocacy skills;**

- **■** *Organizational capacities*;

- **■** *Sectoral capacities*—**developing transparent policies and supporting infrastructure;**

- **■** *National capacities*—**linking all capacity levels into a comprehensive ICT national strategy.**[49]

An example of a multilevel approach is the CATIA Program (Catalyzing Access to ICTs in Africa), which is being supported by DFID, CIDA, SIDA, IDRC, USAID and Cisco. It is managed out of South Africa and consists of nine components including low-cost satellite Internet access; building strong African ISP associations; building the capacities of local groups, including local media to engage in ICT policy debates and to advocate for better access; public service radio broadcasting; a network of African institutions strengthening the expertise needed in setting ICT policy; low-cost computers and open-source software tailored to the African market; African-based Open Knowledge Network for the creation and exchange of local content.[50] It is thus both multilevel and targeted at strengthening both connectivity and content.

Capacity development in ICT can be focused on the development of the national ICT sector—its infrastructure, policy and trained human resources—as an end in itself without a focus on specific applications; or it can be targeted at developing ICT for use in certain sectors, such as education. Different donors have tried both approaches. The first approach accepts that ICT is crosscutting and fosters networking, dissemination of information and linking

the remotest village to the global economy. The second allows donors to follow their own program priorities for development.

One of the challenges in developing human capacities in ICT is the skill drain. Demand for skilled technicians is so high that they rapidly leave the public sector. In South Africa approximately 25 percent of ICT-skilled workers leave the country each year while the demand for them is growing at 40 percent per annum.[51]

The OECD-DAC has been surveying how bilateral and multilateral donors have been integrating ICT into their assistance to developing countries since early 2001.[52] Their results show that most donors see support to capacity building in ICT as a means to an end that is better health, education, governance, etc., and not an end in itself (i.e., developing the ICT sector of the national economy).

DFID makes this distinction clear in its ICT strategy.[53] It argues that the benchmark for measuring the success of its ICT-for-development programs should not be access to ICT but the impact on progress toward achieving the MDGs—a much harder result to measure. Many donors cite meeting the MDGs as having been an impetus to increasing their attention to ICT infrastructure and capacity building. The focus is on using ICT to provide better access and service to underserved regions, rural hinterlands and vulnerable populations. At its heart, ICT capacity building addresses the challenge of social equity, democracy and an inclusive society.

Most donors have deliberately built their ICT strategies on partnerships with other donor agencies, and have also reached out to the private sector more than in other development areas. This is both because support to ICT is expensive and is a fast-moving field so there is a readiness to accept lessons learned by donors and the private sector who have gone before. The private sector is seen as key to expanding ICT access and applications. The high cost of ICT infrastructure means that donors want to get it right the first time and are therefore willing to spend more time and money in upstream activities like situation analyses, needs assessment and examination of alternatives than in more traditional areas of support where they feel on more familiar territory.

If the private sector has a special role to play in ICT development, so also does government since it is they who must establish a well-regulated, competitive enabling environment for ICT and it is govern-

mental capacities to do this that needs to be an early focus for capacitating the enabling environment of the institutions such as universities that donors want to strengthen.

In many ways, ICT capacity building throws into relief many of the experiences that have accompanied capacity building in other areas, because it is so new, rapidly changing and costly. The question of sustainability and donor exit strategies are often raised with ICT although it probably should be addressed just as much for investments in agriculture, health or education. There is more a sense of a bottomless pit for ICT because it is less familiar to most donors. Investment in ICT capacity building soon takes donors to the level of systems that are both cross-sectoral (public, private and civil society) and cross-national since many aspects of ICT infrastructure require a regional approach. The experience of the Partnership for Higher Education in Africa has also realized that a regional approach to the purchase of bandwidth also provides more leverage with suppliers.

Many donors have developed strategy papers for ICT development—probably more than have done so for capacity building. They are moving beyond experimental approaches to mainstreaming ICT across all areas of work. Canada has been active in ICT support since the 1980s and CIDA co-hosted with the World Bank the first Global Knowledge Conference in 1997 that led to the Global Knowledge Partnership. CIDA's strategy for ICT emphasizes *knowledge sharing* as the first-order priority rather than a focus on particular sectors or MDGs.[54]

Other bilateral donors have tended to focus attention on particular sectors. Italy has focused on government-to-government transfer of know-how on *e-Government* including capacity building for public accounting, government intranets, national strategies for e-government, and statistical systems. Swedish SIDA and Norwegian NORAD have focused on the higher-education sector, especially in Africa, and are supporting the networking of universities and linking universities with government departments. SIDA has developed a strategy for ICT that echoes that of the Partnership for Higher Education in Africa—developing ICT competencies in African universities as a means of transforming Africa.[55]

USAID has approached ICT as an integral part of its programs in health, agriculture, economic growth, environment and democracy. The USAID Africa Leland Initiative has established pilot projects

in 22 countries for Internet-technology development, including building national systems for telecommunications legislation and regulations, technology infrastructure, and training human resources. Other donors have focused primarily on ICT infrastructure support such as telecommunications, rather than on developing the human capacities to use ICT. These include the Japan Bank for International Cooperation (JBIC) and the German Kreditanstalt für Wiederaufbau (KfW).

Among the bilateral donors, USAID, DFID, CIDA and the Australian Agency for International Development (AusAID) are more "heavily" into support for ICT, including ICT capacity building. Among the foundations, it is possibly Markle and Benton that lead the way. Within the private sector it is Cisco, which has partnered with multilateral and bilateral donors in several *learning network* initiatives.

One key to developing ICT is for donors to look at the demand side and human needs as well as the more technological supply side in order to avoid investing in expensive hardware and infrastructure that is inappropriate to available human capacities or even counterproductive to development goals. The experience of the IDRC Acacia project in establishing community telecenters in different countries in Africa was that telecenters are not a simple panacea—their location within a community; the attitude and training of their operators; the cost of their services—all need to be designed to respond to local needs and to ensure equity of access for the most marginalized and disadvantaged people. Local ownership is critical to success. Otherwise the telecenter movement in Africa will be doomed to repeat the lessons of the water borehole movement three decades before.

ICT in higher education

> In the eagerness to find a solution to rapidly expanding the numbers of students enrolled at university level in Africa, distance learning and information and communication technologies (ICTs) have been jumped upon as quick fixes to the problem. Formerly regarded as second best, distance education has come to new respectability, particularly in combination with the new possibilities for delivery offered by ICTs. There has come to be a simplistic but widely held notion that ICTs will automatically benefit African education. The reality, however, is that ICTs can't go it alone: quality assurance, provided by

> adequate human-resource infrastructure, is an essential part of the equation. Regrettably, such infrastructure is presently inadequate to meet the demand for post-secondary entry to higher education across the region in most of Africa.[56]

The use of ICT to expand access and improve quality of teaching in higher education is an area that many donors have supported. Distance learning has been pioneered by the U.K.'s Open University since 1969 and has its descendants in the China TV University, the African Virtual University and in many national distance-learning initiatives. Distance learning institutions use a mix of ICT that include printed material, videos, CD-ROMs, e-mail, the Internet, radio and television. They can increase access to higher education for those who are disadvantaged by location, ethnicity, gender, disability or those who wish to learn at their own time and pace.

ICT also presents opportunities for increasing the efficiency of education administration through the use of databases to manage everything from supplies, student enrollment, courses timetables and budgets. The assumption has been that costs per student will decrease and quality will increase since the best teachers can reach more students. The reality is that, while everyone believes that costs will eventually come down, the evidence on lower costs is so far inconclusive, and quality assurance requires a whole supporting infrastructure including an effective national accreditation system.

The African Virtual University (AVU) started as a World Bank project in 1995 funded through infoDev with the aim of providing science and engineering courses across sub-Saharan Africa. Course content was developed by universities in the United States and Europe and support provided by staff at the partner universities in Africa. The AVU started in 1997 and provides videotaped instruction or live broadcasts with students responding by e-mail, telephone or fax. Programs are delivered via 26 universities (including 11 Francophone universities) in 15 countries and so far have reached 24,000 students.

The pilot phase revealed a number of problems in the AVU model. One is the business model with fees still out of reach for many potential students. Another is the course content that needs to be more locally appropriate and thus some investment in helping universities to develop their own materials. There was also insufficient attention to providing

tutors in the universities and to paying them adequately for their time. In other words, the AVU needs to be more African-based in both curriculum and human resources. For the next phase, the focus will be on computer science and business in order to reduce the need for local adaptation of course material. For the longer term, the AVU will need to invest in human-capacity building in the universities that it initially saw as delivery mechanisms rather than equal partners in knowledge production. DFID will be supporting AVU.

The world of online learning is already transforming the education scene and will need to be taken into account for all capacity-building efforts. Many new providers are entering the field and alliances are being formed between universities, publishing houses and private consulting firms.

Communicating knowledge in the era of ICT

ICT is sometimes seen as the means for developing countries to leapfrog some of the traditional development steps, such as land lines for phone connections. One of the transforming characteristics of ICTs is that they allow the horizontal transfer of information rather than relying on traditional models of diffusion of knowledge from the North to the South and from the urban to rural areas. That being said, most of the knowledge transmitted via ICTs is still generated in the North and is in English. Creating local knowledge and transmitting it by ICT is easier in theory than in practice.

ICT provides the possibility of accessing information instantaneously from almost anywhere in the world and at generally low cost compared to alternative modes such as the distribution of hard copy books and journals. Donors are also considering how to support the need for higher-education institutions to have access to the latest literature in their fields. Two parallel initiatives, one in the health sciences (HINARI—the Health InterNetwork Access to Research Initiative) supported by WHO and one in the agricultural sciences (AGORA—Access to Global Online Research in Agriculture) supported by the Food and Agriculture Organization, give free access to scientists working in named institutions in developing countries.[57]

Another initiative, supported by a number of donors including SIDA, DFID, IDRC and the Rockefeller Foundation is SciDev.Net (Science and Development Network) a free-access Web site targeted to developing countries that provides the latest news on scientific research and policy, reproduces articles from *Science* and *Nature*, provides regional gateways to literature that tends otherwise not to be available internationally, and develops dossiers that discuss the state of the scientific debate in a number of key fields.

Some of the early donor initiatives in ICTs have evolved into second-generation organizations that are providing capacity building to developing countries. One of these is Bellanet, an initiative of IDRC, SIDA, Rockefeller, SDC and DANIDA that develops capacities in Open Source software, Open Content and Open Standards (Open Development Program), as well as providing ICT platforms for collaboration across organizations, networks and countries (Online Communities Program). Bellanet undertakes training and coaching for trainers and for online facilitators and produces training materials via CD-ROM.

Lessons learned

An analysis of donor ICT capacity-building initiatives shows that many come up against the twin barriers of scalability and sustainability—they are difficult to replicate beyond the special circumstances of pilot projects and their future is not assured when the donor funding runs out. Some of the lessons identified are[58]:

■ **Initiatives that clearly identify development goals within the context of the target population are more likely to develop effective operating models and deliver tangible results (e.g., PEOPLink).**

■ **Initiatives should be demand-driven and locally owned (e.g., SANGONet).**

■ **Initiatives should be planned and managed using a solid business model (e.g., HealthNet).**

■ **Technology should be affordable, easy to use and maintain, and flexible enough to accommodate user demands for new services.**

■ **The interests of key stakeholders should be broadly aligned with each other and with the goals of the intervention—** *win-win* **situations must be engineered from the outset.**

■ **Initiatives with the most impact have approached development problems in a holistic and coordinated way, not only through the provision of ICT.**

■ **There is a fierce debate about the costs of access to scientific and scholarly information. A revolution is occurring in journal publishing with initiatives that provide free access, and other experiments to transfer the costs from readers to authors. Donors need to take account of these changes in providing support to higher education.**

On the horizon are likely to be more partnerships between donors in ICT, including partnerships across some of the traditional divides—multilateral, bilateral, private sector, NGOs like Bellanet, and foundations. One of the important outcomes of ICT is the possibility that it provides for supporting networks like AERC. The development of capacity for managing knowledge networks is likely to be one of the areas in which more donors will invest in the future.

However, it is still uncertain (some would say unlikely) that developing regions like Africa can become competitive in a globalizing world through the intensified use of ICTs, when other countries have such a head start. National governments and donors may have to consider investing in alternative routes to economic competitiveness rather than only through the development of a knowledge economy. This debate is being taken up by the Scientific Committee for Africa, which is part of the UNESCO Forum on Higher Education Research and Knowledge.[59]

9

Issues Raised by the Landscape Analysis

The review raises some issues that are already recognized by donors (although not necessarily dealt with) and perhaps a few new ones. It has also identified some emerging challenges that lie on the horizon, which will influence the donor agenda for capacity building.

Capacity building and decentralization

It is estimated that 80 percent of developing countries are undergoing some form of government decentralization so that decentralization is a major factor for capacity building—both in framing the national context for capacity building and as an objective for capacity-building initiatives. Until recently, local governments and their needs for professional capacity building were neglected by central governments and donors alike. However, donors recognize the need to shift their focus to provincial and municipal governments, which are usually weaker to begin with and increasingly overburdened with new responsibilities. Behind the move to decentralize government services is the belief that it will promote democracy and improved governance on the one hand and reduce corruption on the other.

There are three different forms of decentralization and each requires a somewhat different approach to capacity building:

- ■ *Devolution*: where political and administrative authority is transferred;

- ■ *Deconcentration*: where central government retains its control but establishes local offices of its different ministries;

- ■ *Delegation*: where managerial responsibility for certain functions is transferred to parastatal, nongovernmental or private organizations while government retains ultimate responsibility.

Under all three forms of decentralization, local governments and organizations need capacity building to undertake new tasks such as strategic planning and resource management as well as old tasks related to accountability and record keeping. Decentralization also means changes at central government level. Capacity building is needed there to prepare central departments for their new roles.

For donors, decentralization complicates the environment in which they must operate and poses the risk that donor efforts are spread too thinly across the main new actors that need professional upgrading, or that the operating scene is too difficult to understand. If devolution is taking place, capacity building is needed around new legislation and regulations to transfer power. If local offices are being established under deconcentration, the needs are more focused on how to run a branch office. If delegation occurs, the focus of capacity building moves

from government to civil-society organizations and how they relate to government.

Decentralization means a change in the relationships within the government system. It also requires donors to be able to map what the system is and where they should be intervening with their capacity-building support.

Systems thinking for capacity building

One of the underlying principles in donor approaches to capacity building today compared to yesterday is that it takes a systems approach. Donors emphasize that individuals operate within organizations, and individual organizations perform within a wider system—the health system, the educational system. In turn, these systems operate within an enabling (or not) environment. We are thus dealing with nested systems and any intervention at one level needs to be cognizant of the interactions with other levels.

The Joint Learning Initiative[60] is investing major effort into mapping health systems and deciding where the relevant boundaries are and what are the critical areas for intervention. There is no single right answer to how a system should be "bounded" but decisions on what to include and exclude will affect how effective interventions are. For example, the JLI may decide to include or exclude the traditional healers and nutritionists that are certainly part of the health system from the perspective of patients but not necessarily so from that the Ministry of Health. Building into the system the behavior of patients who act on the recommendations of advice coming from outside the formal health system will have implications for where to intervene to achieve improved health outcomes.

Another case is that of the higher education system. The Partnership for Higher Education in Africa is focusing its attention on selected universities within selected countries. The issue here is not whether the Partnership is building the capacity of the higher-education system as a whole, but that it is important to have an overall map of the higher-education system within which to situate individual capacity-building activities. This is especially important if the Partnership is able to stimulate reform in the larger higher-education systems through its work with selected universities that are leading the way. Universities are a subsystem within a national or regional higher-education system. A well-functioning higher-education system will include different types of universities such as research and graduate teaching universities, undergraduate liberal-arts colleges, technical colleges, community colleges, and other specialized training colleges turning out skilled trades, administrators, etc.

From the perspective of the student, the choices in higher education in Africa are changing and thus the relevant higher education *system* for donors is also shifting. New players in the systems include locally based private colleges, an influx of competition from universities in the North who have seen their supply of developing country students dry up as their fees have risen, and Internet-based distance learning programs. Many of the new players are outside of the regulatory bodies for higher education and too few countries have adequate national accreditation systems in place to regulate institutions or to define national standards that embrace new providers.

There are a number of issues to consider:

- Can the universities being supported by the Partnership play diverse roles within their national higher-education systems without becoming overloaded? More specifically, what model does Rockefeller have for universities like Makerere University? Is it seen as a regional center of excellence for graduate training or primarily as a large-scale undergraduate college fulfilling a national demand? Can it also play the role of a community college for teaching administration to decentralized government workers? Does it make sense for Makerere to become a bigger multipurpose institution or is it time to think about a more differentiated higher-education system? The new Strategic Plan for Higher Education in Uganda envisages a multipurpose Makerere within a more differentiated higher-education system.[61]

- Do we know enough about what is happening in the higher-education systems of Africa to answer the above question? What are the impacts of private-sector colleges and Northern university virtual and physical campuses to higher-education systems in developing countries?

- How can governments be assisted in the short term to regulate and provide accreditation to the rapidly changing scene in higher education? Should we be thinking more regionally about accreditation across national systems?

Another system concept that is not used by donors much in relation to Africa, but is used in countries farther along the industrial development path is that of a National Innovation System (NIS). This is defined by OECD as a system of government agencies, universities and private firms that interact to create new knowledge, science and technology, and are supported by policies, finance, and social and professional

interaction. A well-functioning national innovation system in which universities, government and the private sector are well linked is key to a country's competitiveness. It would be interesting to apply some of the OECD NIS methodology to countries in Africa and see if some insights could be gained about where capacity-building interventions would be most effective from a National Innovation System perspective.

Scaling up donor-created institutions

While donors are adding more roles onto selected universities as they become capacitated, is there an opposite trend when it comes to regional institutions like AERC that donors have established themselves? AERC is seen as a success story by all donors that could lay some claim to it and it has led to a number of regional networks that are modeled on it, including SISERA, EEPSEA and the new Graduate Program in Agricultural Economics for Africa. Although not modeled on AERC, there is also a new initiative in resource economics in Southern Africa.

The investment in time, effort and money involved in creating and sustaining an AERC is enormous and in the case of AERC, it has reaped major dividends. AERC is a compendium or portfolio approach to capacity building and it clearly works. At the same time, it has fixed costs in terms of the secretariat and network that require long-term support from donors. Yet donors have created separate new network institutions for doing similar capacity building for economics in Africa instead of building them into a larger AERC. Each network requires donor support into the long term. Perhaps at some future date there will be a move to network the networks and share more administrative costs.

Is there a trade-off between (measurable) short-term results and long-term impact?

One of the findings of the review is that donors have increasingly focused their capacity-building support to produce results in the short and medium term. A results-based perspective has also influenced the awarding of fellowships and scholarships for graduate work and thesis support, where the relevance of the research and the demand for certain qualifications and skills are more factored into selection criteria than before. The World Bank is wrestling with how to map inputs, results and longer-term impacts for capacity building of individuals and organizations.

This trend toward results-based capacity building raises a number of questions:

- How do donors bring together the two perspectives on capacity building—as primarily instrumental to achieve development goals or as a long-term goal in its own right (the rights-based approach)? Providing some guidance on this question is one of the advantages of having an agency-wide discussion process on capacity building. But what are the implications for what donors do in practice?

- One effect of the emphasis on getting results is that donors tend to select the more-experienced researchers to get the job done, to the neglect of strengthening the capacities of more junior and untested ones;

- In Northern countries where governments try to adjust the production of trained personnel in different fields, they are not very successful at matching supply to demand and it is an open question whether donor-sponsored initiatives in developing countries will do better;

- A demand-driven approach to supporting particular disciplines will shift the offerings in universities away from public goods to the private-goods end of the spectrum— that is, away from humanities and even basic sciences toward business and applied disciplines. This is a concern expressed by the Ford Foundation in Southern Africa. Should donors play a countervailing role to encourage keeping a balance in university curricula, on the premise that developing countries also need the basic scientific skills to innovate and generate new knowledge? There are good arguments for having a special emphasis on science and technology teaching even though the impact will be longer term.

- There was a huge development dividend from the first wave of graduates trained with support from the Rockefeller and Ford Foundations and USAID. Is there a danger in trying to make today's Ph.D.s theses more tailor-made to perceived needs? Will we get it right this time around?

Diversity and Gender

One of the challenges in professional capacity building is that of reforming higher-education institutions to become more accessible to a more diverse population of students. Diversity is generally interpreted to mean gender, race, ethnicity, socioeconomic status, culture and religion, and increasingly is extended to seniority, age and previous training. For example, in South Africa there is:

> …an emergent realisation that the future of diversity will certainly depend on its ability to integrate the politics of cultural and identity recognition with the politics of social justice and equity. This requires a re-conceptualisation of diversity in the context of transformation.[62]

The diversity issue relates not only to student access to higher education but also to a tolerant and welcoming atmosphere on campus for men and women students of different backgrounds. It relates to curriculum reform so that diversity issues and gender become part of the curriculum and to the need for adequately diverse role models in teaching and senior administrative positions. There are several roadblocks on the way to diversity which a number of donors, notably the Ford Foundation in South Africa and the Partnership for Higher Education in Africa are approaching through support to studies and institutional policy processes. The development of social-integration programs on many campuses is given less priority than other educational reforms partly because there is a belief that diversity must evolve naturally rather than be engineered. In curriculum reform, gender and diversity studies tend to be tacked on to existing curriculum more for political correctness than seen as integral to better scholarship.

While gains have been made in increasing women students on many campuses in Africa, and reforms are under way for student services and outreach, the same has not been true for faculty, especially at the more senior levels. For example, in South Africa female student enrollments in universities have increased from 43 percent in 1993 to 52 percent of the total student population in 1999. However, women are concentrated in humanities programs and are underrepresented in science, engineering and business programs.[63]

There is a sharp disconnect between the gains made in diversity in the student body and those made in the faculty in South African universities, especially the historically advantaged institutions. White faculty still constituted 93 percent of the historically advantaged universities and 90 percent of the historically advantaged *technikons* in 1998 although the historically disadvantaged *technikons* saw a rapid rise in the proportion of African faculty from 17 percent in 1993 to 49 percent in 1998. The proportion of women academics increased from 30 percent in 1992 to 35 percent in 1998 but they were concentrated in the lower ranks of teaching and administrative staff and more of them are employed on short-term contracts with poorer conditions of service than are their male colleagues.[64]

One of the particular challenges for gender equality in education concerns subjects such as mathematics, science and engineering. A consortium of donors[65] is supporting an ongoing program that began in 1996 to improve the situation—the Female Education in Mathematics and Science in Africa (FEMSA) project which is hosted by the Forum for African Women Educationalists (FAWE) based in Nairobi. FEMSA includes 11 countries in sub-Saharan Africa[66] and aims to improve both the participation and performance of girls in science, mathematics and technical subjects at primary and secondary school levels.

Some of the experience in improving gender equity at more senior levels has been brought together by UNESCO as a follow-up to the World Conference on Higher Education (Paris, Oct. 5–9,1998) in its "good practice handbook."[67] The lessons learned include paying attention on legislative and enabling environments, increasing the quantity and quality of women postgraduate students through scholarships for women, and improving the conditions for women in postgraduate studies, as well as establishing special programs, mentors and networks for women, and ensuring there is regular monitoring of progress.

Clearly there is progress as these few examples indicate but also more reform is needed. The challenge for donors is to provide the support needed to engage institutional reforms for increasing diversity in higher education while not pushing too rapidly an external agenda. The approach of the foundations in supporting analyses and policy development by the institutions themselves would seem an appropriate and effective route to take.

Lessons may still be missed—the case for evaluation.

Most donors invest more in up-front planning than in evaluation of their capacity-building initiatives and in the past the learning curve of donors has been slower than desirable. Without some changes, it is likely that this situation will continue.

Capacity building is difficult to gauge within the results-based framework that many bilateral and multilateral donors are using except through rather superficial indicators like numbers of trainees. In any case, capacity building is not a mechanical cause and effect process but takes place as a transformation process within an environment where cause and effect relationships are complex and uncertain. Donors recognize this and are using different ways to judge success. One operational approach to the dilemma being tried within the World Bank is to develop a matrix

approach to looking at long-term horizons (and larger-scale impacts) along one axis and shorter term, more local-scale outcomes on the other.

A related challenge is how to track capacity building within donor programs where it is embedded in larger activities. This has always been a challenge for IDRC, which argues that everything it supports is capacity building to some degree. USAID and SIDA do not track capacity building in their projects. CIDA and IDRC have tried to with mixed results.

There are several ways forward that donors might consider:

■ **Develop a workable cost-effective methodology for tracking capacity building within projects and programs that can provide some agency-wide feedback on both investments and successes;**

■ **Ensure that there is more upstream consideration of evaluation measures when projects are being planned;**

■ **More generally, invest in more situation analysis and upstream research before capacity building takes place;**

■ **Undertake more evaluations focused on capacity-building initiatives across different projects and programs to try to identify some more generic lessons.**

One of the spinoffs of doing more evaluations of past experience in capacity building is that it is likely to help clarify for donors what they mean by capacity building and what their future strategy should be.

Evaluations are usually conducted within the framework of particular projects or programs. But donors also need to ask questions that are more "out of the box" and relate more to their overall strategies for capacity building than to the success of individual initiatives. Are their success stories replicable and sustainable? Are donors creating a more unequal development playing field by picking winners among some institutions (e.g., universities) and providing them with large packages of support while others receive none?

10

Emerging Principles for Capacity Building

There is an emerging consensus among donors about the do's and don'ts of capacity building. In fact, the review of the literature rather depressingly suggests that the success factors for capacity building have been known for at least a decade and are reiterated or recast by later reviewers rather than being newly discovered insights.[68]

At a general level many of these are encapsulated in UNDP's 10 default principles (Box 13) and those of the U.N. system as a whole (Box 14). The challenge for donors is how to make the principles operational and effective in specific national contexts. Equally challenging is for donors to change their own institutional cultures and procedures to be better-performing organizations in supporting human capacity development. It is all very well to say that capacity building is long term but for too many donors, commitment to 15 to 25 years support to the same institution is a challenge they have consistently failed to meet.

Most donor agencies appear to be poorly equipped to deal with the implications of capacity building within their own houses. A few, such as CIDA and DGIS have awareness building and training seminars for staff and provide guidelines on how to implement a process that embodies local ownership and

participation. One of the important principles is to assess local commitment and ownership and to identify if it is really there at the levels needed—and is not just an expression of interest at the highest level far from where it is actually needed. In general, donor agencies agree that capacity development should be well grounded in institutional appraisal, situation analysis and stakeholder analysis but not all donor staff knows how to do them. Staff turnover and overuse of short-term consultants may need to be addressed as these are recognized impediments to good capacity-building initiatives.

In the way they conduct their capacity-building projects, donor agencies can undermine the very capacities of the intended beneficiaries that their projects aim to strengthen. In their focus on achieving well-performing programs, donors have sometimes created ways to bypass bureaucratic bottlenecks of individual organizations or national governments rather than helping to remove them; they have bypassed normal budget and accounting procedures rather than taking the time to strengthen them; and they have established parallel or new monitoring and evaluation systems rather than ensuring that these are institutionalized. These actions defeat capacity building in the long run for shorter-term gains. There is a danger that managing performance can result in managing *by* results rather than managing *for* results.[69]

Box 13
UNDP's 10 default principles for capacity development

1 **Don't rush.** Capacity development is a long-term process.
2 **Respect the value system and foster self-esteem.**
3 **Scan locally and globally: reinvent locally.** Knowledge cannot be transferred; it needs to be acquired.
4 **Challenge mind-sets and power differentials.** Capacity development is not power neutral and challenging mind-sets and vested interests is difficult.
5 **Think and act in terms of sustainable capacity outcomes.** Capacity is at the core of development; any course of action needs to promote this end.
6 **Establish positive incentives.** Motives and incentives need to be aligned with the objective of capacity development including through governance systems that respect fundamental rights.
7 **Integrate external inputs into national priorities, processes and systems.** Where national systems are not strong enough, they should be reformed and strengthened, not bypassed.
8 **Build on existing capacities rather than creating new ones.**
9 **Stay engaged under difficult circumstances.** The weaker the capacity the greater is the need. People should not be held hostage to irresponsible governance.
10 **Remain accountable to ultimate beneficiaries.** Anchor development firmly in stakeholder participation and maintain pressure for an inclusive accountability system.

C. Lopes and T. Theisohn, Ownership, Leadership and Transformation: Can We Do Better for Capacity Development? UNDP, Earthscan, 2003.

Box 14
Guiding principles on capacity building for the U.N. system

■ National ownership, felt needs and national priorities are the most important determinants of the effectiveness of capacity building programs.
■ Capacity building is one of the principal and explicit goals of all U.N. system activities.
■ Capacity building must be holistic and include strengthening the processes, systems and rules that shape collective and individual behavior and performance.
■ The diversity of the U.N. system organizations is a strength but there should be greater coherence and shared objectives and strategies for capacity building at country and regional levels.
■ U.N. organizations should seek creative partnerships, alliances and networks both within and outside the U.N. system;
■ Effective capacity building requires flexibility, experimentation and an openness to learning.
■ Development of sustainable capacity needs long lead times so that there is a need for balance between capacity outcomes and substantive development outcomes.

UN-ACC Guidance Note on Capacity Building; approved March 2000.

Donors need to internalize some of the principles learned about capacity building within their own organizations and adapt their procedures to create some room for creativity and risk taking. They may also be well served by creating incentives for staff to spend the time to get capacity-building initiatives well designed for the context in which they will be used. This means paying attention to tracking systems and evaluation of impacts at the time when the projects are being planned.

Equally challenging is how to develop appropriate *strategies* for capacity building, including decision about longer-term sequencing—deciding which institutions or particular functions or staff groups to focus on first and which to leave for later. Strategic decisions need to be based on explicit criteria such as probability of success and potential for future leverage or demonstration effect when the pilot activities need to be translated into broader system change.

Donors have recognized that participatory approaches are one of the principles for effective capacity development but it is less clear what that means in practice. More donors have accepted the *principles* of participation and flexibility than have translated what this means for internal working methods and regulations. Donors still largely design, organize and implement their "participatory" approaches rather than limiting themselves to the analysis required to make their funding decisions. M. Sarris (2004) argues for a new "home-grown capacity building strategy" for Africa but what does this mean for how donors should do business in the future?

In many ways, donor approaches to capacity building get to the heart of their approach to development assistance and how they understand social change takes place. It raises questions about the motivation and character of the donor agency itself:

> Asking what it takes for an aid agency to be better at "capacity building" is tantamount to asking what it takes to be a better aid agency, period.[70]

One of the "lessons learned" has been that building individual capacities will only be sustainable if the organizations in which they work are also strengthened. This has resulted in a focus on organizational capacities for many donors. The next logical step—to strengthen the systems in which these organizations must operate and perform—is readily acknowledged by donors but less frequently actually tackled by

them. Evaluations of capacity-building projects tend to focus on the strengths and weaknesses of *internal* factors in the design and implementation without looking to the decisions of the donor to not address conditions in the wider operating environment and institutional systems.

Part of the reluctance of many donors to "get into" the wider environment in which organizations operate is that they are loath to deal with such open-ended systems and they are equally reluctant to address issues of the politics of power.[71] This includes a reluctance to pay sufficient attention to issues of corruption and cronyism that can undermine any capacity-building

efforts. Yet one of the principles for capacity development is that local ownership of the process is a sine qua non for success. Thus dealing with existing power relationships is part of the equation.

Finally, a corollary of the emerging principles for capacity building is that donors should discuss more with developing-country governments and institutions some of the ideas they are currently discussing in-house and within the donor community. Much of the debate on capacity development seems to have been conducted largely among donors themselves. It is perhaps time to reopen the discussion with our partners in national governments and institutions.

Footnotes

1 E. Berg, Rethinking Technical Cooperation—Reforms for Capacity Building in Africa; UNDP, New York, 1993.

2 E. Jaycox, Capacity Building: The Missing Link in African Development; address to the African-American Institute conference, 1993.

3 Meeting held on July 22, 2003, at the Rockefeller Foundation, New York.

4 M. Pires, R. Kassimir, and M. Brhane, Investing in Return: Rates of Return of African Ph.D.s Trained in North America; Social Science Research Council, New York, 1999.

5 T. Mkandawire, Three Generations of African Scholars; CODESRIA, 1995, Bulletin 2.

6 Report of the U.N. Inter-Agency Workshop on Capacity Development; Geneva, Nov. 20–22, 2002.

7 Some bilaterals such as NORAD and several of the foundations continued to support higher education.

8 Adapted from C. Lusthaus, M-H Adrien, and M. Perstinger, Capacity Development: Definitions, Issues and Implications for Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation; Universalia Occasional Paper No. 35, September 1999, Exhibit 1.

9 Based on Table 5.2 in Constructing Knowledge Societies: New Challenges for Tertiary Education; World Bank, 2000.

10 Private communication from David Court.

11 Peter Morgan, One More Time: Just How Should We Think About the Concept of Capacity? ECDPM Occasional Paper 1 (draft), Nov. 2003.

12 One major study on capacity building from both practical and conceptual perspectives is being undertaken for the OECD-DAC by the European Centre for Development Policy Management (ECDPM) led by Heather Baser. It is described in the online journal, Capacity.org, Issue 19: www.edcpm.org.

13 Report of the U.N. Inter-Agency Workshop on Capacity Development, op. cit.

14 For this review, the term capacity building is used for what donors are engaged in, as it seems to be the most common term used by donors themselves.

15 World Bank, Constructing Knowledge Societies: New Challenges for Tertiary Education; Education Group, Human Development Network, April 16, 2002, World Bank, Washington, D.C., p. 4.

16 This table is indicative rather than definitive and is based on information from interviews. It does not represent the official view of each agency.

17 The World Bank uses the term "Institutional Development Technical Cooperation (IDTA)."

18 International Human Dimensions Programme on Global Environmental Change and Inter-American Institute for Global Change Research.

19 John Berry, Cooperation for Capacity Building: Improving the Effectiveness of University Linkage Projects; Asia Branch, CIDA, internal document, 1995.

20 E. T. Jackson, How University Projects Produce Development Results: Lessons from 20 years of Canada-China Cooperation in Higher Education; *Canadian Journal of Development Studies*, 2003, Vol. 24, No. 1, pp. 41–49.

21 Many donors (and others) use the terms organization and institution interchangeably and do not recognize the useful distinction between them in economics and other social sciences, which is that: institutions are the rules of the game and organizations are the players (D. North, Institutions, Institutional Change and Economic Performance; Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, U.K., and New York, 1990).

22 Programme de Troisieme Cycle Inter-Universitaire (PTCI) funded by CIDA, USAID, IDRC, ACBF, Cooperation Française and DGIS.

23 UN-ECOSOC, United Nations System Support for Capacity-Building; Report of the Secretary-General, May 14, 2002; E/2002/58.

24 For example, Berg, 1993, Rethinking Technical Cooperation: Reforms for Capacity Building in Africa; UNDP, New York.

25 Resolutions 53/192 (1999) and 56/201 (2001) of the U.N. General Assembly.

26 World Bank, The Role and Effectiveness of Development Assistance: Lessons from World Bank Experience; World Bank, Washington, D.C., 2002.

27 UNDP, 2002, Capacity for Development—New Solutions to Old Problems, and UNDP, 2002, Developing Capacity through Technical Cooperation; Country Experiences, UNDP, New York.

28 UN-ECOSOC, United Nations System Support for Capacity-Building; Report of the Secretary-General, May 14, 2002; E/2002/58.

29 Ibid.

30 From Annex 7 G in Constructing Knowledge Societies: New Challenges for Tertiary Education; World Bank, 2002.

Footnotes (continued)

31 WBI, Towards a more Strategic Approach to Capacity Building in Africa, 2003.

32 World Bank/UNESCO, Higher Education in Developing Countries: Peril and Promise; report of the Task Force on Higher Education and Society, 2000.

33 OECD-DAC, Criteria for Donor Agencies' Self-Assessment in Capacity Development; DCD/DAC (99) 4, 1999.

34 Capacities, Change and Performance Study is being led by European Centre for Development Policy Management (ECDPM) in the Netherlands. The study will include 20 case studies and will produce a compendium of tools and analytical frameworks.

35 Sources for this section are: JICA, Capacity Development: Technical Cooperation in the Health Sector; Discussion Paper 1, 2003; JICA, A Study on Japan's ODA to Africa, 2002; and Robin Ruggles, Japanese Approaches to Capacity Development: Case of Thailand and Bosnia-Herzegovina (draft), 2003.

36 SIDA's Policy for Capacity Development as a Strategic Question in Development Cooperation; Stockholm, November 2000; and Analysis of Needs for Capacity Development: Policy Secretariat; Capacity Development Working Paper 4, SIDA, March 2000.

37 BIFAD, Renewing USAID Investment in Global Long-Term Training and Capacity Building in Agriculture and Rural Development; Washington, D.C., June 2003.

38 It is estimated at $3 billion a year: OECD-DAC *Journal* 2003, Vol. 4, No. 3.

39 Zimbabwe was considered for support but rejected for the time being.

40 Carnegie Corporation provides grants primarily for the benefit of the people of the United States but can use 7.4 percent of its income in countries that are or have been members of the British Commonwealth. In practice, Carnegie has worked only in African Commonwealth countries. Grants in non-charter countries including Eastern Europe are made through U.S. institutions when the substantial purpose is to increase knowledge and understanding among the people of the United States.

41 Vartan Gregorian, New Directions for Carnegie Corporation for New York: A Report to the Board, New York; Carnegie Corporation of New York, Feb. 2, 1999.

42 The three program areas are Asset Building and Community Development; Peace and Social Justice; and Knowledge, Creativity and Freedom. Support to education falls within the last program.

43 Jonathan Fanton, President, www.macfound.org.

44 Gordon Conway, Re-Imagining Philanthropy: Partnerships and Poverty in the Global Age; The Global Philanthropy Forum, Stanford University, March 2004.

45 Joyce Moock, Presentation to Rockefeller Board Meeting, April 2003.

46 While this paper does not review leadership programs, it is worth noting that many of the U.S. foundations have supported leadership-training initiatives, most of which are restricted to U.S. citizens.

47 Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Ireland, the Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, the United Kingdom and the United States. Japan provides funds through a trust fund at the World Bank.

48 IDRC in a Changing World: Program Directions 2000–2005; International Development Research Centre, Ottawa, 33 pages.

49 ECDPM, Developing capacities for ICT enabled development; Capacity.org, Issue 18, July 2003.

50 www.catia.ws.

51 Accenture, Markle Foundation, UNDP, Creating a Development Dynamic: Final Report on the Digital Opportunity Initiative; July 2001.

52 OECD-DAC, Donor ICT Strategies Matrix; Paris, OECD, 2003.

53 DFID, The Significance of Information and Communication Technologies for Reducing Poverty; DFID, London, January 2002.

54 CIDA's Strategy on Knowledge for Development Through Information and Communication Technologies; CIDA, Ottawa, Canada, February 2003.

55 ICT—Transforming the World by Transforming Universities; SIDA, Stockholm, Sweden, July 2002.

56 G. Till, Harnessing Distance Learning and Information and Communication Technologies for Higher Education in Sub-Saharan Africa: An Examination of Experiences Useful for the Design of Widespread and Effective Tertiary Education in Sub-Saharan Africa; paper for Partnership for Higher Education in Africa, 2000.

57 One drawback is that the country must have a GNP per capita of U.S. $3,000, which excludes countries like Brazil, India and China.

58 Accenture, Markle Foundation, Creating a Development Dynamic: Final Report on the Digital Opportunity Initiative; UNDP, July 2001.

59 David Court, op. cit.

60 www.globalhealthtrust.org.

61 David Court, op. cit.

62 A. Harpur and M. Cross, Campus Diversity Audit; CHET (Centre for Higher Education Transformation), South Africa, 1999.

63 Ibid.

64 Ibid.

65 Rockefeller Foundation, DANIDA, Irish Aid, DGIS, SIDA, ADEA, Carnegie Corporation, Commonwealth Secretariat, NORAD, Royal Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Austrian Development Cooperation, UNESCO.

66 Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Ghana, Kenya, Malawi, Mozambique, Senegal, Swaziland, Tanzania, Uganda and Zambia.

67 Women and Management in Higher Education: A Good Practice Handbook; UNESCO, Paris, 2002.

68 N. Boesen, Enhancing Public Sector Capacity—What Works, What Doesn't and Why? OED, World Bank, January 2004 (draft).

69 A. Qualman and P. Morgan, Applying Results-Based Management to Capacity Development; Policy Branch, CIDA, February 1996.

70 M. Schacter, "Capacity Building": A New Way of Doing Business for Development Assistance Organizations; Policy Brief No. 6, Institute on Governance, Ottawa, 2000.

71 C. Lusthaus, M-H Adrien, and M. Perstinger, op. cit.

Annex I
People contributing to the review

Foundations

Carnegie Corporation of New York
Andrea Johnson
Program Officer, International Development

Narciso Matos
Chair, International Development

Ford Foundation
Jorge Balan
Senior Program Officer

Ahmed Bawa
Programme Officer, Johannesburg

William and Flora Hewlett Foundation
Sara Seims
Director, Population Division

John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation
Raoul Davion
International Program

Rockefeller Foundation
Joyce Moock
Associate Vice President

Rosalia Sciortino
Regional Representative, Bangkok

Peter Matlon
Director, Regional Program, Nairobi

Akinwumi Adesina
Associate Director
Food Security, Nairobi

Hilary Brown
Coordinator, Human Resources
for Health and Development

Bilateral Donors

Austrian Development Cooperation
Brigitte Dekrout
Thimphu

Canadian International Development Agency
Real Lavergne
Senior Policy Analyst, Policy Branch

Department for International Development
Dylan Winder
Africa Great Lakes and Horn Department

German Technical Cooperation Agency
Johannes Knapp
Coordinator, Rural Development Program

Noragric
Ivar Jorgensen
Deputy Director

Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency
Ingemar Gustafsson
Head, Methods Development Unit

United States Agency for International Development
Holly Wise
Director, Global Development
Alliance Secretariat

Multilateral Organizations

Food and Agricultural Organization
Thomas Hofer
Forestry Officer
Forest Resources Division

World Bank
Catherine Gwin
Task Manager, Operations Evaluation Department
Washington, D.C.

Lynn Bennett
Social Development, Kathmandu

World Bank Institute
Michael Sarris
Director of Regional Knowledge
and Learning

Other Organizations

African Capacity Building Foundation
Apollinaire Ndorukwigira
Manager, Research, Training and Information
Systems Department

American Association for the Advancement of Science
Shere Abbott
Director, Center for Science, Conservation
and Sustainable Development

European Centre for Development Policy Management
Heather Baser
Programme Coordinator
Internal Donor Reform

International Development Research Centre
Fred Carden
Senior Officer, Evaluation Unit

Chris Smart
Director, Special Initiatives

Roger Finan
Regional Director, South Asia, Delhi

SciDev.Net
David Dickson
Executive Director

Private Consultant
David Court
Nairobi

Jeffrey Fine
Ottawa

.

Annex II
References

Accenture, Markle Foundation, UNDP, Creating a Development Dynamic: Final Report on the Digital Opportunity Initiative; July 2001.

Baser, H., Introducing the DAC Study on Capacity Development; Capacity.org, issue 19, ECDPM, Maastricht, 2003.

Beaglehole, R., A. Lucas, and R. Matchaba, Enhancing Public Health in Developing Countries: External Evaluation of the Public Health Schools Without Walls Program; Report to the Rockefeller Foundation, July 2001.

Bennett, L., Empowerment and Social Inclusion: A Social Development Perspective on the Cultural and Institutional Foundations of Poverty Reduction; Social Development, World Bank, March 2003.

Berg, E, Rethinking Technical Cooperation—Reforms for Capacity Building in Africa; UNDP, New York, 1993.

Berry, J., Cooperation for Capacity Building: Improving the Effectiveness of University Linkage Projects; Asia Branch, CIDA, internal document, 1995.

BIFAD, Renewing USAID Investment in Global Long-Term Training and Capacity Building in Agriculture and Rural Development; Washington, D.C., June 2003.

Boesen, J., and A. Lafontaine, The Planning and Monitoring of Capacity Development in Environment Initiatives; Report prepared for DANIDA, May 20, 1998.

Boesen, N., Enhancing Public Sector Capacity—What Works, What Doesn't and Why? OED, World Bank, January 2004 (draft).

Bolger, J., Capacity Development: Why, What and How; Capacity Development Occasional Series, Vol. 1, No., 1, May 2000, Policy Branch, CIDA, Hull.

Bolger, J., The Emerging Program Focus: Striving for Greater Development Impact; Capacity Development Occasional Series, Vol. 1, No. 2, May 2000, Policy Branch, CIDA, Hull.

Bossuyt, J., Capacity Development: How Can Donors Do It Better? Policy Management Brief No. 5, 1994, ECDPM, Maastricht.

Bossuyt, J., Mainstreaming Institutional Development: Why Is It Important and How Can It Be Done? January 2003, ECDPM, Maastricht.

Brown, M., South Africa Shows the Value of the Diaspora Option; www.SciDev.Net, May 22, 2003.

CHET, Capacity Building Initiatives in Higher Education; Centre for Higher Education Transformation (CHET), South Africa, 2002.

CIDA's Strategy on Knowledge for Development Through Information and Communication Technologies; CIDA, Ottawa, February 2003.

Clarke, D., Developing Capacities for ICT Enabled Development: Capacity.org; ECDPM, 2003.

Conway, G., Re-Imagining Philanthropy: Partnerships and Poverty in the Global Age; The Global Philanthropy Forum, Stanford University, March 2004.

Curtis, P., 2002, University Courses Face Closure Under Gats: *The Guardian*, Oct. 29, 2002: www.education.guardian.co.uk/print/0.3858.4534618.00.

Danielson, A., P. Hoebink, and B. Mongula, Are Donors Ready for Change? UNDP *Development Policy Journal*, Special Issue on Technical Cooperation, Vol. 2, December 2002, New York.

DANIDA, Plan of Action for Active Multilateralism—Capacity Development; Good Governance, DANIDA, 2000.

DFID, The Significance of Information and Communication Technologies for Reducing Poverty; DFID, London, January 2002.

Eade, D., Networks and Networking in Capacity-Building: An Approach to People-Centred Development; Oxfam (U.K. and Ireland), 1997, pp. 154–159.

ECDPM, Developing Capacities for ICT Enabled Development; Capacity.org, Issue 18, July 2003.

Fine, J., External Evaluation of University Science, Humanities, Engineering Partnership in Africa (USHEPiA); draft, November 2003.

Foster, M., New Approaches to Development Co-Operation: What Can We Learn From Experience With Implementing Sector Wide Approaches? ODI Working Paper 140, London, Overseas Development Institute, October 2000, www.odi.uk/publications/working-papers/wp140.

Furtado, X., Decentralization and Capacity Development: Understanding the Links and the Implications for Programming; Capacity Development Occasional Paper Series, No. 4, CIDA Policy Branch, Hull, U.K., August 2001.

Gomez, R., Capacity Development: Strategic Corporate Policy Paper No. 1; GTZ, Eschorn, Germany, March 2003.

Haddad, W., and A. Draxler (eds.), Technologies for Education: Potentials, Parameters and Prospects; UNESCO, Paris, 2002.

Harpur, A., and H. Cross, Campus Diversity Audit; Centre for Higher Education Transformation (CHET), South Africa, 1999.

Horton, D., Planning, Implementing and Evaluating Capacity Development; ISNAR Briefing Paper 50, July 2002

Horton, D., et al., Evaluating Capacity Development: ISNAR, CTA, IDRC; ISBN 1-55250-111-6, 2003.

IDRC in a Changing World: Program Directions 2000–2005; International Development Research Centre, Ottawa, 33 pages, 2000.

Jackson, E. T., How University Projects Produce Development Results: Lessons From 20 Years of Canada-China Cooperation in Higher Education; *Canadian Journal of Development Studies*, Vol. 24, No. 1, pp. 41–49, 2003.

Jaycox, E., Capacity Building: The Missing Link in African Development; address to the African-American Institute conference, 1993.

JICA, A Study on Japan's ODA to Africa: Towards Sustainable and Self-Reliant Poverty Reduction in Africa; Institute for International Cooperation (IFIC), Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA), Tokyo, August 2002.

JICA, Capacity Development: Technical Cooperation in the Health Sector; Discussion Paper 1, Medical Cooperation Department, Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA), Tokyo, January 2003.

JLI, Human Resources for Health and Development: A Joint Learning Initiative; www.globalhealthtrust.org, 2003.

King, K., and McGrath, Knowledge-Based Aid: A Four-Agency Comparative Study; ESRC Learning to Make Policy Project; draft, 2002.

Lautier, F., Meeting the Challenges for Enhancing Capacity for Development: East-West Conference Nov. 2–4, 2003; paper presented at inauguration of the Joint Vienna Institute.

Lavergne, R., and J. Saxby, Capacity Development: Vision and Implications; Capacity Development Occasional Series No. 3, CIDA, Hull, January 2001.

Annex II
References (continued)

Lemelson Foundation, Invention for Sustainable Development Program: A Strategy for the Lemelson Foundation; www.lemelson.org, 2003.

Lieberman, A. E., Taking Ownership: Strengthening Indigenous Cultures and Languages Through the Use of ICTs; LearnLink Academy for Educational Development, Washington, D.C., 2000.

Lopes, C., and T. Theisohn, Ownership, Leadership and Transformation: Can We do Better for Capacity Development? UNDP, Earthscan, 2003.

Lusthaus, C., M-H Adrien, and M. Perstinger, Capacity Development: Definitions, Issues and Implications for Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation; Universalia Occasional Paper No. 35, September 1999.

Malcolm, S., A. M. Cetto, D. Dickson, J. Gaillard, Y. Quere, and Scheffer, Science Education and Capacity Building for Sustainable Development; ICSU, Series on Science for Sustainable Development No. 5, International Council for Science (ICSU), Paris, 2002.

Mkandawire, T., Three Generations of African Scholars; CODESRIA Bulletin 2, 1995.

Morgan, P., One More Time: Just How Should We Think About the Concept of Capacity? ECDPM Occasional Paper 1 (draft), 2003.

Nair, G., and M. Hart-Poliquin, Integrating Capacity Building Into a Results Framework; The World Bank Institute (draft), 2004.

NORAD Invests in the Future: NORAD's Strategy for 2000–2005; Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation (NORAD), Oslo, 2000.

North, D., Institutions, Institutional Change and Economic Performance; Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, U.K., and New York, 1990.

OECD-DAC, Criteria for Donor Agencies' Self-Assessment in Capacity Development; DCD/DAC (99) 4, 1999.

OECD-DAC, Donor ICT Strategies Matrix; Paris, OECD, 2003.

OECD-DAC, Philanthropic Foundations and Development Co-operation; DAC *Journal*, Vol. 4, No. 3, 2003, Paris, OECD, 2003.

Perskinson, R., Planning Ahead for Knowledge Societies…A "Perfect Storm" for Global Higher Education; Education India Conference; April 2003.

Pires, M., R. Kassimir, and M. Brhane, Investing in Return: Rates of Return of African Ph.D.s Trained in North America; Social Science Research Council, New York, 1999.

Qualman, A., and P. Morgan, Applying Results-Based Management to Capacity Development; Policy Branch, CIDA, February 1996.

Ruggles, R., Japanese Approaches to Capacity Development; Case of Thailand and Bosnia-Herzegovina (draft), 2003.

Sall, E., The Social Sciences in Africa: Trends, Issues, Capacities and Constraints; Paper prepared for the Human Capital Committee of the SSRC, Social Science Research Council, New York, 2003.

Sarris, M., Towards a More Strategic Approach to Capacity Building in Africa; World Bank Institute (draft), 2004.

Schacter, M., "Capacity Building": A New Way of Doing Business for Development Assistance Organizations; Policy Brief No. 6, Institute on Governance, Ottawa, 2000.

SDC, Mekong Region Programme 2002–2006; Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC), internal document, 2002.

SIDA's Policy for Capacity Development as a Strategic Question in Development Cooperation; Stockholm, November 2000.

SIDA, Analysis of Needs for Capacity Development; Policy Secretariat, Capacity Development Working Paper 4, March 2000.

SIDA, ICT—Transforming the World by Transforming Universities; Stockholm, Sweden, July 2002.

Till, G., Harnessing Distance Learning and Information and Communication Technologies for Higher Education in Sub-Saharan Africa: An Examination of Experiences Useful for the Design of Widespread and Effective Tertiary Education in Sub-Saharan Africa; paper for Partnership for Higher Education in Africa, 2000.

United Nations, Capacity-Building for Poverty Eradication: Analysis of, and Lessons Learned From Evaluations of U.N. System Support to Countries' Efforts; United Nations, New York, 2002.

United Nations, Report of the U.N. Inter-Agency Workshop on Capacity Development; Geneva, Nov. 20–22, 2002.

UN-ACC Guidance Note on Capacity Building, Approved March 2000; Administrative Committee on Coordination (ACC).

UNDP, Capacity for Development—New Solutions to Old Problems, and UNDP, Developing Capacity Through Technical Cooperation; Country Experiences, UNDP, New York, 2002.

UN-ECOSOC, United Nations System Support for Capacity-Building; Report of the Secretary-General, E/2002/58, May 14, 2002.

UNESCO, Women and Management in Higher Education: A Good Practice Handbook; UNESCO, Paris, 2002.

UNICEF, Developing National Capacities for Achieving the MDGs Within a Human Rights Perspective: A UNICEF Approach to Capacity Building; UNICEF, New York, 2000.

Vartan, G., New Directions for Carnegie Corporation for New York: A Report to the Board, New York; Carnegie Corporation of New York, Feb. 2, 1999.

Watson, R., M. Crawford, and S. Farley, Strategic Approaches to Science and Technology in Development; World Bank Research Working Paper 3026, Washington, D.C., April 2003.

WBI, Towards a More Strategic Approach to Capacity Building in Africa; draft paper, 2003.

Wood, B., The Framework for International Development Cooperation 2005–2010; background paper for IDRC, Ottawa, August 2003.

World Bank, Constructing Knowledge Societies: New Challenges for Tertiary Education; Education Group, Human Development Network, World Bank, Washington, D.C., April 16, 2002.

World Bank, The Role and Effectiveness of Development Assistance: Lessons from World Bank Experience; World Bank, Washington, D.C., 2002.

World Bank, Sharing Knowledge: Innovations and Remaining Challenges; OED, October 2003.

World Bank/UNESCO, Higher Education in Developing Countries: Peril and Promise; report of the Task Force on Higher Education and Society, 2000.

Annex III
Acronyms

AAAS	American Association for the Advancement of Science
AAU	African Association of Universities
ACBF	African Capacity Building Foundation
ADEA	Association for the Development of Education in Africa
AERC	African Economic Research Consortium
AfDB	African Development Bank
AGORA	Access to Global Online Research in Agriculture
ANC	African National Congress
AusAID	Australian Agency for International Development
AVU	African Virtual University
CATIA	Catalyzing Access to ICTs in Africa
CBNRM	Community Based Natural Resources Management
CEPA	Centre for Economic Policy Analysis
CIDA	Canadian International Development Agency
CGIAR	Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research
CIES	Consortium for Social and Economic Research
CODESRIA	Council for the Development of Social Science Research in Africa
DANIDA	Danish International Development Agency
DFID	Department for International Development
DGIS	Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs
DHMT	District Health Management Team
ECA	United Nations Economic Commission for Africa
ECDPM	European Centre for Development Policy Management
ECOSOC	Economic and Social Council
EEPSEA	Economy and Environment Program for Southeast Asia
EU	European Union
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
FAWE	Forum for African Women Educationalists
FEMSA	Female Education in Mathematics and Science in Africa
FORUM	Forum on Agricultural Resource Husbandry
FSAPs	Financial Sector Assessment Programs
GDLN	Global Development Learning Network
GDN	Global Development Network
GMR	Greater Mekong Region
GTZ	German Technical Cooperation
HINARI	Health InterNetwork Access to Research Initiative
IAI	Inter-American Institute
ICSU	International Council for Science
ICT	Information and Communication Technologies
ICT4D	ICT for Development
IDRC	International Development Research Centre
IFAD	International Fund for Agricultural Development
IFP	International Fellowship Program
IHDP	International Human Dimensions Program
IIASA	International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis
ILO	International Labor Organization

IMF	International Monetary Fund
JBIC	Japan Bank for International Cooperation
JICA	Japan International Cooperation Agency
JLI	Joint Learning Initiative
KARI	Kenya Agricultural Research Institute
KfW	German Kreditanstalt für Wiederaufbau
KIPPRA	Kenya Institute of Public Policy Research and Analysis
LEAD	Leadership for Environment and Development
MDGs	Millenium Development Goals
MOFA	Ministry of Foreign Affairs
ODA	Overseas Development Assistance
NEPAD	New Partnership for Africa's Development
NERICA	New Rice for Africa
NIS	National Innovation System
NORAD	Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation
OECD-DAC	Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development's Development Cooperation Directorate
PACT	Partnership for Capacity Building in Africa
PBAs	Program Based Approaches
PHE	Pathway to Higher Education
PHSWOW	Public Health Schools Without Walls
PRSPs	Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers
SAPs	Structural Adjustment Programs
SATIII	Southern Africa AIDS Training Program
SDC	Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation
SIDA	Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency
SISERA	Secretariat for Institutional Support for Economic Research in Africa
SWAps	Sector Wide Approaches
TEHIP	Tanzania Essential Health Interventions Project
UN-ACC	United Nations Administrative Committee on Coordination
UNCED	United Nations Conference on Environment and Development
UNDP	United Nations Development Program
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
UNFPA	United Nations Population Fund
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
USAID	U.S. Agency for International Development
USHEPiA	University Science, Humanities and Engineering Partnerships in Africa
WARDA	West Africa Rice Development Association
WB	World Bank
WBI	World Bank Institute
WHO	World Health Organization
WIPO	World Intellectual Property Organization
WMO	World Meteorological Organization
WTO	World Trade Organization