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**Editor’s note:**

This paper pursues some of the conceptual and strategic discussion initiated in the first paper titled “Capacity Development - Why, What and How?” Recognizing that the concept is used in different ways, the paper aims to strengthen understanding of the concept’s importance and to clarify the implications of adopting a capacity development approach in development co-operation. Future contributions are expected to explore capacity development from different angles and perspectives, with increasing attention to operational issues. Keeping in mind that true understanding will only emerge from the exploration of concrete development experience, we welcome case studies of CIDA projects and programs as contributions to the series.

Réal Lavergne, Policy Branch
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**INTRODUCTION**

The concept of capacity development (CD) emerged in the late 1980s and gained increased prominence throughout the 1990s. Today, the phrase has wide currency in the development community. It has been the object of considerable discussion in CIDA and has become part of our daily language. Yet the concept remains a complex and difficult one to grasp and operationalize in the design, execution and evaluation of development initiatives. People in CIDA understand the concept in different ways, and feel a need for joint learning and experimentation on how to incorporate the concept more systematically in the Agency’s approach to development co-operation.

The purposes of this Occasional Paper are twofold: to strengthen understanding of the concept; and to clarify the implications of adopting a CD approach in the management of development co-operation. We begin with an exploration of the meanings and uses of the phrase. This is followed by two sections covering the use of the concept in development co-operation and how to interpret results from using such an approach.
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1 The authors are Senior Analysts with CIDA’s Partnership and Policy Branches, in CIDA. This CD Occasional Series is produced by Policy Branch in collaboration with CIDA’s Capacity Development Network. The views expressed in these papers are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect CIDA policy. Comments on this edition, or ideas for future editions, should be sent to Réal Lavergne, CIDA Policy Branch, (819) 997-1597, or real_lavergne@acdi-cida.gc.ca. While taking full responsibility for the final content of the paper, the authors would like to thank colleagues in and out of CIDA for their comments on previous drafts, notably Heather Baser, Joe Bolger, Charles Lusthaus, Ann Qualman and Diana Youdell, who provided particularly detailed comments.

2 A dozen workshops were organized in CIDA between 1994 and 1998, and numerous papers have been produced and made available to CIDA staff. Several of those papers are referenced in the bibliography of this paper. Most projects and programs in CIDA contain some aspects of capacity development, and many can be described as capacity development “initiatives.”
WHAT DOES CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT REALLY MEAN?

One reason the concept of CD is so complex is that it evolved from a wide range of previous approaches. As these became more sophisticated, and as they merged, they became absorbed into the general concept of CD. Lusthaus et al offer a taxonomy of four different approaches or schools of thought with respect to CD. These include:

- the organizational approach, focused on building capacity at the level of individual organizations;
- the institutional approach, which focuses on the processes and rules that govern socio-economic and political organization in the society at large;
- a systems approach, which emphasizes the interdependencies among social actors and the need to promote capacity building in a holistic way; and
- a participatory process approach, which emphasizes ownership and participation as fundamental elements of CD.

Most interventions involve a measured approach involving elements from each of these schools of thought.

CD has taken on so many meanings and absorbed so many other approaches that it is sometimes used as a slogan with limited analytical usefulness [Lusthaus et al, p. 5]. For the concept to be useful, it must not be so general as to be meaningless. Nor should it be used as a slogan where simpler concepts, such as training or organizational strengthening, would more accurately reflect reality.

A question that frequently arises is whether CD is not everything that we do as a development agency. Is all development not fundamentally about capacity development? In a sense, it is. Development is about a society’s capacity to fulfil the needs of its members in an increasingly satisfactory way, based on the resources available to it. But not everyone thinks of development in these terms - for example it is all too easy to confuse development with increased GNP per capita or with industrialization. Speaking of “capacity development” instead of just “development” might be useful if only to remind us what real development is about. However, there is more to the concept than that. CD also has to do with the types of capacity that are emphasized.

Society’s capacity to meet the needs of its members depends upon the resources available to it, and on how well those resources are utilized. The resources available to society are wide ranging and may be more or less tangible in nature. Tangible resources obviously include physical assets such as infrastructure, plant and machinery and natural resources; but also some relatively tangible or measurable features having to do with the education and health of the population itself. We would also include here resources that can be described in structural terms or as tangible forms of information and analysis. Examples of this are organizational structures and systems, legal frameworks and policies, books, reports and the like.

Then come a wide range of less tangible, but no less important, dimensions of capacity having to do with skills, experience and creativity; social cohesion and social capital; values and motivations; habits and traditions; institutional culture, etc. These intangible dimensions of capacity, often referred to as “capabilities,” are crucial because they determine how well society uses the other resources at its disposal. Whatever else CD might imply, its specificity is the central place accorded to these capabilities.

Some users of the concept go somewhat further than this by emphasizing what they call “core” capabilities. Core capabilities refer to the creativity, resourcefulness and capacity to learn and adapt of individuals and social entities. They are what allows them to realize their human and social potential to the
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highest possible level. An example of this approach is that taken by the Community Development Resource Association of Capetown, which unequivocally locates the foundation of capacity development in the values, vision, self-definition and confidence of people themselves (CDRA, 1998).

The idea of core capacities highlights the ability of individuals, organizations or society as a whole to do several things:

- to be guided by key values and a sense of purpose;
- to define and analyse their environment and their own place in the greater scheme of things;
- to define the issues and reach working agreements on purposes or mandates;
- to manage and resolve conflicts;
- to formulate strategies;
- to plan, and act on those plans;
- to acquire and mobilize resources;
- to learn new skills and approaches on a continuous basis;
- to build supporting relationships with other parties;
- to assess performance and make adjustments;
- to meet new challenges proactively, by adjusting agendas, approaches and strategies.3

This approach provides a richer, more specific, understanding of capabilities than one based principally on technical skills or human resource development. While the general term "capabilities" covers a wide range of abilities affecting performance, the concept of "core" capacities focuses on the ability to play an active role in the ongoing development of capacity. However, one concept does not exclude the other. CD encompasses technical skills and knowledge as well as core capacities because both are important, but there is value in pointing to core capacities as fundamental in the pursuit of sustainable development.

The intangibles of development are much more difficult to influence than other, more concrete dimensions of capacity, and the distinction is therefore an important one for the way development co-operation is managed. Attention to some of the difficulties involved has led capacity development practitioners and thinkers to identify a number of important features requiring attention in any capacity development effort. The following points to three such features.

The first one is that, unlike more tangible results of development efforts, from roads and bridges to training and development plans, capabilities to use resources in an efficient, effective, relevant and sustainable way, cannot be generated or delivered from the outside. They must be learned by doing, and wilfully acquired over time by those who are engaged in the development process. There are no turnkey capacity development projects! Another way to put this is to say that an outside intervenor cannot build or develop capacity in others. CD is something that development actors do for themselves. The challenge for external partners is to build on local energy and commitment by "facilitating resourcefulness."4 A corollary of this is the need to respect the principles of local ownership and participation often associated with CD efforts.

A second feature of CD is the conditioning influence of relationships and systems on performance. Individuals may be educated, or well trained, but that is of no value if they remain unemployed, or linger unproductively in a job offering little stimulation or incentive to perform. CD approaches thus need to take a
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holistic or systemic view of development. To quote Joe Bolger as he put it in the first instalment of the Occasional Paper series:

This [systemic] perspective represents arguably the most important contribution of capacity development, i.e. a systematic recognition of the importance of thinking about individuals, organizations, programs, policies, etc. as part of a broader whole rather than as discrete, or loosely connected concerns. (p. 3)

A third essential feature of CD has to do with the immediacy and predictability of results that can be achieved. Because the development of capabilities takes time, and produces relatively intangible, often uncertain results, there is inevitably a tension between CD and more tangible objectives. The central challenge of a CD approach is thus to balance the short-term need for tangible results (for example the achievement of poverty reduction goals in areas such as health and sanitation or access to clean water, or the reorganization of a government department) with the long-term CD needs of sustainable development. Advocates of a CD approach argue that development co-operation has so often failed in the past due to the neglect of CD because pressures for quick, predictable results have led to the neglect of CD.

To summarize, what distinguishes a CD perspective is enhanced concern for the intangible dimensions of development. CD is about increased ability to use and increase existing resources, in an efficient, effective, relevant and sustainable way. Usually emphasizing “core” capabilities, the CD approach recognizes the primacy of learning by doing, takes a holistic approach that recognizes the interdependence of actors and systems, and seeks to balance the need for short term results in satisfying social needs with the need for long-term improvements in capacity.

The expression “capacity development” can be used in several ways. Although it is usually discussed as an approach to development co-operation, CD can be understood as a process in its own right, as it is in the following definition:

Capacity development is a process by which individuals, groups, organizations and societies enhance their abilities to identify and meet development challenges in a sustainable manner.\(^5\)

This use of the expression recognizes that capacity development is something that individuals, groups, organizations and societies do for themselves. Outside partners can provide resources and facilitate the process, but cannot deliver the desired outcome.

For outside partners, the adoption of a capacity development approach determines where the emphasis should be placed. Practitioners of a capacity development approach are rarely satisfied with building roads and bridges - they are more likely to emphasize the efficiency and effectiveness of the Ministry of Transport in planning, building and maintaining the country’s transportation system. Similarly, they would not be satisfied with producing a strategic document for health reform using expatriate expertise - they would give greater importance to improved capacity to think strategically in health organizations. When

---

\(^5\) This definition of CD was developed by CIDA for use in a CIDA workshop series beginning in 1996. For other definitions, see for example: Lusthaus et al., Exhibit 2; UNDP, 1998, p. 6; and Bolger, 2000, p. 2.
engaging in training activities, they would do so as part of a larger approach ensuring that the training is absorbed and translated into increased performance.

The distinction between development co-operation based on tangible forms of investment and CD is not trite. It is fundamental, because development assistance organizations typically work in a resource transfer mode. We are good at providing funds for roads and schools, technical assistance and training, but less good at supporting capacity development. To advocate a CD approach to development co-operation involves a fundamental shift of priorities, methods and cultures in how donors do business with their Southern counterparts.⁶

USES OF THE CONCEPT IN DEVELOPMENT PRACTICE

To emphasize that CD matters, and matters fundamentally, does not mean that other development goals should be neglected. The concern should be for appropriate balance. As some commentators of this paper put it, there is no point having capacity to manage, but no resources. However, we need to recognize some of the biases inherent in development co-operation for tangible, short-term results, that lead to the neglect of CD as a day-to-day preoccupation.

Correcting this bias requires two types of response: the adoption of a CD approach to some degree in everything that we do; and the pursuit of initiatives specifically designed to build capacity. CD as an approach can be understood as any approach promoting CD in a systematic and substantial way. A CD project or initiative is one whose principal goal, objectives or outcomes are defined in terms of CD. Either perspective requires an awareness of the possible roles that external partners may play, in consultation with developing country stakeholders.

CD as an approach

The experience of Canada’s IDRC provides an example that is well known to one of the authors, of what is meant by a capacity development approach.⁷ IDRC has adopted a CD approach to all of its work ever since it was founded in 1970. In terms of the three features of a CD approach identified above, IDRC has tried to promote indigenous capacity at an individual and organizational level, through learning by doing, while taking a long-term perspective. It has had more difficulty applying a fully holistic or systemic perspective, due to the specific focus of its mandate on development research.

IDRC has pursued a CD approach by adopting a number of conventions that define its corporate culture. In particular, IDRC supports only organizations in developing countries, or partnerships between developing country organizations and Canadian ones. Leadership for proposal development is vested in those (mainly Southern) organizations, as is the responsibility for execution of projects and for results. Project funds are disbursed directly to the host organizations, without a Canadian executing agency to act as intermediary. IDRC officers provide technical support, and put researchers in contact with other researchers using a networking format. In many cases, IDRC has worked with the same organization for a decade or more, as it built up its capacity. For example, it was a founding donor of CODESRIA, the Council for the Development of Economic and Social Research in Africa, in 1973, and continues to support that organization to this day.

⁶ See Schacter, 2000, who treats capacity building as a “new way of doing business for development organizations.”
⁷ Réal Lavergne worked in IDRC for many years before joining CIDA.
This approach can be contrasted to support for research by many other organizations, which emphasized the final product (a book or report), often produced by expatriate researchers. Most IDRC projects also seek the publication of books and reports as the principal output of its projects, but capacity development is always an important outcome as well, due to IDRC’s particular approach. This illustrates how a capacity development approach can be adopted regardless of the primary objective of a development activity. In like fashion, one can argue that every CIDA project should take a CD approach - which is to say that it should systematically address capacity development goals objectives.

**CD projects or initiatives**

It is also possible to design projects or initiatives specifically, or primarily, for the purpose of capacity development. In this case, CD is no longer just an approach. It becomes the main goal or objective of a specific project or initiative whose primary outcomes are defined in terms of increased capabilities. This perspective implies that gaps or constraints have been identified for action by one or more development agencies. The approach may be relatively holistic, such as that taken by the African Capacity Building Foundation in recent pronouncements, or more specific, as for many other initiatives, such as the African Economic Research Consortium, which focuses on research and training for economists.\(^8\)

CD projects or initiatives usually include training, education or organizational development, although that would not be sufficient to qualify them as capacity development. CD initiatives could also include funding for infrastructure and other tangible forms of investment, such as funding for infrastructure development in the education or research sectors. There is no presumption that all support for CD must be intangible in nature just because the ultimate outcome being pursued is intangible. What matters is that such support be part of a broader initiative whose primary aim, emphasis or centre of gravity is capacity development.

**Possible roles and strategies**

Peter Morgan (1998) has identified a number of possible roles and strategies that donors may adopt in designing CD initiatives, some of which address the broader social, cultural or legal/political milieu. Building on his work, we would emphasize the following:

- helping development actors at different levels to settle on clear strategic directions;
- helping to improve organizational capabilities and incentive systems;
- the provision of opportunities for experimentation and learning through pilot projects and attention to systemic constraints on innovation and learning;
- the promotion of innovative approaches for the sharing of experiences within and across national boundaries;
- the promotion of new technologies to extend the reach of information and dialogue;
- helping to shape an enabling institutional environment.

As this suggests, there is a wide range of possible roles and strategies. A critical point is that these roles cannot be assumed or taken for granted, but have to be negotiated among the different actors. An external organization such as a donor may have an obvious and expected role as funder, but if the different parties have built enough trust and common history, an external partner may perform other roles, as a provider of
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8 These are examples of projects supported by CIDA in collaboration with other donors. The African Capacity Building Foundation (ACBF) is a multi-donor initiative to build capacity in Africa. For more information on either of these initiatives, see www.adbf-pact.org and www.aercafrica.org. Note that substantial use is made in the African context of the expression “capacity building” instead of “capacity development.” Although there may be nuances of meaning, most people treat these concepts as equivalent in terms of the outcomes being pursued.
information and promoter of best practices; or as a catalyst, sympathetic critic and pathfinder, encouraging leadership, problem solving and strategic thinking. Much depends on the sort of expertise that the external partner can bring to the table.

**Principles and values**
From an understanding of CD and its features, can be derived a number of principles for development co-operation, some of which have already been mentioned. These include local participation, ownership and control, emphasis on the use of local capacities, a sound understanding of local conditions, a coaching, supportive role for technical assistance, an iterative and flexible approach, and a systemic, long-term perspective. While these principles are applied in different ways by different actors, they characterize much of the “conventional wisdom” in this area.

Applying some of these principles requires that donors and donor representatives be aware of their own social values. If CD is about core capacities, which include social values of various sorts, then the promotion of CD is inevitably about the promotion of certain values - for example about learning and change, about the proper distribution of power in society, about gender equality or environmental sustainability. Donors come to the table with social values and legitimately want to promote those values. There is a certain paradox in wanting to do this while also promoting local ownership and control, but working in close partnership with counterparts in developing countries does not mean leaving one’s values at home. It does imply the need for mutual respect and tolerance, and careful choice of one's interventions and partners in the first place. This involves some key choices early on regarding the level of intervention, and what we are calling here the “politics” of capacity development.

**Levels of intervention**
External actors such as CIDA have to ask at what level of social interaction they are most likely to have a strategic influence. Implicitly or explicitly, participants will draw upon some theory of individual, organizational or social change. The prospects for achieving useful results rest directly upon the appropriateness of the strategies they choose. One of the key questions to ask concerns the choice of entry points for promoting capacity. Options include:

- the individual;
- a community or organization;
- a network of organizations;
- the regulatory, policy or legal framework;
- at the highest level, the diffuse but powerful mix of norms, customs and habits that make up a society’s cultural, economic and socio-political milieu.

The better our systemic understanding of capacity development, the more strategic a donor’s interventions can be. This requires an understanding of how different social components or processes are inter-linked and how they influence each other. These processes and linkages play out at several different levels of society, from individual communities or organizations to national or global entities and processes. How do interventions at one level complement those at another? Capacity development at the individual or organizational level may not be of much use if there are systemic impediments to performance, such as poor incentives or lack of access to resources. As we have argued, capacity development is more than skills acquisition by a particular individual, community organization or government department. It includes a systemic dimension.
Different types of intervenors tend to become involved at different levels. For example, non-government actors may pitch their analysis and strategy at the level of the organization or the community. They may do so because their history and immediate concerns may be found here, or because they may feel this is their sphere of influence. Conversely, a multilateral or bilateral agency, such as CIDA, may be able to work with a network of organizations or with select government departments. Funding agencies working together, as proposed in Sector Wide Approaches, can target entire sectors in a holistic fashion, or take an even broader strategic perspective of capacity development, the way the African Capacity Building Foundation is doing. Addressing broad goals and issues such as poverty reduction or improved environmental management requires engagement with a wide range of actors at different levels in both state and civil society.

**Political considerations**

Capacity development requires a great deal of awareness and sensitivity to political issues, because choices about capacity development inevitably influence the structure of power in society. If capacity development is about human development and change, then it will also be about power and interest and probably conflict as well, within communities, organizations and society at large. Capacity development thus raises fundamental questions about whose capacity is to be promoted, and in whose interest. Funding agencies responding to requests or recommendations for support must ask who is championing a particular initiative and who opposes it. Are some voices and interests represented to the exclusion of others (such as women, minorities, the poor), systematically or by oversight? Whose analysis holds sway in defining the issues and problems to be addressed? Donors themselves are important actors, by virtue of the resources that they can bring to bear. Whose interests do they represent, and what roles can they legitimately play in arbitrating among different groups? Unavoidable questions such as these should be front-and-centre in the exploration and design phase of any CD initiative, because the answers will influence the entire undertaking.

Reaching clarity and agreement on the broad functions or positions of different actors should thus precede choices about how best to enhance capacity. This raises questions about differences of power between governments and non-state actors, among local stakeholders in general, between North and South, between local stakeholders and outside experts.

An important dimension of this is that CD initiatives, by their very nature, cannot be designed from the outside. They must be “owned” by developing country stakeholders, and negotiated with outside partners according to what the latter have to offer. However, this does not imply a passive role on the part of external partners. As the above suggests, external partners cannot escape the very political nature of CD. At issue is how the different actors work and interact and how respective roles are defined in an initiative. Who decides which people and organizations join the negotiations? How can external partners respect the primacy of local ownership without tying themselves to the priorities of powerful stakeholders at the expense of others? Success in putting together a joint undertaking provides a solid foundation for negotiating roles and strategies. Participants should be acutely aware of their own assumptions and strategies as an intervention is implemented, monitored and evaluated, and must be prepared to revisit and adjust them as time goes on.

These considerations highlight the need for candid institutional analysis of both developing country and external partners as part of the capacity assessment phase preceding any intervention. Questions about role and strategy can be a mirror for both external partners and domestic stakeholders as much as a lens. What interest or competence qualifies an organization for particular roles and strategies? What are the enabling or constraining effects of organizational culture, of administrative procedures or patterns of
informal power? What resources, capacities and assets do different groups bring to the task? A capacity assessment may be useful in identifying needs and resources in the South, but may be equally useful in judging the quality of resources a Northern donor brings to an intervention, especially if the scrutiny comes from the users of donor services.

Increased awareness of strategic considerations and political realities has important implications for our understanding of accountability. At issue is deciding to whom the various stakeholders, including external partners, should hold themselves accountable when their actions affect the lives and well-being of others. Answering this question is fundamental to the legitimacy of all concerned. The Results Based Management approach, with its focus on shared responsibility for results, can be a powerful tool for discussions of mutual accountability to be included as part of the negotiations.

ASSESSING SUCCESS

The importance of process
It is important to remember that by addressing considerations of why and how, of values, purposes, roles and strategies, people can achieve important results in the early stages of an initiative. Investing in the front end can yield immediate as well as longer-term results and benefits. For example, participatory analyses of needs and assets can develop individual and collective skills in strategic thinking, problem-solving and research techniques. These skills may lead to a more sophisticated analysis of the issues and contribute to improved design of the intervention in terms of entry points, complementary strategies, key indicators and ways of tracking them, and so on.

Structured dialogue around purposes, values and interests can also enhance trust and build skills in managing conflict. This dialogue might include a conscious effort to rethink and redefine historic roles of government and community, or of donor and host. It can contribute to increased confidence and negotiating skills. The long term commitment resulting from such processes can be an invaluable long-term asset for all stakeholders.

What counts? Capacity development as both means and end
How to assess the success of CD initiatives raises fundamental questions about what constitutes a satisfactory outcome. Capacity in human affairs is not a fixed, measurable quantity, but rather the potential to act effectively. For many people, the real test of capacity will be the end results in terms of improved performance - for example better strategic plans, improved access to drinking water or improved community health. However, capacity development can also be regarded as valuable in its own right. As Morgan points out, “Policies, goods and services may change and become obsolete, but living capacity can mutate and survive” (Morgan, 1999, p. 5). Capacity development is therefore both a means and an end, and assessing success requires a balanced approach between these two views.

Although results are commonly assessed in the evaluative stages of a project or program, the balance between the two types of results will depend very much on how the issue of capacity development is defined in the first place. And that, too, must be negotiated. If ownership and participation are essential to longer-term success and sustainability of an intervention, then it becomes critical to know not only what constitutes success, but also who defines and judges it.

Performance over time
A further, and obvious, complication, is that improved performance from capacity development manifests itself over time. Much of the impact from capacity development may thus be speculative in nature, requiring important assumptions about broader social conditions that may impede or enhance improved performance. Because if capacity is potential, to be affirmed through action, it is also highly contingent, that is, shaped by the interplay between actors and their environment. Questions of quality of performance and “results” over time thus direct attention to the broader social context, the wider patterns of political and economic power and the way in which these inhibit or enhance capacity.

The only sure approach to capacity development is one based on learning, on the capacity of people to understand, adapt and reshape their organizations and their environment. From this viewpoint, sustained performance will not be a stable or unchanging “steady state,” but a dynamic balance between external demands and a collective capacity to respond. Again, it is the potential to act that capacity development seeks to influence.

**SUMMARY AND CONCLUDING COMMENTS**

We have attempted to clarify the concept of CD by reducing it to its essential defining characteristics. As we have seen, the implications of adopting a CD perspective are important. What the approach calls for is a shift in focus, away from one biased towards the delivery of tangible outcomes or the short-term satisfaction of development needs, to one of promoting “enhanced abilities to identify and meet developmental challenges, in a sustainable manner,” with an emphasis on “core” capabilities. The emphasis is thus on the intangibles of development. As we have pointed out, capacity understood in these terms must be learned by doing, over time. It cannot be “delivered.”

External funding agencies or groups pursuing CD may do so from different perspectives - as an approach, or as a goal - and may take on a variety of roles. They need to decide on entry points, and need to do so with due regard for the political choices implied in everything that they do. Assessing success requires a recognition that the process itself is important, and can yield important benefits even before an initiative is launched. Assessing success is not straightforward, however, because capacity development is both a means and an end in itself. Ideally, we need to assess both the increased performance resulting from increased capacity, and the increased potential to act, however that potential might be manifested in the future.

Although we have tried to distil the “essence” of CD in this paper, what seems to emerge most clearly is the complexity of applying such an approach, given the requirements for a holistic, long-term approach, developed in partnership with a range of stakeholders, and the difficulty of defining and measuring satisfactory results. Its application requires that funding agencies such as CIDA develop their own capacities in the form of a corporate culture, strategic approach and practice based on the facilitation of others’ development. Like all capacity development, such a shift involves learning by doing. It requires will and leadership, and can only happen over an extended period of time. The CD perspective is no doubt a sophisticated and challenging one for donors to apply, but it is one well worth taking up, in our pursuit of aid effectiveness and sustainable development.
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