



# CDF 2023 Proceedings

14, 15 June 2023

**Enabling Environment for  
Capacity Development**



## **COPYRIGHT AND AUTHORSHIP**

Editors and contributors in alphabetical order

### **Editors**

Anuttama Dasgupta, Smitha N

### **Co-Editor**

Ishani Debroy

### **Contributors**

IIHS Urban Practitioners' Programme (UPP)

### **Design**

Anuttama Dasgupta, Kiran Amarnathan, IIHS Communications and Design

### **Suggested Citation**

Dasgupta, A., & Smitha N. (2023). *Capacity Development Forum 2023 Proceedings*.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.24943/CDF08.2023>

## **RIGHTS AND PERMISSIONS**

**License for Use:** This work is available under the following license: All the content created by the author(s) for the purpose of this work is copyrighted. You are free to share, to copy, distribute and transmit the work under the following conditions:

**Attribution:** You must attribute the work in the manner specified by the author or licensor (but not in any way that suggests that the author endorses you/ your use of the work).

**Non-commercial:** You shall not use this work for commercial purposes.

**Restrictions on use:** The content of this work shall not be modified, edited, or altered in any manner without prior written permission of IIHS.

**All queries on rights and licenses should be addressed to:** [library@ihs.ac.in](mailto:library@ihs.ac.in)



# Capacity Development Forum 2023

## Enabling Environment for Capacity Development

15 – 16 June 2023 | Hybrid format | IIHS Bengaluru City Campus and Online

<https://iihs.co.in/capacity-building/capacity-development-forum-2023/>

### *About the Capacity Development Forum*

Through the Capacity Development Forum (CDF), IIHS aims to bring together diverse stakeholders involved in capacity development into a 'community of practice' and enable collaborations between institutions and individuals working in the space. The long-term objective of the forum is to consolidate learnings from across the country and around the world and create an open access repository of knowledge on capacity development. The first edition of the Capacity Development Forum was held on 8–9 December 2021 and the second edition was held on 15–16 June 2023.

### *CDF 2023: Enabling environment for capacity development*

The theme of CDF 2023 was 'Enabling Environment for Capacity Development'. It had four panels and an international dialogue on day 1, followed by two round table discussions and a workshop on day 2. The panels were convened around various approaches and trends in reimagining mandates, structures and institutional arrangements shaping development initiatives. They brought together important stakeholders working at the intersection of various scales and sectors of capacity development to discuss how an enabling ecosystem and policy environment can address critical challenges of the government's capacity to deliver services to the public effectively. A summary of each of the panels and discussions can be found below.

### *Session notes*

#### DAY 1

##### Welcome address – Aromar Revi

Aromar Revi, Director, IIHS, welcomed the keynote speaker Dr. R Balasubramaniam, Member (HR), Capacity Building Commission. In his address, Aromar introduced IIHS' extensive capacity development work across diverse themes ranging from housing, urban transport, urban planning, and governance to livelihoods, climate change and disaster risk reduction. The capacity building function of IIHS not only delivers training programmes but also develops capacity building frameworks, enabling institutional capacities at various levels. IIHS has partnered with government agencies in developing individual and institutional capacity and trained all levels of government officials, ranging from IAS officials to level five officers of the Government of India.

The capacity development initiatives of IHS have always been aimed towards building state capacities in places where they are the weakest and focussed strongly on the third tier of government, especially in the urban, with the aim of enabling citizen engagement, improving public resource allocation, and addressing the 74<sup>th</sup> Constitutional Amendment of empowering city governments. The practice of capacity development in today's context needs to address two pertinent questions. First, with India being a large democracy, how can capacity be built at both the centre and the states within the current political economy? Secondly, how do we create a space within public and private institutions to enable sustainable urban transformation?

### Session 1: Keynote address - R Balasubramaniam

In his keynote address, Dr. R Balasubramaniam, Member (HR), Capacity Building Commission (CBC) set the context for the deliberations of CDF 2023 by laying out the capacity development framework of Mission Karmayogi, which is aimed at creating a future-ready civil service for India. Arguing that civil society can only supplement the state, not supplant it, Dr. Balasubramaniam cited the conduct of free and fair elections and the administration of COVID-19 vaccination drive in India as success stories of the Indian state's capacity to deliver. He pointed out that service delivery and trust in public institutions form a virtuous cycle and spoke about Mission Karmayogi's vision of people's participation improving service delivery and governance by necessitating and affecting a shift in the mindset of civil servants from 'Karmachari' to 'Karmayogi' i.e., from rule-based to role-based functioning.

Dr. Balasubramaniam pointed to the uncertainties in the future of work, the future of public administration, and the definition of what constitutes public goods. Pointing out that 70 per cent of learning happens on the job, 20 per cent in interactions with peers and 10 per cent in the classroom, he stressed the need for lifelong learning to cope with the emerging challenges created by the fast pace of change in technology and the operating environment. Public administration must be cognisant of the changes in work, the workplace and the worker and adapt to the blurring of sectoral boundaries. Drawing inspiration from the movie 'The Matrix' (Wachowski, L., & Wachowski, L. (1999). Warner Bros.), he said that building state capacity in India is like learning to fly a helicopter while flying it. To do this, learning ecosystems must be designed that create capability, promote motivation, and provide opportunities to deliver results. These learning ecosystems should also help in tying functions, roles, and competencies to service delivery and measurable outcomes. The building of ecosystem capacity must transition from a demand driven one to a supply driven one. Public administration must adapt to the changes in the external environment such as evolving aspirations of citizens and changes in the political economy. It should develop the necessary behavioural, functional, and domain competencies to respond to societal changes, be responsive and accountable to the public, and enable the government in its primary role of fulfilling the needs of its citizens.

At the end of his keynote address, Dr. Balasubramaniam along with Aromar Revi launched the Capacity Development Suite. The Capacity Development Suite is a set of live online courses that will enable learners to deepen their skill sets, broaden their understanding, and expand their professional networks in the field of capacity development. In its inaugural version, the suite will consist of two courses: 'CD Measures: Training Needs Analysis (TNA) and Impact Assessment' and 'CD Methods: Applied Adult Learning Theories and Case Development', to be held through December 2023 and January 2024. The suite is intended for capacity development practitioners and trainers, sectoral experts, programme managers, and researchers and scholars engaged in the development sector in funding, implementation, and management roles.

## Session 2: Panel 1 - Perspectives from national-level organisations/ministries: Policymaking for large-scale capacity development interventions

### Panellists:

- Anthony de Sa, IAS (Retd), Chairman, Madhya Pradesh Real Estate Regulatory Authority (RERA)
- Arun K Vijayan, IAS, CEO, Smart City Thiruvananthapuram & Commissioner of Entrance Examinations, Govt. of Kerala
- Pradeep Singh, IFS, Director, Department of Drinking Water and Sanitation (DDWS), Ministry of Jal Shakti

### Moderator:

- Dr. Subha Muthukumar, Lead, Urban Practitioners' Programme, IIHS

Panel 1 was aimed at drawing out capacity development insights from national level organisations based on their experience in implementing large-scale mission-driven projects. Panellists felt that mission-driven programmes have aimed to build both individual and institutional capacities and have encouraged an integrated, holistic, and convergent approach to capacity building on all fronts. Partnerships in knowledge management and dissemination go a long way in building all round capacity. Interaction with academia and the private sector can also contribute to the quality of capacity building.

Taking the case of mission-driven augmentation of infrastructure and services, the panel discussed the importance of involving all stakeholders in implementation, including service providers, the private sector, and beneficiaries, at every step. Decentralisation, social audits, and transparency also create an enabling environment for augmenting capacities. The panel felt that the sense of pride engendered by superior performance could be a good motivator to sustain and improve performance and service delivery.

The panel stressed on the need for organisational support for training and skill-building, including the requisite technological, and managerial changes, as well as changes in organisational structure that would help improve performance.

Building capacity is a complex process, and addressing the weakest links first goes a long way in augmenting existing capacity. Weak links that were pointed out by the panellists included the lack of continuous feedback on performance and the lack of mentoring post training. Sustainability of the capacity built through training and transformation of the organisation go hand in hand. Hence, there is a case for integrating the trainer, trainee, and the concerned department within the feedback mechanism.

Feedback mechanisms, in turn, must capture what worked and what did not, and the weakest link must be identified and addressed. The government department, trainers, and trainees must work together in a three-way matrix with continuous feedback loops for improvement in implementation. It is also easier to measure effectiveness in missions if a system is set up for it at every level. Collection of data, monitoring and measurement of service delivery followed by grievance redressal is another important part of feedback that needs to be implemented.

The way forward for capacity building is a demand-based approach that aims to identify gaps in capacity and address them. The panel underscored the need for convergence for improving urban governance. Convergence of missions provides a great opportunity for cross learning when diverse stakeholders come together. This was discussed with the example of the convergence of the Smart Cities Mission and the Jal Jeevan Mission in Kerala where institutional, financial, and human resource convergence was carried out by design.

### *Key Takeaways*

- The loop between the training agency, government departments and trainees must be closed to improve the effectiveness of capacity building programmes.
- Feedback mechanisms must capture what worked and what did not, and the weakest link must be identified and addressed. Government, trainer, and trainee institutions must work together in a three-way matrix with continuous feedback loops for better implementation.
- Convergence of missions provides a great opportunity for cross learning when diverse stakeholders come together. Involving all stakeholders in the implementation process, including service providers, the private sector, as well as beneficiaries allows for capacity to be built at every level.



- The way forward for capacity building is a demand-based approach that aims to identify gaps in capacity and address them. Capacity building implementation should not only focus on training, but also on skill development, and states must provide an enabling environment for the same.

### Session 3: Panel 2 - Emerging role of the private sector in capacity development

#### Panellists:

- Narayanan Ramaswamy, Partner and National Lead for Education & Skill Development Sector, KPMG India
- Vaishnavi Prabhakaran, Head – Sustainability, TATA Power
- Vijay Ganapathy, Co-founder and Partner, Development Sector Advisory, Thinkthrough Consulting

#### Moderator:

- Dr. Geetha Krishnan, Head, Urban Practitioners' Programme, IIHS

Panel 2 discussed the role of the private sector in development, and the panellists, who represented organisations such as KPMG India, Tata Power, and Thinkthrough Consulting, shared their experiences in partnering with the state and a variety of stakeholders in providing critical services.

The panel debunked the myth that the government is a homogenous, single entity and argued that it is a large, diverse organisation characterised by hierarchies that have varied degrees of capability, motivation, and ability to deliver development outcomes. The government is also full of contradictions. While there often seems to be a lack of a clear-cut job definitions in the government, government officials are also governed by stringent rules and processes. Initially formulated from a place of reason and logic to facilitate streamlined operations, these rules and processes have ended up hampering innovation as the government machinery has come to be more focussed on making sure the rules are followed rather than improving service delivery.

The panel also brought out the different standards for service levels and time taken that are the norm in the government in contrast to what is acceptable outside. The adoption of technology by the government is also slow, especially in the areas of applied analytics, artificial intelligence, and drone technologies, because of which the workforce in the government finds itself out of tune with the needs and requirements of the citizens they are meant to serve. Speaking to the adoption of technology, the panel felt that for investments in technology to bear fruit, it is necessary for technology adoption to have clear end objectives at the outset.

Going down hierarchy levels from where schemes and programmes are formulated to where they are implemented, the original idea gets lost and the approach to implementation on the ground becomes merely procedural. The panel stressed on the importance of data for decision making and the need for it to be accessible. Taking the

example of training for health workers engaged in vaccination needing to go together with the availability of vaccines and cold storage, the panel drew home the need for all round capacities to be developed, not just at the individual level, but also at the institutional and systemic levels. The panel stressed that capacity building should not be confined to training alone but should be multi-dimensional and include behavioural aspects as well. Training is not synonymous to capacity building and should not be treated as such. Training can happen at the individual level, but it needs to be accompanied by changes at the systemic and organisational level for capacity development efforts to make any difference.

The importance of leadership for capacity building is critical, especially if one were to look at the private sector where leaders focus on emerging trends, and consequently are the people who drive change. The combination of a top-down and bottom-up approach works very well in such cases. Any new and emerging trend draws a diverse range of people, and mentorship plays a particularly significant role in creating a pipeline for leadership. Capacity building must be characterised by autonomous/voluntary and continuous learning, linked to career progression, and backed by assessments. Learning can happen in a classroom, in the online mode or while at work. The opportunities for learning are ample for anyone in the government because of the breadth of experiences they accumulate over many years.

Sustainability of capacity built is especially relevant in the context of projects and programmes being managed and executed by external consultants. In such cases, a clear definition of new roles and institutionalisation of capacity is necessary before the consultants leave. The role of the private sector is to bring in efficiency and accountability through their partnership with the government. A focused approach helps in trying to solve identified problems rather than trying to change the entire system all at once. The Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) departments of private sector companies must try to complement the role of the government rather than duplicating their efforts.

### *Key Takeaways*

- Institutional capacity of government can be enhanced through continuous low dose, high frequency training.
- Capacity building should be for the entire vertical of an organisation and learning should happen across sectors.
- Capacity building should not be taken to be synonymous to training. Training can happen at the individual level but must be complemented by change at the system and organisational levels. There is also a need to focus on behavioural aspects of individuals. All these components of training focussed effort and incremental change taken together constitute capacity building and this is what can drive institutional change.

- The role of the private sector is to bring in efficiency and accountability through their partnership with the government. It helps to have a focussed approach in trying to solve identified problems rather than trying to change the entire system all at once.

#### Session 4: Panel 3 - Models and approaches for institutionalising capacity development through projects at the state level

##### Panellists:

- Anand Lakhan, Independent Consultant
- Dr. Rahul Karnamadakala Sharma, Non-Residential Fellow, NCAER - National Data Innovation Centre

##### Moderator:

- Anuttama Dasgupta, Lead, Urban Practitioners' Programme, IIHS

On Panel 3, the two panellists, Dr. K Rahul Sharma, and Anand Lakhan, shared their insights from their respective practices in the field. While Dr. Sharma described capacity building systems of the government from a human resources management perspective, Anand Lakhan spoke from his experience in building capacity at the community level to negotiate with the government on the matter of rights.

Dr. Sharma argued that capacity building for the civil services needs to be first preceded by human resource planning to understand workforce requirements at every level, in terms of numbers, skillsets, and competencies, along with a sharpened focus on the recipients of the service delivered. However, human resource planning in the government runs on a minimal budget. Pointing out that administrative training institutes and other sector training institutes work in silos with little communication or coordination between them, which leads to a lot of duplication, he stressed the need for a more judicious utilisation of available resources. He advocated for an increase in the budgetary allocations for training and capacity building from the lowly one percent of the total cost of human resources that it currently is. He also drew attention to the low levels of autonomy that training institutes normally have in decision making. Acknowledging that most often postings at the training academy for civil servants is considered a punishment posting, and the lack of motivation among both trainers and trainees is widespread, he said that the problem has persisted despite several Administrative Reforms Committees (ARCs) having been constituted for recommending corrective measures to remedy the situation.

Dr. Sharma also suggested some remedial measures. Calling for a need for diverse pedagogical approaches to be applied based on the training need, he said that the content of the training programme must have relevance to the trainee's job for it to be motivating and effective. He stated the need for foundational training for every employee to build desired levels of behavioural and functional competencies. He argued for clear professional development pathways and for incentives and career

progression to be linked to learning to increase motivation. Updating service rules and carrying out charter reviews is often a no-go area for the government because of threats of litigation.

Anand Lakhan shared two instances where communities were supported in safeguarding their rights by building their own capacity to negotiate with the government. In both the instances, the community's capacity was built through access to information and knowledge, specifically an understanding of the master plan.

The first community was motivated to build its own capacity to read master plans to protect itself from eviction. The process, Anand Lakhan noted, had an exceedingly positive impact on the community members' lives as it gave them agency that they did not know they had. In the second instance, the community's capacity was built through access to information on identifying a bargaining point to protect it from eviction. When the community found out that even the government departments were not following the master plan, they were able to negotiate better with them. From these two experiences, Anand Lakhan concluded that capacity building on the end user side must be matched by capacity building on the service provider side for there to be any possibility of dialogue leading to positive outcomes. The discussions in this panel brought out the importance of combining a top down and bottom-up approach in capacity building, where capacity is built both ways—to meet end users' expectations and ensure efficient service delivery.

### *Key Takeaways*

- Capacity building for the civil services needs to be preceded by human resource planning to understand workforce requirements at every level—numbers, skillsets, and competencies—with a sharpened focus on the recipients of the service delivered.
- Workforce planning and cadre reviews are prerequisite to training effectiveness.
- To improve motivation for training, the training needs to be more useful to participants, allow for exchange of ideas, and be tied to professional development pathways.
- If citizens' and end users' capacity to safeguard their rights can be built, it would make officials more accountable and lead to better service delivery outcomes.

## Session 5: Panel 4 - Perspectives from CD practitioners and researchers on emerging opportunities and challenges

### Panellists:

- Kenneth Sim, Dean, Chandler Academy of Governance, Singapore
- Dr Manoj Kumar Pati, Knowledge Management Specialist, KHPT
- Dr. G Rameshwar Rao, Director, Engineering Staff College of India (ESCI)

### Moderator:

- Iswarya R, Consultant, Urban Practitioners' Programme, IIHS

Panel 4 brought together capacity building professionals with varied experiences to share their insights on what measures and interventions worked in strengthening institutional capacity in their respective sectors of practice. The panellists began with a few opening remarks about the scope of their work, ranging from domain specific training and interventions in sectors such as public health engineering and healthcare, to more universally applicable skills such as policy design, programme implementation, leadership development, scenario planning, and HR systems, and what capacity building means for them in each of those areas.

The panel brought out various perspectives ranging from the importance of involving the whole of the government and society, including community members, frontline workers, supporting departments, as well as policy makers in domains such as public health, to the importance of leadership development for civil service. The panel observed that capacity building is most often embedded in routine and regular activities and advocated for a multisectoral approach for the success of these initiatives. Institutionalising knowledge within the community and making it available locally goes a long way in sustaining the capacity that has been built.

The panel highlighted the tightening fiscal situation for capacity building, especially human capacity, owing to the inability to attribute outcomes to specific training programmes. The panel advocated for a baseline level of subvention to sustain the activities of training institutes. This, combined with the autonomy given to training institutes to raise their own funds, will serve as an incentive for them to perform.

Tying together talent attraction, retention, and career progression to capacity development programmes at a systemic level, and aligning leadership in the two areas, provides the much-needed motivation and incentive for increased participation in training programmes. Defining competency frameworks that are fit for the purpose for each job role in public service provides a clear-cut path to development for public servants. The role of leadership, for instance, is critical to execution in organisations, systems, and policies. The panel also highlighted the importance of capacity building being a lifelong endeavour as a set of interconnected and firsthand experiences to learn from. The working-training continuum, in which most of the learning comes from doing, observation and mentorship at work, must be recognised, and training institutions must

reframe learning in such a way that there is a greater synergy between training and the workplace and work. The workplace can also provide for curated activities to connect to what was taught in the classroom to reinforce learning. This calls for close coordination between employers, institutions, and learners. A diversified mix of learning pedagogies, including online synchronous and asynchronous formats and in-class sessions provides for learning needs of diverse types of learners and better learning outcomes.

### *Key Takeaways*

- Capability development<sup>1</sup> is a continuous process as capabilities take very long to build but disintegrate very quickly.
- Capacity building is dynamic, but often intangible and difficult to measure.
- Only 10 per cent of learning happens through formal training; the rest is through learning by doing.
- Learning should be lifelong and be embedded in the workplace

### *Closing remarks*

Dr. Geetha Krishnan, Head, Urban Practitioners' Programme, IIHS, in his closing remarks, responded to the common challenges in capacity development highlighted across all the panels and brought to the forum a striking concern that despite the problem having been identified universally across sectors it is yet to be solved.

Geetha summarised the sessions into three distinct points: One, he emphasised that it is imperative for the community of practice to acknowledge that training is but a part of capacity building and development. In this larger scheme, the CDF aims to create a space for dialogue and discussion to investigate the capacity development ecosystem under which the community of practice needs to grow, serve, and deliver. Capacity development must address the entire stakeholder community and not just a specific segment of people.

Secondly, he spoke to the 70-20-10 model of capacity development mentioned by Dr. Balasubramaniam and highlighted that there was resonance and consensus that 70 per cent of the learning happens through experience, 20 through developmental relationships and only 10 per cent through classroom-based training. He recalled that other panellists had also emphasised the need for taking capacity development to the field as this is where learning happens.

Third, he addressed the concern around the lack of motivation to teach and learn. So long as postings to a training institution are regarded as a punishment by government officials, it will be difficult to remedy the low levels of motivation. As echoed by several

---

<sup>1</sup> Kenneth Sim used the term 'Capability development' to mean the development of people capacity, as opposed to 'Capacity development' that has a broader connotation.

panellists throughout the day, tying learning to career growth and incentives might be the way forward.

## Session 6: International dialogue on role of capacity development in strengthening public institutions in India

Discussants:

- Aromar Revi – Director, IIHS
- Dr. Devesh Kapur - Starr Foundation Professor of South Asian Studies, Johns Hopkins University's School of Advanced International Studies (SAIS)

This session was a dialogue between Aromar Revi and Dr. Devesh Kapur based on some of the topics covered in the latter's book, 'Rethinking Public Institutions in India', (Devesh Kapur, Pratap Bhanu Mehta, and Milan Vaishnav (eds), *Rethinking Public Institutions in India* (Delhi, 2017; online edn, Oxford Academic, 18 May 2017)) that deals with state capacity for service delivery in India.

Aromar Revi and Dr. Kapur began the session by discussing the perception that the government is overstaffed while it is in fact so severely understaffed in critical areas that it is unable to deliver essential services. Reconciling this with mantras such as 'minimum government maximum governance', the discussants said that in situations where the delivery of essential services is not assured, the government tries to make up for this gap by giving handouts and benefit transfers. They then went on to discuss the issue of vacancies in the government, and the need for attracting the right kind of talent and retaining them. The enablers for this, besides the right set of incentives, are also certain levels of tolerance for differences of opinion and dissent. Pointing out that some of the best talents that the country has produced are outside the country owing to the enabling environment that exists there, Devesh called for introspection on the reason for such a situation.

Stressing on the importance of political stability for a conducive policy environment, and on the need to transcend social divisions such as caste, Devesh pointed to examples of states where political stability and greater social equity have led to more positive socio-economic outcomes for the population. These often take precedence over organisational factors such as pay, promotions, transfers, working conditions, modernisation, and clear definitions of roles and responsibilities, although they are also extremely important.

Addressing the issue of grassroots capacity in core sectors such as education and health, Devesh emphasised the importance of capacity to reside at the local level, for better accountability and quality of service delivery. He called for the augmentation of capacities at the grassroots level to be able to take on more responsibility and implement schemes more effectively.

Speaking to the mission mode approach of government schemes and programmes, both at the central and state levels, Devesh stressed on building capacity for sustaining the gains and replicating the achievements made under the missions in the times that follow. Mission-mode approaches are more suitable for one-off activities that have an end date rather than for continuous activities that characterise sectors such as health and education. He called for moving away from a supply-side approach to a demand-side approach where the civil society organises around the issues that matter to them and demands better services.

In relation to capacity building in the civil services, Devesh underscored the connect between training and posting and said that unless training is used immediately on the job, it becomes inconsequential.

In response to a question on leveraging Panchayati Raj institutions to develop the capacities and capabilities of civil servants, the discussants felt that the implementation of the 74<sup>th</sup> amendment to devolve power to local governments is dependent on the political economy. Since urban areas are where wealth is created, the state wants to retain control of them, and therefore lacks the motivation to devolve power to the third tier of government – the city. This is also seen in the treatment of state finance commissions, which are either not set up or their reports not accepted in time. If cities and towns were able to raise their own revenues, they would be financially self-sufficient and autonomous, and would be able to attract the right kind of talent. For this to happen, there needs to be political will, with the demand for it coming from citizens. The same applies to a range of problems that the country faces.

In response to an audience member's question on whether a top-down or a bottom-up approach works better, Devesh said that there are no absolute answers and that some problems are more amenable to a top-down approach while others are better solved by a bottom-up approach. For example, taxes may have to be treated with a top-down approach, but service delivery can be bottom-up with community involvement in organising, delivering and accountability.

### *Key Takeaways*

- Critical areas of government are understaffed. They must be adequately staffed for assured high quality service delivery in order that handouts and benefit transfers do not routinely replace the services.
- Grassroots capacity in critical areas such as education and health care must reside within the local community for better accountability and quality of service.
- Political stability and a conducive policy environment are important for positive socioeconomic outcomes for the population. These often take precedence over other organisational factors.
- A demand-side approach with civil society taking a lead in demanding better services is more conducive to providing them, rather than a supply-side approach as is currently the case.



- There is no serious move to implement the 74<sup>th</sup> Amendment to the Constitution because the political economy favours the state retaining control over local finances. The same applies to the state finance commissions, which are either not set up, or their reports not accepted in time.
- Civil services capacity building can be effective only if it is useful to the civil servant undergoing the training.

## DAY 2

### Session 7: Round table 1 - State-level training institutions on the enabling environment for capacity development

Round table 1 summarised the important points that were discussed on day 1 around the issues of motivation for capacity building, enabling environments, institutional structures, and processes to support it, empowerment of the community and their role as partners in service delivery, and demand for accountability in service delivery that feeds back into motivation and performance improvement. This round table, constituted of representatives from various state level training institutes as a community of practice, reflected upon the key learnings from panel 3 and discussed how STIs can contribute to building sector specific enabling environments through their work.

Acknowledging the fact that there is a lot happening in the capacity building space and that there is an urgent need to connect the dots, the participants agreed on the crucial role of training institutes in setting the agenda for capacity building. They reiterated the importance of community participation in all aspects of service delivery, from demand and implementation support to audit, feedback and measurement to improving motivation.

Participants of the round table also brought up the issue of pacing training programmes in a way that they are more continuous but less intense, to ensure better uptake, retention, and application to job related outcomes. Just like members of the upper bureaucracy receive induction training, employees of local bodies must also receive induction training and orientation to citizen charters, acceptable timelines, and processes of grievance redressal. Monitoring systems must be set up to measure the effectiveness of service delivery.

Agreeing that state training institutes (STIs) are important stakeholders, and that they have a lot to contribute to the enabling environment, participants pointed out that sometimes they do not have the resources or the expertise. This reduces willingness to play an active role in contributing to building the enabling environment. Capacity building for STI staff must be need-based and customised, bringing together related domains, and everyone must be covered.

Participants stressed on the importance of creating a repository of knowledge, and a framework to manage knowledge gained over a period. Practitioners must be brought together to engage as a 'community of practice'. Capacity building must be built into projects, and training programmes must be tailored according to the needs of participants. Impact evaluation must be an integral part of any effort to build capacity.

### *Key Takeaways*

- Training institutes play a crucial role in setting the agenda for capacity building as part of the enabling environment.
- Capacity building and training programmes should be conducted in a continuous but less intense way for them to be effective.
- Community participation in all aspects of service delivery, from demand and implementation support to audit, feedback and measurement, is critical to improve motivation for capacity building for improving service delivery.
- Induction training and orientation to citizen charters, acceptable timelines, grievance redressal are important for officials of urban local bodies.
- Capacity building for STI staff must be need-based and customised, bringing together related domains, and everyone must be covered.
- A community of capacity development practitioners can provide a forum to exchange knowledge and information and create a framework for managing knowledge gained collectively over a period.

### Session 8: Round table 2 - Community of practice: Capacity development practitioners on enabling environment

Constituted of capacity development practitioners from other training entities, administrative training institutes and academic institutions, round table 2 discussed the means and methods of developing a community of practice. Practitioners felt the need to develop a community of practice that would enable them in their work and build their capacity in all the verticals of capacity development. The establishment of an advisory committee can play a crucial role in providing guidelines to the practitioners and could pave the way for setting standards.

Practitioners spoke about the challenges that they face in terms of capacity development, ranging from there not being enough literature in this sector, the lack of incentives for participants to attend training programmes, establishing communities of practice for various thematic areas especially on the digital front, tackling sector-agnostic approaches, policy and legal framework inadequacies, inadequacies in public engagements, and the lack in leadership, funding, and the like.

Some significant inputs included training of trainers with a multisectoral approach and an emphasis on creating master trainers and leaders, building capacities of students,

developing capacities of resource persons, establishing community advocates and alternative community development plans.

The round table also tabled the idea of creating partnerships to address the lack of domain knowledge that eventually would enable them to access their requirements and tailor them to their own needs.

One distinct point of discussion was around recognition in the capacity development space. Considering that there are many sectoral experts who are not in the training territory, bringing them into the fold and establishing some kind of evaluation is critical. But the criteria for qualification may not work as many uncertified practitioners are excellent trainers.

### *Key Takeaways*

- Establishing an advisory committee will help capacity development practitioners by providing them standards and guidelines to follow in their practice.
- Some of the key challenges faced by capacity development practitioners include the lack of adequate literature, policy inadequacies affecting resources, and lack of committed leadership.
- Creation of partnerships for knowledge exchange is important to address the shortcomings in domain knowledge.
- A system of recognition and accreditation for trainers provides for credibility and standardisation in capacity building practice.

### *Session 9: Workshop – Framing teaching cases*

This half-day workshop was a closed event for registered participants. The workshop sessions were conducted by IIHS Faculty, Vineetha Nalla, Gargi Sen and Nihal Ranjit, based on their research work on the Odisha State Disaster Management Authority (OSDMA) who took the learners through a systematic process for framing teaching cases from research projects.

After establishing the need and benefits of teaching with cases, the sessions navigated through the critical steps of conceptualising and structuring a teaching case. This included: developing the case summary and the main case write-up, identifying appropriate supplementary readings as a part of the case archives, and developing the teaching note, including the pedagogical possibilities that render the case accessible to any instructor apart from the author of the case.

[www.iihs.co.in](http://www.iihs.co.in)

**IIHS, BENGALURU CITY CAMPUS**

197/36, 2nd Main Road, Sadashivanagar, Bengaluru 560 080, India  
T +91 80 6760 6666 | F +91 80 2361 6814

**IIHS, CHENNAI**

Floor 7A, Chaitanya Exotica, 24/51 Venkatnarayana Road, T Nagar, Chennai 600 017, India  
T +91 44 6630 5500/6555 6590

**IIHS, DELHI**

803, Surya Kiran, 19, Kasturba Gandhi Marg, New Delhi 110 001, India  
T +91 11 4360 2798 | F +91 11 2332 0477

**IIHS, MUMBAI**

Flat No. 2, Purnima Building, Patel Compound, 20-C, Napean Sea Road, Mumbai 400 006, India  
T +91 22 6525 3874