



**DAC Network on Governance (GOVNET)  
and Learning Network on Capacity Development (LenCD)**

**Proposal for review and consultations and reviews  
on the draft Capacity Development Good Practice Paper:**

*“Living Up to the Capacity Development Challenge:  
Lessons and Good Practice”*

Room Document for session II, 26<sup>th</sup> January

**Capacity Development workshop, 26th January 2005  
OECD Headquarters, Paris (Room 5)**

## Background

1. Capacity development is central to the work of the GOVNET and has been strongly reaffirmed as a DAC priority on various occasions, given its links to many other activities in its work programme. The DAC specifically expressed its support to the development of a Good Practice Paper in Capacity Development on several occasions including at the 2004 Senior Level Meeting. The work currently under way in that area, under the leadership of the GOVNET LenCD1, has led to the development of a Good Practice Paper, which addresses capacity as a cross-cutting issue for development assistance. Specifically, the paper recommends that donors do not support capacity as a separate area of intervention but as a cross-cutting key driver of development effectiveness in any country and fully recognizing its political dimensions.

## Objectives and ultimate goal of the consultations and review process

2. The ultimate goal of this consultation and review process is threefold: (i) get early feedback on the extent to which the paper may improve the way we support capacity development; (ii) improve the current draft with feedback received from ultimate users and beneficiaries; (iii) steer debate among stakeholders at the field level and stimulate them to identify entry points for their own work.

Specifically, the consultations and reviews will aim at:

### *Field Level*

- Engaging domestic stakeholders/counterparts to identify issues and entry points in the particular context and obtain comments on relevance using the paper as a starting point
- Seeking comments from donor agency staff on the operationalisation of the concepts put forth in the paper and identification of entry points (review to be consolidated by each donor)
- Fostering dialogue on CD within existing donor and other stakeholders' networks
- Building a common understanding of the issues and options to address capacity development at the country level among development partners, donor/agency staff and counter parts

### *Headquarters/Policy level*

- Outreach to all agencies including bilateral, MDBs and UN system, including through existing networks and contacts
- Within the DAC, strengthen the positioning of capacity as a cross-cutting issue and a key driver of development effectiveness
- Building ownership on the paper itself and its proposed recommendations at the policy level

---

<sup>1</sup> The Learning Network on Capacity Development (LenCD) was established in June 2004 and came out of the desire to provide greater form and visibility to capacity development, both as part of the work of the GOVNET and beyond. LenCD's model largely follows the example of the Learning Network on Program-Based Approaches (LENPA) and is also integrated into the GOVNET, although it draws on a greater range of participants than the GOVNET.

- Identifying ways in which the paper's impact and outreach could be optimized and its recommendations mainstreamed in practice (e.g through specific events at which its recommendations could be validated and through policy development processes for reflecting the findings/recommendations)
- Providing guidance to donors that are in the process of or thinking of developing policies for CD

### **Stakeholders to consult and proposed approach**

3. We propose that OECD Delegations willing to partake in this process coordinate consultations and feedback received with staff and counterparts at the field and at Headquarters level.

A questionnaire (Annex 1) could serve as a basis to structure feedback received and stimulate dialogue. Existing mechanism of bilateral or multilateral engagement should be used, to avoid burdensome processes and duplication of existing dialogues.

- **Partner country counterparts:**
  - Videoconferencing facilities, to carry out consultations in a systematic and effective manner (several thematic roundtables could be organized for instance through the WBI supported Global Development Learning Network (GDLN))
  - Network discussion for instance through partner platforms such as the *Capacity Development Learning Network*., *capacity.org* and the *Capacity 2015* Information and Learning Networks
  - Multi-stakeholders' conferences on CD scheduled for 1<sup>st</sup> quarter 2005 (e.g the Paris HLF, Feb/March 2005; LENPA (April 05); preparatory meetings for MDG and PRSP reviews, African meetings on capacity, etc.)
- **Field level staff:**
  - Multi-stakeholder consultation in selected countries supported with small Seed Resources for instance through the UNDP Small Grants Innovation Facility.
  - Regular donor/stakeholders fora, such as CGs and Roundtables and other events that may be opportune
  - Selected pilot field offices or embassies that may want to engage in a more in depth probing
  - Established networks and communities of practice
- **Agency staff at Headquarters level:**
  - UNDP to disseminate/collect feedback from other UN agencies
  - The World Bank to disseminate/collect feedback from MDBs
  - OECD delegations to coordinate dialogue and collect feedback from capitals and selected field offices

## Next Steps: Good Practice Paper and the DAC

4. The draft Capacity Development Paper will be discussed at a GOVNET Capacity Development workshop (26<sup>th</sup> January), where participants will also be asked to reflect on the proposed consultation plan. At the 6<sup>th</sup> GOVNET meeting (27-28<sup>th</sup> January), Members are expected to engage in a discussion with the aim of endorsing the paper in principle, and reflect on the optimal way to hold consultations and reviews of the paper with various stakeholders, based on the present proposal. The consultation process will seek to improve the paper and enhance its feasibility and ultimately its impact on current practices.

1. Based on the proposed timeframe (see below), a final version of the paper will be submitted to **GOVNET in May 2005**, integrating comments received after the consultation process. After the GOVNET's endorsement in May, **the paper will be submitted in June 2005 to the DAC for review**. The DAC should advise on the best ways to optimize the impact of the paper and of its recommendations both at the policy and field level, and how it can contribute to the mainstreaming of capacity in development cooperation. Based on feedback received from the DAC, the paper will be further fine-tuned and submitted for endorsement to the **DAC Senior Level Meeting in December 2005**.

### Timeframe (2005)

- **February-mid April:** consultation and review process (proposed deadline:15 April)
- **March:** presentation of interim version at the OECD Paris HLF (CD roundtable)
- **May:** final version for endorsement by GOVNET (15 May)
- **June:** final version presented to the DAC for review
- **December:** final paper submitted for endorsement to the DAC Senior Level Meeting

**ANNEX 1: QUESTIONNAIRE ON THE DRAFT GOOD PRACTICE PAPER:**

1. Does this GPP offer a useful framework and guidance for ongoing discussions within the DAC about the importance and need to mainstream capacity development in development cooperation?
  
2. Does the paper help re-think about how to improve donor's involvement with regards to capacity in the context of achieving the MDGs, implementing successfully Poverty Reduction Strategy Programs or on how to engage with fragile states?
  
3. Is it sufficiently clear what kind of reforms for country operations and in agency head quarters are desirable?
  
4. Does the paper adequately emphasize the political economy dimensions that require other than technical responses?
  
5. Does the paper provide enough of a basis for effective policy dialogue and engagement for capacity development on country level?
  
6. What the main issues that require more/less attention in the draft?

---

Completed by:

Date:

