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1. **What is ‘capacity-development’ for governance’?**

‘Capacity’ is the combination of people, institutions, resources, and organisational abilities, powers and practices that enable a group to reach their own goals over time.

With such a complex starting point it is little wonder commentators have noted that:

> Capacity building is a risky, murky business with unpredictable and unquantifiable outcomes, uncertain methodologies, contested objectives, many unintended consequences, little credit to its champions and time lags (Morgan 1998: ).

To add to the murkiness, the international development literature these days seems to prefer the term ‘capacity development’ over that of ‘capacity building’, arguing that capacity development focuses on the question of sustainability, and recognises the long-term timeframes involved, that change is evolutionary and incremental, that holistic strategies are needed that draw upon the wider environment.

Capacity development is:

… the process by which individuals, groups, organisations, institutions, societies and countries develop their abilities, individually and collectively, to perform functions, solve problems, set and achieve objectives, and understand and deal with their development needs in a broader context and in a sustainable manner (UNDP 1997).

Central to this vision is developing effective governing arrangements.

The UNDP goes on to note that:

> The capacity for governance is seen to be at the heart of sustainable human development and a prerequisite for effective responses to poverty, livelihood, environmental and gender concerns. This brings a new view of capacity development … It acknowledges that sustainable human development implies societal development and that this implies a deepening of the organizational structures of society, both state and civic, changing the process by which their elements relate and interact. This is the task of capacity development (1996: 2).

Good governance is thus integral to community capacity building and community development. The two are co-existent.

Sterritt (2002), using the analogy between sporting and Indigenous governance, makes the point that, ‘Who would dream of entering a sporting field without being offered the opportunity to learn and develop the skills and tools to play the game? Yet, we do so routinely in the game of governance’.

So what is capacity development for governance?

Governance is about the way a group of people organise to collectively represent themselves, negotiate their rights and interests, and make decisions about: who they are as a group; how they manage their affairs; who has authority within their group; what their agreed rules are to ensure authority is exercised properly; who should enforce their decisions; how their decision-makers will be held accountable; and what institutions and organisations will be the most effective in accomplishing their ends.

Capacity development for governance is the process by which individuals, and group as a whole, develop their capacities to do the collective job of governing.
From this perspective, the capacities of individuals need to be linked to their roles in that collective task, so that they can contribute to the processes which result in consensus, planning, action, and implementation.

In other words, capacity development for governance is more than just a matter of personal development. It draws our attention to processes of instilling new attitudes, values, techniques, principles, as well as reaffirming valued existing techniques, principles and attitudes.

Capacity development is therefore about change. When effective capacity development happens it is transformative - there are striking examples in the ICG Project research where leaders and governing boards have actively created and are reproducing a ‘culture’ of capacity development to support their governing arrangements.

But underlying these processes are several important questions—questions that have been a focus of our project research (to different degrees in different case studies). For example:

1. What abilities are seen to be important for Indigenous governance?
2. What are the current capacity strengths and gaps in community governing bodies?
3. Whose capacity is to be developed; and for what purpose?
4. By whom and how?
5. And perhaps most importantly: from whose perspective will these questions be answered?

In every society there are cultural determinants of what constitutes leadership, representation, participation, legitimacy, accountability and so on. Governments often have different standards and priorities (e.g. financial, corporate, technical, administrative etc.) to those of civil society. Differences in views and values about governance are especially pronounced across cultures.

So capacity development for governance raises issues of relative power, and of cultural legitimacy.

This paper looks at these questions and provides a short overview of preliminary findings arising from across all case studies being undertaken by the ICG Research Project; not just WA case-studies.

The paper concludes by discussing some early issues and implications raised by the findings.

2. What capacities? And for what purpose?

Developing capacity is not an end in itself; one must ask the question “Capacity for what”? Why is capacity development for governance important?

The answer appearing from the research is that capable organisations are clearly associated with good governance and outcomes. In other words, capacity development matters.

From the research, it appears that capable governance comes about when Indigenous people have a genuine decision-making role and interest over things that matter to them - when they have something of substance to manage and make decisions about.
Good governance appears to be correlated to improved economic development outcomes, to effective service delivery, to improved social outcomes. Conversely, low capacity organisations are experiencing difficulty in getting outcomes, and preoccupied with disputes over leadership, representation and membership.

So are there capacities that seem to be critical for facilitating capable, good governance? And who determines what these are?

In the research, low governance capacity within organisations is characterised by:

- a high turnover of CEOs, managers, and elected representatives;
- ineffective representation;
- lack of legitimacy, power and authority;
- debilitating political intervention in day-to-day management;
- lack of transparency of decisions;
- irregular meetings and failure to get a quorum;
- unresolved conflicts of interest;
- lack of guiding policies and procedures;
- poor planning;
- tense staffing environment and poor working conditions;
- inadequate systems, record keeping and information sharing;
- poor service delivery;
- contested community engagement and support;
- poor communication with constituents;
- lack of financial and program accountability; and
- erratic economic development outcomes.

But what are the factors underlying these weaknesses in capacity? Are they internal or external; institutional or individual; structural or systemic; cultural or political?

It is easy enough to identify a long list of capabilities needed for legitimate, effective governance in Australia. These have been discussed in detail by Dodson and Smith, Finlayson, and Dodson et al (forthcoming). And the Project research is already highlighting a number of capacities which organisations are self-identifying as needing to be strengthened.

Some organisations are attempting to develop their own in-house capacity for assessing capacities, and for follow-up training and governance development; using external expertise when an objective eye or fresh insight is needed. The recurrent focus of their in-house training and other forms of capacity development seems to be on:

- Leadership, representation and succession
- Roles and responsibilities of elected members, management and staff
- Cross-cultural values and behaviour
- Resource governance and negotiation skills
- Dispute resolution and mediation
- Organisational structures and systems

A recurring concern within community organisations is how these issues and ideas can be expressed in a legitimate institutional and structural form.

Importantly, the focus of in-house training is on actual work, not on theoretical governance standards, or external perceptions of what is needed. There is flexibility in style and delivery
in order to respond to changing local conditions, internal crises, mobility, external pressures and so on.

Those organisations that have some form of in-house ability to monitor and assess their own individual and collective capacities seem to be faring better in riding out the ‘three Cs’—change, crises, and conflict—and appear to be more effective in doing their jobs as a consequence.

Organisations which do not have internal capacity assessment and review processes seem to be doing less well in handling change, crises and conflict.

A number of organisations are relying heavily on the capacity and experience of key individuals—leaders and senior managers. Their role is often extremely effective in creating a positive culture of capacity-development for governance.

But in some case study instances, when this reliance on a key individual is not institutionally embedded and supported by other kinds of capacity, organisations are finding themselves vulnerable to the turnover of key people, and to their honesty, integrity and personal agenda.

The research is suggesting that the sustainability of outcomes that are secured primarily by the ‘force of will’ of a powerful person can be highly questionable. Enabling leadership can descend into self-serving behaviour when there is low capacity on the part of members to call leaders to account, and when there are weak institutions to support members doing that.

However, looking at a long list of either gaps or strengths doesn’t actually help much by itself. It is important to clearly identify which ones have priority—to give clear local purpose to capacity development.

Again, the research is highlighting the role senior people in organisations (Indigenous and non-Indigenous) play in identifying what the priority areas for capacity development are. The evidence is that governance capacity in many Indigenous organisations currently relies not only on Indigenous leaders and board members, but on non-Indigenous senior managers and CEOs. This suggests a need for the combined development of strategic capacities for both Indigenous and non-Indigenous ‘leaders’ in organisations. The kind of capacities that need to be developed appear to be different in both cases.

The research also reports very complicated arrangements in the mix of Indigenous/non-Indigenous staffing, leadership, management, and skill sets within every organisation. This mix differs from place to place to suit local social, economic, political and cultural geographies and operating environments.

It will be important to look at the local dimensions of capacity development, and the local factors underlying its effectiveness in order to generate sustained governance outcomes.

3. **Capacity for whom?**

In answer to the question—‘Capacity for whom?’—a seemingly simple research finding is that inadequate capacity is a problem found amongst all players in the governance environment.

It’s a problem found amongst leaders, managers and staff, and for some whole organisations. The consequences of this spreads out into communities (and vice versa).
But low levels of capacity for governance are also being identified as a problem amongst key players in the surrounding environment. For example, inadequate capacity is a problem within governments, for departments and bureaucrats, the private sector, and for NGOs.

The research case studies are highlighting several different dimensions in which governance capacity-development operates, and which have different arena for action.

Preliminary analysis across the case studies indicates there are at least five dimensions of governance capacity-development (see Diagram 1):

3.1 **The Individual** (leaders, workers, managers, officers, bureaucrats)
This dimension focuses on the critical role of individual learning and capacity. Areas of personal development include: educational levels, financial literacy, health, on-the-job training, formal and informal skills, mentoring and coaching all of which effect an individual’s ability to participate in decision-making, and to understand and undertake their role and responsibilities.

The research is highlighting a central role (both positive and negative) not only of Indigenous leaders, but also of Indigenous and non-Indigenous managers. Their capacity to lead and to manage, therefore, is a fundamental factor in the governance capacity of organisations.

But the early research suggests that capacity development at the individual level is no guarantee of good governance, or even of developing capable people in an organisation.

Individuals need access to resources, information, technology, support, infrastructure to do their governing job.

3.2 **The Entity** (organisations, structures)
Indigenous ‘traditional’ systems of governance mean operating within institutions of family, clan, land-owning and ceremonial groups, within kinship and marriage systems, and age and gender peer-groups etc. Today Indigenous governance also means working within representative organisations.

To function effectively, organisations need institutions (rules of the game), structures, a clear mission, goals, functions, administrative, financial, information-management and corporate systems, human and other resources. And they need competent people working for them.

An important pathway for strengthening organisational and community governance is capacity development for individuals that focuses not only on their actual professional roles and responsibilities, but also on the adequacy of the organisation’s systems for supporting their work.

This ‘organisational pathway’ to capacity development tends to be a primary focus for most government program support.

But doing capacity development for governance at the level of an organisation, is no guarantee of sustained improved governance. Organisations and societies may have very different views about what constitute valued skills, capacities and knowledge.

Good governance requires an organisational ‘culture’ of shared values, norms and institutions, and these need to have legitimacy in the eyes of individuals if they are going to commit themselves to working towards common goals. In other words the
issue of ‘culture match’ applies as much to capacity development as it does to governance as a whole.

3.3 The ‘Governance Culture’—(about cultural dimensions, institutions, values, attitudes, behaviour, relationships)

Some case studies in the research Project are highlighting the important role of ‘institution building’ and ‘culture match’ as capacity-development mechanisms within organisations. This is evident where leaders, managers and staff within organisations are actively working out the values and rules that will constrain and guide their behaviour (individually and at an organisational level).

Importantly, some organisations are developing approaches to their own internal capacity-building that are supported by staff and elected members as being culturally valid and ‘proper’. In other words, not only the structures of organisations need to be seen to have internal cultural legitimacy, but the very processes of developing individual and organisational governance capacities also have to have cultural legitimacy.

The result of this internal ‘institution building’ is that some organisations are creating an internal ‘governance culture’ which emphasises Indigenous ways of consensus decision-making, leadership and representation (in particular), alongside emphasising a shared commitment to the organisation itself, and to work values of trust, loyalty, mutual support, internal accountability, and achieving outcomes. Effectively, people are trying to create and reproduce a culture match over time.

But organisations do not operate in isolation. They interact with others.

3.4 Inter-relationship between Entities—(about systems, networks, interactions)

Organisations and groups are part of systems and networks of other organisations and relationships that are necessary to their functional effectiveness. For example, an enterprise development organisation may be linked to particular family groups, it may own particular infrastructure and property handled through other organisations, it will be linked to certain public and private sector agencies through programs, grants and service delivery relationships, be connected to other businesses and financial institutions, and influenced by wider regional and national conditions etc.

Some Project researchers are working with organisations that are making strong governance-building efforts, but have a weak or erratic ability to relate to other organisations and players, even those with similar purposes. Issues of conflict, dispute, competition with other community or regional organisations and agencies can disable the effectiveness of a good organisation.

But building a capacity for agreement-making, partnership, joint venturing, negotiation and networking is not sufficient by itself either—especially for the issue of sustainability of governance reforms.

3.5 The Enabling Environment (about the wider context of policy, political, social, legal, economic and financial institutions and frameworks)

The research is clearly indicating that sustainable governance capacity for individuals, entities and systems requires a positive authorising or enabling environment.

Many of the factors that determine Indigenous governance sustainability relate to the cross-sectoral context including: the adequacy of policy and legal frameworks, the effectiveness of mainstream education and training programs; the extent of service-delivery coordination, government program guidelines and reporting criteria; the extent
of public-sector capacity, political and bureaucratic will, the extent of devolved power and authority, funding allocations and mechanisms, levels of accountability, property rights and so on.

This wider environment can both enable and disable Indigenous capacity for legitimate, effective governance.

The research is certainly highlighting that the rapidly changing national policy and funding environment at the moment is a cause of great uncertainty in Indigenous communities and their organisations and that, in some instances, it is having a negative impact on organisational capacity for good governance.

Not surprisingly there seems to be a strong correlation between having capable leaders, managers and staff, and getting good governance and successful outcomes. But there are complex linkages across these five dimensions of capacity development. For example, an organisation can have a good manager and staff, but weak leaders and institutions, and not get good governance; it can have incompetent managers, but a good leader and staff, and it will still be hard to get good governance in an organisation. In these situations when the good leader goes, or when the good manager goes, the organisation falls down. The capacity for good governance has to be embedded beyond the individual leadership and management. You can have also have a great organisation, effective leadership and management, with strong institutions and competent staff, but a disenabling wider environment. As a result, some organisations are not as effective as they might otherwise be.

In other words, the research strongly suggests that we need strength across the linkages, as well as within each dimension, in order for good governance and outcomes to be sustained.

### 4. Capacity development—By whom and how?

It is a mistake to equate training, and especially one-off training exercises, with capacity development, although training is an important mechanism. Formal educational courses at all levels, ‘learning by doing’, team learning, job shadowing, volunteering, mentoring, coaching, supervision, community development projects, community and group meetings, review and evaluation processes, are all mechanisms for the development of individual, organisational and community capabilities.

It follows that there are a large number of possible deliverers and styles of developing governance capacity - from formal to informal, internal and external deliverers, individual delivers and team delivery.

The project research is identifying some major gaps and deficiencies in governance capacity-building programs and training providers including:

- a lack of suitably qualified and experienced deliverers;
- poor quality delivery;
- lack of governance capacity resources, tools and materials;
- lack of local relevance and meaning in the content;
- inflexible program criteria and course structures;
- failure to understand participants’ learning culture and styles;
- lack of community-based training and development;
- one-off courses and input;
- failure to provide follow-up support and mentoring;
- poor coordination and dispersed funding at the government level
• lack of enabling policy frameworks.

Approaches that are mainly technocratic, that focus on corporate and external financial accountability tend to abound, but these are coming up short in actually getting sustained improvement in capacity for good governance.

Why is this the case? The research findings suggest difficulties lie partly in the complex dynamics involved in Indigenous communities and organisations (e.g.; involving complex cultural, political, physical, social and economic factors). But equally involved is the impact on communities and organisations of the lack of cohesive policy frameworks for Indigenous governance development, and the lack of integrated government funding and program approaches.

At issue here is often the reluctance of governments to acknowledge that at least half of the ‘Indigenous governance problem’ lies within government itself, and that strengthening Indigenous governance capacity includes the issue of governments’ preparedness to address issues of Indigenous local power and authority.

5. Emerging lessons?

Many of these insights and research conclusions are not new. But given that the Project is undertaking case-study research across all the dimensions discussed above, it is possible to draw out some lessons and guiding principles which, if considered as a whole, may go some way towards generating sustained strengthening of Indigenous governance.

5.1 Where to start?

A question which always seems to create uncertainty of effort is: “Where to start?” At the level of individuals? With organisations and institutional strengthening? With community-wide development approaches? Or big-impact political and policy change?

The Project research suggest that there are area for focused attention, but that there will have to be initiatives across all the five dimensions of capacity development listed above.

Importantly, initiatives will need to be undertaken in a manner that emphasises a coordinated, integrated, holistic approach. So who should take responsibility for what?

5.2 Individuals:

Capacity starts with individual people.

It is a truism that you cannot develop someone else’s capacities. It cannot be conferred; the person, group or organisation whose capacity is to be developed has to want to make that change. This means that individuals and organisations need to be centrally involved in developing their own capacity. This raises issues of personal motivation, values and behavioural change – very tricky areas when it involves cross-cultural governance and differences in relative power.

A fundamental guiding principle in all capacity development processes is that, above all else, people have to individually and collectively undertake the reorganisation (change) of their own behaviours, institutions and systems (both in the design and delivery of processes to develop associated capacities to do that).

In other words, Indigenous people have to ‘own’ and direct the process of developing their capacity for organisational and other forms of governance.
5.3 **Leaders and managers:**

There is a central role here for Indigenous leaders. Start with influential people.

To get sustained governance capacity at the level of organisations, knowledge and learning has to be internalised and institutionalised—it has to be embedded deep within the ‘governance culture’ of an organisation.

The research is showing that Indigenous leaders and non-Indigenous managers, together, can have a remarkable impact on creating and reproducing an internal ‘culture of learning and development’ within their organisations. It is the culture of developing governance capacity that helps organisations survive the turnover of people and crises.

5.4 **Organisations:**

Who else has a role and responsibility? Organisations, as a whole, have a life beyond the individual. They operate in a wider environment where they negotiate relationships with a range of other community and regional organisations, stakeholders, state and national agencies.

Organisations that are inward-turning can have many strengths; but one of them is not being able to handle externally created pressures and changes. They are also less able to recognise external opportunities, and negotiate their continued survival.

Groups or ‘families’ of organisations that form partnerships, alliances, federations and consortia appear better placed to share resources and capacities, and therefore weather storms.

Grounded in ownership, guided by leadership, and informed by cultural confidence, capacity-development for governance is not ‘power neutral’—it is concerned with the flow of funds, access to resources, the power to make decisions and control assets etc. These external factors have significant impacts on organisational capacity and governance.

5.5 **The enabling environment:**

At the level of the enabling environment, the preliminary research findings suggest a critical need for top-level political support and championing within government. It also suggests the critical need for bureaucratic leadership and collaboration.

Particularly, the research indicates the need for an integrated approach to funding, and a clear program focus, housed within a lead agency with a mandate and with a lead Minister.

Anything less puts government in the position of reproducing a disabling environment for Indigenous governance.

5.6 **Ask the hard questions:**

The conditions for both poor and good governance capacity are perpetuated from within and from without. Organisations, leaders, governments and bureaucrats will need to reflect on the following questions:

Q: What is the capacity of Indigenous leaders, managers, and community organisations to develop capacities for governance?

Q: What are the constraints, gaps, assets and strengths at the local level?

Q: What is the capacity of government policy-making to support Indigenous governance capacity-development?
Q: What is the capacity of bureaucrats, government program and funding processes to support Indigenous governance capacity-development initiatives?

Q: What is the capacity of current training/education/community-development providers to support Indigenous governance capacity-development?

5.7  **A developmental process:**
Building legitimate, capable governance is a developmental process; it takes time.

If it is developmental, and involves change (in people, institutions and organisations) then we need to think more flexibly about ways to support capacity development; ways that allow for a recognition that change is the key.

For change to be positively enabling, it needs to be situated within a developmental framework based on local control and participation, and access to and control over real resources.

The development of capacity will be ongoing and incremental. It will be a process of continuous learning that becomes embedded in an organisation’s ‘governance culture’.

This will require a long-term commitment to carry out community development for governance.

It will also require leadership and commitment at the most senior levels—from both Indigenous leaders and governments.

5.8  **Suggested priority areas for governance capacity-development:**
At heart, governance capacity development is about cultural match. But it is also much more than that. It is a process that should actively strengthen Indigenous decision-making, and control over their core institutions, goals and identity.

Developing and sustaining strong, legitimate Indigenous governance needs to be founded on both clear authority and practical capability. The first raises issues of jurisdictional devolution, resourcing, and the role of government. The second involves developing the human, institutional, and organisational capacities of Indigenous groups for genuine self-determination.

The international research indicates that strong Indigenous governance has four main attributes: cultural legitimacy, power, resources and accountability:

(a) **Legitimacy**—concerns the way structures and processes of governance are created, leaders chosen and decisions made, and the extent of constituents’ confidence in and support of them—culture match and institutional capacity are important here;

(b) **Power**—concerns the extent of acknowledged legal, jurisdictional, political and cultural authority and capacity to make and exercise laws, resolve disputes and carry on public administration—genuine decision-making power and practical capacity to exercise that power are important here;

(c) **Resources**—concerns the economic, cultural, human, technological and natural resources needed for the establishment and implementation of governance structures—capacity for resource governance and (social and economic) investment are important here; and

(d) **Accountability**—concerns the extent to which those in power must justify, substantiate and make known their actions and decisions—capacity for both ‘internal and ‘external’
accountability are important here.

Preliminary ICG Project research is suggesting that these same attributes need to be the subject of intensive facilitation and capacity-development in Australia.

To strengthen these attributes of good governance, capacity-development should focus on:

**Local ownership and control:**
- a recognition and devolution of genuine decision-making power and governance authority to Indigenous people;
- encouraging self-organisation and self-governance. That will be impossible to achieve if capacities are developed in a way that creates or reinforces dependence;
- being participatory—in the identification of capacity needs, design and delivery;
- supporting Indigenous initiatives to build their own governance institutions, values and processes;

**Leadership and succession:**
- Indigenous leadership and advocacy—it is critical to have Indigenous champions for governance development;
- enhanced program support for younger and emerging Indigenous leaders who are working in community and regional organisations;
- establishing mentoring and coaching networks, working directly with elected members, leaders, and senior managers;

**The wider enabling environment:**
- a multi-dimensional approach where Indigenous organisations are recognised as being connected to a wider operating environment;
- developing a ‘whole-of-community’ approach to Indigenous governance-development that operates as a partnership between government, the private sector and a community, creating a more holistic approach to governance development within communities;
- creating an integrated approach across government, including the identification of a lead-agency role to achieve better coordination of effort and funding across government;
- formulating targeted policy frameworks that ‘enable’ Indigenous governance and capacity development;
- Indigenous and non-Indigenous champions—it is critical to have experienced champions to ensure sustained development and program support for community governance-building efforts;

**A developmental framework:**
- reinforcing a community-development approach to governance which is ongoing and seeks incremental changes in capabilities;
- recognising the fact that people and organisations go through stages of learning and development—so that time and flexibility matter;
identifying both gaps and existing strengths in capacity, and build on established skills and knowledge systems;

setting realistic expectations and achievable goals that are relevant to people;

robust internal self-assessment, combined with external dialogue about what are priority areas for building capacity;

A place-based approach:
- using a ‘place-based’ learning methodology—where one gets to know the place, the organisation, the leaders and their goals, in order to provide capacity-development based on local needs, priorities and conditions;
- promoting Indigenous dialogue within communities and across regions about the best ways to carry out governance building;

Learning–by-doing:
- using action-learning strategies, giving attention to concrete systems of decision making. This emphasises the value of ‘learning by doing’, ‘learning on the job’, and learning that is relevant to actual organisational objectives and functions;
- including practical context-specific projects that have outcomes attached to them;

Delivery:
- providing equitable opportunity for both men and women, managers, staff and leaders, older and younger people, together and separately;
- flexibility of delivery to enable the development of capacity at times of crisis in organisations and communities, rather than resorting to compliance or auditing modes of external intervention;
- establishing ‘train the trainers’ programs in governance capacity-building, focusing on the community development workers, organisational managers and leaders who can work as local trainers and mentors;
- identifying and disseminating better practice and innovative approaches;
- production of high-quality, relevant training tools and materials for Indigenous governance, such as governance manuals, policy and planning tools, strategic analysis tools, videos;

Funding and resources:
- providing an identified pooled-funding line within government for Indigenous governance capacity-development;
- identifying governance capacity-development as a budgetary component in every relevant government program;
- creating financial incentives and recognition for undertaking development of good governance;

Review and monitoring:
- qualitative evaluation of delivery, outcomes and impacts;
Diagram 1. The dimensions of Indigenous governance capacity-development

**Focus for Strategic Action**

**Dimensions of Governance Capacity Development**

(Dis)Enabling Environment
- Political will, bureaucratic will, support policies, legal frameworks, property rights, financial frameworks, resource allocation, infrastructure, government capacity, NGO & private sector role and capacity

Inter-organisational
- Creating & reproducing relationships between organisations, partnerships, networks, negotiation and mediation skills, resource sharing, joint ventures, service agreement-making

Governance Culture
- Creating and reproducing shared values, behaviours, mission, goals, institutions, strategic direction for future, leadership, participation, representation, legitimacy, accountability

Organisations
- Creating structures, institutional capacity, systems design, human, asset & resource management, planning, leadership & representation, networking, procedures & processes, policies, accountability, legitimacy & culture match

Individual and teams
- Skills building, knowledge enhancement, mentoring, leadership, participation, motivation and attitude, roles and responsibilities, team building, relationships, incentives