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1. Introduction

This paper introduces 3 major themes, Capacity Development, Institutional Change and Theories of Change that will be the background of the seminar: “Scrutinising Success and Failure in Development”.

Why these three themes? Because we think and have come to realise that these themes have many linkages and connections in development practice and theory but are hardly ever brought together to deepen the understanding of mutual linkages, consequences and how we can use these in a more coherent and mutually enriching manner.

The seminar aims to explore how a better understanding of capacity development, institutions and theories of change and their inter-linkages can be integrated into development policy and programmes to foster greater impact and contribute towards more equitable, just and sustainable societies.

2. Capacity Development.

Capacity Development as a concept or a field of intervention has seen quite some developments in the last decade. What has not changed however is that Capacity Development is firmly anchored in development paradigms and is linked to the development process of individuals, organisations, institutions and societies at large.

In the nineties of the last century capacity development was mainly seen as an intervention linked to teaching and training directed at individuals working in organisations. It was also often referred to as capacity building implying that capacities did not yet exist, and needed to be built up from scratch. The “building” metaphor suggests a process starting with a plain surface and involving the step-by-step erection of a new structure, based on a preconceived design.

The current understanding of the concept of capacity development recognizes that there is no situation in which capacity does not exist. The question is whether the existing capacities are being recognized and whether the existing capacities are capacities that enable individuals and organisations to perform well in what they want to achieve.

---

1 At Wageningen International, but also in other organisations working on capacity development.
Current definitions of what capacity entails vary from “performance based type definitions” to much more holistic society/sectoral/large systems approaches to understanding capacity.

The first category defines capacity as the ability to perform. Capacity development is in this case understood as strengthening the “ability to perform”. This can apply to individuals, organisations and institutions. The underlying understanding is that there is a “notion” or a norm saying something about what the required, intended, aspired performance should be. Capacity development in this understanding is therefore also about closing the gap between the actual performance and the desired performance. This may concern individuals working in a situation where a particular performance is needed and where these individuals lack certain competencies (knowledge, skills, attitudes), which means that they do not yet perform according to expectations. A new policy development in an organisation might for example require capacity development of the whole organisation like in the case of the introduction of a gender policy where the organisation as a whole and its individual staff members need to develop new knowledge, skills, attitudes. A gender policy requires new systems, structures, and a change in culture to be able to realize the new policy.

The second category defines capacity as more holistic society/sectoral/large systems approaches to understanding capacity. McKinsey when studying the experiences of USA based voluntary organisations came up with a framework for capacity development of NGO’s that identifies 7 aspects of an organisation’s capacity:


The important lessons drawn from the study were that when the different elements of the triangle are all connected and integrated and there is awareness about embedding these 6 aspects in the 7th element: the organizational and contextual culture this really leads to capable organisations.
Thinking about Capacity Development has developed further, in particular when UNDP defined capacity development as the cornerstone of its development approach. Many publications\(^4\) have come out of this initiative and over time more conceptual clarity has been gained. The specific role of UNDP is to support governments in Developing Countries. The ideas developed recognise the importance of ownership, endogenous processes, transformation, and multi stakeholder involvement as the basis for Capacity Development. From the UNDP’s attention to Capacity Development grew the OECD/DAC Govnet interest in Capacity Development which led o.a. to a publication in which Capacity development is defined as:

“Capacity is the ability of people, organisations and society as a whole to manage their affairs successfully ... Capacity development is the process whereby people, organisations and society as a whole unleash, strengthen, create, adapt and maintain capacity over time”.\(^5\)

A recent paper\(^6\) by Antoinette Gosses in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs Source book (forthcoming) called: **Stop teaching, start learning- the mystery of capacity development** – gives some other definitions/ descriptions:

- ‘CD entails the sustainable creation, utilization and retention of the abilities of individuals, institutions and societies to perform functions, solve problems, and set and achieve objectives, in order to reduce poverty, enhance self-reliance and improve people’s lives’ (UNDP, Capacity Development Practice Note, 2006).
- ‘CD refers to the approaches, strategies and methodologies used by developing countries and/or external stakeholders to improve performance at individual, organisational, network/sector or broader system level (ISS, Support for Capacity Development, The Hague, June 2005).
- ‘Capacity refers to the conditions that must be in place e.g.: knowledge, competence, and effective and development-oriented organisations and institutional frameworks, in order to make development possible (SIDA, Manual for Capacity Development, Stockholm, October 2005).
- ‘Capacity is that emergent combination of attributes, assets, capabilities and relationships that enables a human system to perform, survive and self-renew’ (ECDPM, The idea and practice of systems thinking and their relevance for Capacity Development, Maastricht, 2005)

OECD/DAC Govnet further states: Capacity development involves much more than enhancing the knowledge and skills of individuals. It depends crucially on the quality of the organisations in which they work. In turn, the operations of particular organisations are influenced by the enabling environment – the structures of power and influence and the institutions – in which they are embedded. Capacity is not only about skills and procedures; it is also about incentives and governance. OECD/DAC Govnet continues to distinguish capacity development from promoting capacity development:


\(^6\) Antoinette Gosses in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs Source book *Stop teaching, start learning- the mystery of capacity development*
“Promotion of capacity development” refers to what outside partners – domestic or foreign – can do to support, facilitate or catalyse capacity development and related change processes. (Ibid p.12)

This emphasises the essentially endogenous character of capacity and capacity development. The role of donors, partners and ‘capacity development’ organisation is not to “do” capacity development but to promote it.

This sense of ownership and ‘location’ and meaning of capacity development also appear very clearly when looking at literature from the NGO side of the development sector. In these publications there is a more explicit critique of the development paradigm, and what capacity development means if it is so closely intertwined with the mainstream development paradigms.

A recent Intrac publication states: ‘The concept of capacity building remains resolutely impervious to tight definition. This elasticity allows donors to fund otherwise difficult projects. But maintaining such a loose definition gives rise to competing agendas and divergent interpretations of success. Over the last fifteen years, we have learned a lot about the ‘how’ of capacity building. A consensus on good practice is even beginning to emerge. We also see some evidence of change. But it is not as tangible and measurable as we would like. Capacity building is certainly not as achievable as we would like. It remains elusive. To our cost, we have failed to set and evaluate realistic goals of capacity building. We have failed to understand and address the constraints in the changing context. Most fundamentally, we have failed to appreciate that because capacity building is an endogenous process it cannot be driven from outside, no matter how much effort and funds we expend.’

Official agencies (UNDP 2006, DAC 2006), academic writers (Morgan 2006, Fowler 2006) international NGOs (Lipson and Warren 2006) and local practitioners (James and Wrigley 2006) all agree that capacity building:

- Is a complex, human process that involves changes in relationship between elements of open-systems.
- Involves shifts in power and identity – capacity involves ‘people acting together to take control over their own lives’
- An endogenous process (‘formed from within’) that involves the main actor taking responsibility for the process of change. Indeed the concept of local ownership has become the cornerstone of development thinking.

In some of the literature (Morgan, Engel ECDPM) a distinction is made in the terms used for “capacity” at different levels:  
- Competencies refer to the individual skills and abilities
- Capabilities refer to a broad range of collective skills of organisations or systems which can be both hard (policy analysis, technical analysis, financial resource mgmt

---

9 Julia Zinke ECDPM Study on Capacity, Change and Performance, final workshop, Workshop report, Maastricht 15-17 May p. 5
10 Paul Engel, Tony Land, Niels Keijzer A balanced approach to monitoring and evaluating capacity and performance A proposed framework (draft) March 2007 ECDPM
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etc) and soft (the ability to earn legitimacy, to adapt, create meaning and identity). Capabilities can be understood as the building blocks of an organisation’s overall capacity to perform.

- **Capacity** refers to the overall ability of a system to perform and sustain itself; the coherent combination of competencies and capabilities.

As to the role and purpose of capacity building there is an underlying agreement that capacity building is about change – making things better, adding value, developing new assets or talents. It is about how best to develop new capabilities (i.e. institutional assets or collective skills) and new competencies (i.e. individual skills and energy or new personal behaviours). These can take place at many different levels (micro, meso and macro) with different elements or target groups. Capacity is in essence about the ability to do something.

From ECDPM’s study on Capacity, Change and Performance which involved public sector as well as Civil Society organisations experiences with capacity development, five core capabilities have been distilled:

- The capability to act
- The capability to generate development results
- The capability to relate
- The capability to adapt and self-renew
- The capability to achieve coherence.

Capacity development implies strengthening these capabilities in an interconnected and holistic manner.

But what does this mean or imply for how we see, design, develop, renew or maintain capacity development programmes. We need to ask ourselves many questions such as:

- Do we focus on the individual, the organisational the institutional and/or the societal level or all?
- Do we involve ourselves at the micro, the meso or the macro/policy/sectoral level?
- Are our partners and clients Civil Society Organisations, educational, academic and other knowledge centres, Governmental Organisations, Private Sector Organisations?
- Or do we engage at all these levels and with all these actors?
- What is the specificity of our approach?
- Is our MSP approach aiming at societal learning comparable to or part of capacity development?
- Is our organisational and institutional development work related to strengthening capabilities?
- Are our courses and tailor-made training in which individuals participate directed at promoting competencies or also capabilities?
- How can we respect the essentially endogenous character of capacity development, and therefore how can we develop our approach in such a manner.

---

11 Julia Zinke *ECDPM Study on Capacity, Change and Performance*, final workshop, Workshop report, Maastricht 15-17 May p. 5
12 Paul Engel personal communication during PSO Capacity Development Learning Trajectory, 16-5-2007
13 At Wageningen International but also in other organisations working on capacity development.
that we promote endogenous capacity development, recognise the existing capacities and start from there?

It becomes obvious that there are many linkages between this new and encompassing understanding of capacity development and ongoing thinking about institutions, institutional development and institutional change. Some say that with the onset of the enlarged understanding of capacity development, institutional development is comprised within.

Others maintain that in order to be able to use the forces of institutions for change processes and in order to know when and how to change institutions intentionally or to create new ones there is a need for further understanding of:

- how institutions influence development processes,
- how institutions affect policy development and implementation and
- how institutions are intrinsically linked to the social organisation of society, organisations and individuals,
- whether it is possible to intentionally create, change, influence institutions for development

3. Institutions and institutional change

Institutions have been recognized as important factors and social organizing principles underlying all societal, organizational and even individual change process. At the same time there is such a plethora of definitions and understandings of institutions and the role these play that taking institutions as a point of departure in developmental approaches has not yet led to a coherent approach. Institutional factors are quite often overlooked, restricted to the organizational level, or to the formal institutions like laws, regulations etc. Often institutions are also misunderstood as institutes. In a recent paper Parto\textsuperscript{14} identifies the definitions and descriptions that over time have been developed for institutions:

**What are Institutions?**

1. *Habits* of a group or the *customs* of a people (Hamilton 1932)
2. *Conventions, rules of action*, embedded in social structure, *locally specific* (Krätke 1999)
3. Settled *habits of thought common* to the generality of men (Veblen 1919)
4. *Collective action* exercised by different types of organization (*family, corporation, trade union, state* in control of individual action (Commons 1924)
5. Convenient term for the more important among the widely prevalent, highly *standardized social habits* (Mitchell 1950)
6. *Sets of rules of the game* or *codes of conduct* defining *social practices* (Young 1994)
7. *Formal organizations, patterns of behaviour*, negative *norms* and constraints (Coriat and Dosi 1998)
8. *Mental constructs* (Neale 1987)

\textsuperscript{14} Saeed Parto \textit{«Good » Governance and Policy Analysis : What of Institutions ?} 2005-001
MERIT-Infonomics Research Memorandum series
10. **How the game is played** (Nelson and Sampat 2001)  
11. A set of socially **prescribed** patterns of correlated **behaviour** (Bush 1986)  
12. **Prescribed or proscribed** patterns of correlated **behaviour** (Tool 1993)  
13. **Constitutional rule systems** for society, **collective choice rules** governing different kinds of organization, **operational rules** of organizations (Ostrom 1999)  
14. **Norms** that regulate relations among individuals (Parsons 1990)  

Source: Parto (2005)

As becomes obvious from this overview of definitions of institutions these range from the formal regulatory frameworks of the state to the informal socially prescribed or proscribed patterns of behaviour. They range from the level of states to the individual and all social actors and processes in between.

The most common definition for institutions is from Douglass North\(^\text{15}\) who defined them as “formal and informal rules that shape human interaction”. North emphasises that a crucial distinction must be made between institutions and organisations. Although like institutions, organisations provide a structure to human interaction, conceptually rules (institutions) must be differentiated from the players (organisations).

**Why are these institutions so important when we consider development processes?**

Institutions are patterns, which anchor behaviour over time, through norms, rules, regulations of a formal or less formal nature. Development is essentially a process of change of these patterns, of setting new, transformed rules, expectations, standards for behaviour, of cooperation and interaction between individuals, in organisations, between organisations and between different social actors. That this implies a change in the embedded power relations is obvious. Institutions are regulated power relations. Changing institutions means changing power relations and changing power relations (i.e. gender equality)\(^\text{16}\) means changing the social institutions that govern these power relations. \(^*\)

Jim Woodhill\(^\text{17}\) posits in a forthcoming publication: “Many institutions, particularly the more informal ones, are so much part of our life and so embedded in what we regularly do that we often take them for granted and don’t even see that they exist. However, social, economic and political change is essentially about institutional change. If we want to create a change, such as including small-scale producers in modern markets, it is essential to look more closely at institutions. By their very nature of creating stability in society, institutions can be difficult to change. Much of the failure in development can be accounted for by a poor understanding of institutions and how to change them.”

\(^\text{16}\) Johannes Jutting and Christian Morrisson *Changing Social Institutions to improve the status of women in developing countries*. OECD Development Centre Policy Brief No. 27 2005  
\(^\text{17}\) Jim Woodhill Regoverning Markets, Chapter 3 *Understanding Institutions and their Influence on Markets* in ***** forthcoming
Developing an institutional perspective in development policy, research, and capacity development demands a deep understanding of the diverse social, economic and political institutions which influence the subject of the development agenda. This can apply to developing market chains for agricultural production\(^{18}\), to building capacities of organisations and academic institutions\(^{19}\), to the evaluation of sustainable development programmes and many more concrete cases.

If we don’t understand the institutional frameworks at play in development processes we will not be able to propose policies, interventions or solutions that will lead to the required changes. We need an understanding of and effectively address institutional constraints or make use of opportunities offered by the institutional arrangements.

The following (Woodhill forthcoming) gives us an institutional analysis framework which incorporates attention for four main functions of institutions namely:

1. Institutions as ways of making **meaning** of our lives and the social and natural world we inhabit.
2. Institutions as the **associations** we make to work together to achieve social, economic and political objectives.
3. Institutions as the basis for **control** over what individuals and organisations should or can do.
4. Institutions as reoccurring **action** carried out by individuals or organisations in social, economic and political life.

---


\(^{19}\) Jaap Voeten and Saeed Parto *How do institutions matter in Institutional Capacity Development, Observations of three Nuffic NPT cases.*
Parto (2005-001, p.10) mentions: In research, careful categorization of institutions ...enables us to investigate the same problem or research question in different contexts, expect different findings due to context specific institutional landscapes, and identify the most relevant factors or variables in a given context. In policy making and implementation, an in-depth appreciation of the collective role of context-specific institutions is likely to minimize the possibility of setting unrealistic policy objectives and generate better understanding of why in some contexts some policies succeed more than others in meeting their objectives.

In agricultural development and the markets for agricultural products institutions play a role in the so-called transaction costs. “Efficient institutions reduce these costs of exchange and production. Transaction costs consist essentially of all the resources, in particular the time of individuals, to search for, negotiate, conclude and enforce an agreement to exchange goods or services. High transaction costs (essentially for obtaining information) and risks lead to coordination problems and market failure, which further increases risks and the costs of exchange.” (Meijerink and Eaton p.9).

However Institutions also play a role in other agriculture and rural development related processes. Institutions determine who is to be considered a producer, who is considered to be a farmer, who can join producer’s organisations, what type of production an individual can engage in. Gender as institution plays an important role in these processes.

Gender relations can be understood as institutions. We can understand men and women not as isolated categories but as social relationships by which men and women are mutually constituted as unequal social categories. Gender relations are, like all social relations, constituted through the rules, norms and practices by which resources are allocated, tasks are assigned, value is given and power is mobilised. Gender relations are products of institutions that are organised and reconstituted over time.20 This can be seen as either as gendered norms, rules and regulations that formally or informally shape women’s and men’s lives or as the gendered governance structures (organisations, social interaction patterns etc) that embed the norms and regulations in regulated patterns of social interaction. Inequality that is embedded in institutions is not only valid for gender relations but can also apply to ethnicity, rural—urban relations, and many other relations in which inequality is embedded. In may cases institutions do not operate for the benefit of all, but embed inequalities of access and control.

Jütting and Morrisey state: “A landmark World Bank study on gender equality (2001)21 also puts priority on the need to reform institutions to establish equal rights and opportunities for women and men. Within the overall institutional setting, social institutions and cultural practices — i.e. laws, norms, traditions and codes of conduct — often are the main sources of persisting discrimination against women in developing

---

20 Naila Kabeer From Feminist Insights to an Analytical Framework An Institutional Perspective on Gender Inequality in Naila Kabeer Ramya Surahmanian Institutions, Relations and Outcomes Kali for Women, 1999

countries\textsuperscript{22}. Examples include polygamy, unequal inheritance rights, obstacles to free movement and early, family-imposed marriages of teenagers.”

The notion that institutions are organised and reconstituted over time that is presented by Kabeer also gives rise to the idea that it might be possible to reconstitute institutions intentionally. This can be for different reasons but in a framework that is linked to development this would be for reasons of promoting equality and sustainability of development processes. The analytical Framework proposed by Woodhill is one of the tools that might help development actors and theorists in understanding the institutional field that is at play in a particular development process. From such an analysis directions for intentional institutional change related to one or more of the 4 aspects of institutional functioning can be derived.

4. Theories of Change (ToC)

When thinking about intentional change of institutions we enter into the planning paradigms and the instruments that are being used by development organisations and donors in planning or change and the management of change. In many organisations the so-called logical framework approach is the preferred or the required approach used. Many criticisms have been voiced by many actors. Criticism that concerns mainly the linear, top-down, quantitative, expert –led nature of planning processes in which the logical framework approach is used.

Doug Reeler\textsuperscript{23} identified the theory of Social Change underlying the Logical Framework Approach:

“…..this theory unconsciously assumes that:

- Project interventions themselves introduce the change stimulus and processes that matter and are the vehicles that can actually deliver development. (Existing, indigenous social change processes, usually invisible to conventional analysis, are seldom acknowledged and are effectively reduced to irrelevancy – except where resultant active or passive resistance to change cannot be ignored);
- problems (as needs to be addressed) are discernable or visible to the practitioner upfront out of cause and effect analysis. Solutions to the core problems analysed can be posed as predetermined outcomes. (The use of logical problem trees is common, despite that fact that they are incapable of dealing with feedback loops and other complex systemic problems);
- participatory processes in the planning phase can get all stakeholders onboard, paving the way for ownership and sustainability. (This would be nice but people are seldom so compliant!);
- unpredictable factors, whether coming from outside or from within the Project, or even as the knock-on effects of the Project work itself are, at worst, inconveniences to be dealt with along the way;
- desired outcomes, impacts or results, sometimes envisioned several years up the

\textsuperscript{22} This is not only valid for developing countries but just as well for developed countries.

\textsuperscript{23} Doug Reeler, \textit{A Theory of Social Change and Implications for Practice, Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation}, CDRA, 2006
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line, can be coded into detailed action plans and budgets and pursued in a logical and linear way. In other words, if the planning is good enough the Project should succeed.”

This type of planning approach does not fit very well with the new ideas presented above on capacity development and institutional change. Both these processes are not linear but involve an often messy and incremental, step by step, sometimes going backwards change. An alternative way of planning seems to be offered by Theory of Change approaches. A ‘Theory of Change’ approach seems to offer opportunities for planning of capacity development and institutional change processes.

**What is a Theory of Change?**

“A Theory of change” is a coherent set of ideas that describe: what the change should be, how a change process occurs, what makes it happen, what has to happen for the intended result/outcome to be reached, who needs to be involved, whose interests are at stake, and what the result/outcome of a change process should be.

A theory of Change approach is different from a much used logic model like a Logical Framework Approach in that it seeks to describe at each and every level of the theory chain why one outcome leads to the other and why one activity will lead to an intended outcome/result.

In a theory of change approach the assumptions underlying the internal logic or causal links chain need to be examined and tested.

Theories of Change as (an) approach(es) in planning and evaluation of change has come about particularly in change processes that are multi-layered, non-linear, multi-stakeholder and which require deep and system level change.

In the literature approaches to Theories of Change seem to be informed by different perspectives. Some examples are:

- A perspective where theories of change were used in the design of Complex Community Initiatives, concerned firstly with involving those stakeholders that were going to be involved in the implementation of change processes in the process of design of systems level changes and only secondly in evaluation.
- In Britain ToC seems to have been used initially as an approach used in the evaluation of complex national level policy planning and evaluation processes.  
- Another approach is a more political science inspired approach which links the use of ToC clearly to a social change agenda, whereby social change takes place at individual, group, organisational and social change and are studied through theories on societal change, group change, organisational change, social movements, and individual change. Depending on the approaches (structuralist, modernist, post modern, interpretive) taken in these studies different theories of change are proposed.)
- At the level of community change processes theories of change are defined as the roadmaps of change. These maps would describe the destination of change,

---

24 Paul Mason and Marion Barnes Constructing Theories of Change: Methods and Sources, Evaluation 2007; 13; 151 [Http://evi.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/13/2/151 p. 152, 154

the context for the map, the processes to engage in during the journey and the belief system which underlies the importance of travelling in a particular way.26

Some other approaches that have not been “labelled as Theories of Change” approaches but which offer ways of going about change processes that are very useful in the multi-layered and messy change processes that we are talking about are:

- Appreciative Inquiry27 is one of theories which have been developed to inquire into organisational change processes from a paradigm that recognises that we construct the world around us together and that the world is not a fixed state. It is a theory that starts from the validation and recognition of the positive in the experiences that organisations, people and also institutions have lived through.
- A New Weave of Power, People and Politics an action guide for Advocacy and Citizen Participation28 discusses in a very practical manner how we can deal with the issues and processes related to changes in power relations, strengthening inclusive democracy, equality and participation of all stakeholders. Issues that are crucial when we discuss capacity development and institutional change.

Changes that require different ways of “doing and being” cannot come about by using approaches that are top-down, centralised, non-participatory and non-empowering and above all not endogenous-driven.

The main differences between different theory of change approaches seems to be the involvement of researchers, implementers, stakeholders in the change process and in particular at which stage and with which purpose.

There are approaches in which researchers through a thorough study come up with a “best” theory of change in for example the education sector and then seek to involve as many stakeholders as possible to adopt and implement the theory of change as a road map of change and also using it later on in evaluation. Here the emphasis is heavily on the “theory” aspect.

In other situations developing the ToC which will serve as a roadmap in the change process is right from the start a participatory process in which communities, policy makers, researchers, and support agencies are jointly involved in constructing the ToC thereby creating a large sense of ownership, a common belief system and a foundation for the actions required in the often complex social change processes.

The roadmap approach of the Annie Casey Foundation, a USA based foundation for childs rights and welfare is such an approach. They have identified three main areas at which change can be effected that are relevant for their line of work:

The impact level: sizeable, lasting and positive change in the lives of vulnerable children and families. However to achieve this desired result, many other on the way changes must occur along the way. These can be changes at the individual, adult family

---

26 Theory of Change: A Practical Tool For Action, Results and Learning Organisational Research Services for Annie E. Casey Foundation 2004 www.aecf.org p. 1
28 A New Weave of Power, People and Politics an action guide for Advocacy and Citizen Participation Lisa VeneKlasen, Valerie Miller, Just Associates, 2005
and community levels like gains in knowledge, skills, behaviours, attitude, meaning and understanding

**The influence level:** changes in institutions, service systems, community norms, partnerships, public will, policies, regulations, service practices and issue visibility.

**The leverage level:** changes in public or private funders’ investment strategies for community programmes.

Theories of Change would outline the outcomes in an outcome map and the assumptions about change. As ToC are used in complex and often multi-layered change processes it is important to link changes at different levels and in different outcome areas to one another. For this a “So That” chain is proposed. “So That” Chains can clarify that results and outcomes are also often needed in the impact, influence and leverage levels.

It is recognised that for a ToC to become effectively implemented core capacities are needed. These include:

- a collective vision and results framework,
- a governance structure,
- groups processes such as governance, decision-making, problem-solving and conflict resolution,
- resident leadership and authentic civic demand,
- strategic use of data,
- effective partnerships among residents, institutions and others,
- support for collaborative learning and accountability to results,
- communication plan and structure (AC pg 10).

When we compare the capacities outlined here and the capabilities presented in the first part of this paper on Capacity development a clear resemblance can be recognised.

5. Conclusion

This is a preparatory paper for the seminar “Scrutinizing Success and Failure in Development”. Based on the discussions and learning during the seminar we intend to further elaborate the linkages and inter-sections between the concepts.