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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Since the adoption of the decentralization policy in 2000, different initiatives aimed at building capacities of the LG’s have been implemented. Despite a considerable presence of decentralized governance CB initiatives benefitting local administrations, it remains difficult to account for the quality of the products delivered and establish their impact and consistency with both the national orientations and local needs, following weak monitoring, coordination and harmonization.

Most capacity building interventions have been delivered in un-coordinated manner, supply driven, reactive and sometimes not in line with the recipient’s needs. Cases are apparent where one capacity building intervention is delivered, and with a week, another provider comes to a district to deliver a CB package that is not very different from the one delivered in a week gone by. Most of the CB interventions have been delivered based on assumed and feelings of the providers mainly, central institutions, NGOs and projects.

The Mission of this strategy is to ensure that local government have qualified and skilled staff operating in a conductive environment for effective service delivery. It mainly aims to integrate effective approaches to assessing current capacities, identifying required capacities and investing in collaborative initiatives to capitalize upon and further develop capacities in a sustainable manner across the core work of LGs.

To achieve this mission the strategy proposes five key objectives which include: (i) developing a comprehensive and coordinated capacity building framework at LG,(ii) Establishing capacity building quality assurance and standardisation system (iii)Strengthening Capacity building planning at LG (iv) Ensuring capacity building is embedded in the development process (v) Enhancing LG capacity to attract, recruit, motivate, and retain a critical mass of technical and professional skills.

This document highlights the roles and responsibilities of different stakeholders involved in its implementation, monitoring and evaluation.

The implementation of this strategy will be financed by the already existing sources through the government of Rwanda, Development Partners and the district own resources.
1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background and Context

The National Decentralization Policy was conceived and approved in 2000 as a mechanism to achieve good governance (through improved participation, promotion of transparency and accountability, and setting up responsive and sensitive decentralized structures), enhance local economic development (through efficiency and effectiveness in implementation of development programs) and bringing quality and accessible services closer to the citizens.

The various phases of this process were defined within this mandate. Indeed, while the 1st phase, implemented from 2001 to 2005, institutionalized decentralization in Rwanda, the second phase (2006-2010), aimed at consolidating progress on national priorities, such as Vision 2020 and EDPRS, and deepening the decentralization process by enhancing effectiveness in service delivery to communities. The Government of Rwanda has just defined key orientations for a 3rd phase, which will focus on streamlining the institutional and legal framework, consolidating achievements in governance and service delivery, and scaling up on local economic development (LED) strategies and initiatives for transformation of local economies and creation of job opportunities.

Decentralization as a mechanism of shifting centres of powers, decision making and responsibilities over allocation of resources and provision of services, needs to be accompanied by required measures to build capacities of all actors and players involved. The proposed Strategy proceeds from this perspective. It is developed within the mandates and imperatives of implementing the key orientations decided by the Government of Rwanda for the 3rd phase (2011-2015) of Decentralisation.

Moreover, this strategy is formulated to complement previous efforts undertaken by the Government and geared towards streamlining capacity building interventions in Local Governments. These include a Capacity Building Needs Assessment conducted in all the districts in 2007-2008 and subsequent CB Plans developed in 2008 for each district. While development of these CB plans has constituted an important step forward in the
move to enhance ownership of the districts over the CB process, it must be acknowledged that many CB interventions in districts are said to continue to be supply-driven, executed in uncoordinated and fragmented manner and sometimes not in line with the above mentioned DCBP. Many assessments indicate, among other reasons of failure to implement these plans, the fact that they are very ambitious in their scope and that they lack prioritization. In this regard, the current strategy is an attempt to propose ways of reviving the DCBP approach as a platform to identify, plan, and monitor CB activities at local level.

The strategic orientations proposed in this document, are defined as a response to identified weaknesses and challenges. They devise measures and strategies for: (1) effectively implementing decentralization capacity building initiatives in a coordinated and harmonized manner; (2) proficient national coordination of all decentralization related capacity building initiatives; (3) making operational CB plans at the district level; (4) standardization of CB delivery throughout all districts for quality assurance purposes; (5) introducing innovative approaches for delivery of CB targeting individual skills; and (5) streamlining and delineating the roles and responsibilities of different stakeholders.

Finally, it is important to mention that Capacity Building must pursue and sustain the achievement of Decentralization objectives i.e. service delivery and economic development. Consequently, all those involved in the process of implementing CB should have always at the back of their mind the objectives and the main thrust of the Decentralization policy. It is understood that any capacity building activity in the districts has to contribute to the fulfilment of the Districts development plans to secure the commitment of district leaders and allow them deliver on their contractual obligations.

1.2. Aim of the LG Capacity Building Strategy

*Capacity development is understood as a process through which individuals, organizations and society obtain, strengthen and maintain the capabilities to set and achieve their own development agenda. As such, Capacity Development is advanced through a comprehensive and holistic working approach, which shall be LG-driven to be effective and relevant.*
The LG CB strategy aims to integrate effective approaches to assessing current capacities, identifying required capacities and investing in collaborative initiatives to capitalize upon and further develop capacities in a sustainable manner across the core work of LGs. In essence, the capacity development agenda is interwoven with the national development programs and future development plans across all sectors, and as such, realizing capacity gains will require investments that address issues of human, institutional, and systems/environmental capacity.

1.3. Vision

Efficient, effective and transparent local government for effective service delivery.

1.4. Mission

The mission for the proposed strategy is to ensure that local governments have qualified and skilled staff operating in a conducive environment for effective service delivery. The strategy seeks to advance capacity gains across all sectors in a manner which is sustainable, inclusive, results-oriented, and aligned with the broader development agenda of the country. The overarching goals reflected in this mission are to equip LG institutions to drive and manage their own affairs by investing in the knowledge, skills, and productivity of individuals, building strong LGs to sustain the fight against poverty, and promoting values and norms that foster social cohesion and equity. As such, LG capacity building is part of the fabric of the national vision and overall development agenda of Rwanda.

1.5. Guiding principles

Capacity building programs in LGs will be guided by the following principles:

- Making CB interventions demand-driven.
- Rethinking how quality can be ensured and standards put in place and respected.
- Avoiding the narrow scope of defining CB as synonymous to training.
- Ensuring that CB interventions are coordinated and harmonized.
2. SITUATION ANALYSIS

2.1. Conceptual formulation of the LG capacity building strategy

Basing on the findings from previous capacity needs assessments have highlighted capacity building challenges faced by LGs, this strategic framework aims to outline the approach by which capacities may be assessed through more appropriate dimensions and how capacity building responses could be designed and coordinated to address interlocking levels of capacity. As such, the LG capacity building strategy introduces a conceptual framework that will help to integrate technical approaches for capitalizing on existing capacity and building capacity in application areas that cut cross all sectors.

In addition to introducing technical practices for developing sustainable capacity, the LG capacity building strategy attempts to provide a cohesive framework to clarify how capacity development interventions are structured and how to mobilize a coalition behind such an ambitious agenda.

The LG capacity building strategic framework outlines:

(1) **Three levels shaping capacity development initiatives:** The three levels, *human, institutional, and the enabling environment*, serve as the organizing logic for ensuring that the Government of Rwanda invests in LG capacity in a holistic manner by directing support to individuals, LG institutional development, and to creating an enabling environment for the sustainability of capacity building efforts. These three levels are interlocking and mutually reinforcing. Because capacity development occurs within complex, adaptive systems, a comprehensive strategy articulates how synergies can be realized by investing across all levels of entry points for assessing capacity and development of responses.

(2) **Technical mechanisms for coordinating multiple capacity development initiatives:** In order to manage investments across the three levels, a coordination mechanism shall be developed which positions LGs to drive capacity development investments, facilitate the exchange of good practices and support resources / technical guidance for any stakeholder investing in capacity building, and capability to monitor and track changes in the capacity building arena.
(3) **Strategic priorities or areas in which capacity will be emphasized to ensure LGs deliver their mandate:** In order to ground capacity building investments in the development agenda, the identification of priorities is needed to answer the question, *capacity building for what?* The present strategy proposes five (5) strategic priorities to guide decisions where investments should be made (ref. section 3.1).

2.2. **Entry points for assessing capacity and developing response strategies**

The following summary of the three entry points provides a definition of what is assessed in a comprehensive capacity assessment, and the corresponding response strategies needed to address capacity gaps and capitalize on capacity assets in an integrative manner.

**Capacity building assessment entry points**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual</th>
<th>Institutional</th>
<th>Enabling environment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Skills, knowledge and Experience invested in an individual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Formal training and Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Marketable skills and experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elements that strengthen the capacity of an organization to deliver its mandate.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- processes &amp; systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- service delivery arrangements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- human resources management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elements that facilitate the development of capacity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- policies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- norms and values</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- facilities and logistics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is critical to highlight these interlocking dimensions. It is recognized that attempts to invest resources in a holistic manner help prevent the perpetuation of partial solutions. It is not good enough to invest in a one-off training program and think that it will transform the quality of service delivery just as it is not adequate to introduce a policy for how something should be done without investing in institutions and people to adapt their systems and ways of working to facilitate the implementation of the policy. Capacity building initiatives must be holistic if they are to deliver desired outcomes.
In the case of LGs, synergies are very important, especially when it is appreciated that capacity building is more than training and will focus on institutional functionality overall, for several reasons:

- Capacity gains result from improved performance at the institutional level, which requires strong organization, internal management, strategic directions and teamwork.
- Compounding this fact, it is clear that well-trained and highly motivated professionals can feel considerable frustration working in institutions that are disorganized and inefficient. As such, institutions cannot rely on a few qualified individuals to fully transform the working culture.
- Sustaining capacity gains requires continuous investments in institutions themselves as highly qualified people will pursue other careers and will not remain working for the institution forever, especially if the incentives are not strong enough to keep highly qualified individual attracted. There are no capacity gains if the know-how, the will for results, and commitment for work disappear with the departure of select individuals.
- Apart from formal education and training, individual capacity is largely developed through role modeling, direct support, and coaching to the individual that is tailored to support them in their current role. If further investments are directed at setting in place standard operating procedures, more opportunities are created for role modeling productive work habits, skills, attitude and professionalism. In tandem, those individuals transferring skills and competencies to other colleagues will have more instruments to enable knowledge transfer is standard operating procedures are introduced within the institution.

2.3. SWOT Analysis

The process of developing the LG capacity building strategy has been anchored in extensive analysis of the current and desired capacities for LGs. The analysis was done using the SWOT tool of analysis and the following were the identified threats, opportunities, Weaknesses and Strengths.
2.3.1. Strengths

✓ *Capacity Building Needs Assessment and Capacity Building Plans*

The CB needs assessment and plans were developed in early 2008 across all districts. Those crucial working documents not only show the planned priorities of the district in terms of CB, but they should also serve as reference documents. To comply with the spirit of decentralization, all interventions should come to implement them on behalf of districts.

✓ *Staffing at local government levels*

Following the 2006 decentralization reform, local administrations have benefited from adequately qualified personnel at District and Sector levels. The reform also introduced a permanent officer, the Executive Secretary, at the Cell level. Subsequent public service reforms (June 2009 and April 2010) confirmed this move by adopting new organizational structures with clearly defined roles at the district level, more professional staff both at the district and sector levels and a second permanent officer at the Cell level.

✓ *District annual training plans*

These plans that are annually submitted to the Ministry of Public Service and Labor (MIFOTRA) can serve as an initiative by the local government to enhance capacity and can be exploited in this context to implement CB programs.
✓ **Imihigo/ Performance contracts**

The introduction of a performance-based approach (*Imihigo*) has contributed to improve the overall capacity of local governments to implement development programs and plans, to deliver quality services to the citizens and has provided important basis for improvement of accountability and effectiveness in the use of available resources.

✓ **Stronger and improved institutional capacity at local government (District)**

The continued effort to empower local governments in the context of both fiscal and administrative decentralization has created stronger institutional structures and capacities at both district and sub-district level.

2.3.2. **Weaknesses**

- **Lack of a coherent capacity building framework**

Capacity building initiatives are undertaken by various entities such as the Rwandese Association of Local Government Authorities (RALGA), Development Partners, Rwanda Institute for Administration and Management (RIAM), the Public Sector Capacity Building Secretariat (PSCBS), Ministry of finance and Economic Planning and other sector line Ministries and central government bodies.

There is, however, not yet a clear comprehension regarding what the outcome of the training is to be, at what level it should be delivered and what measures are to be used to determine whether the training has achieved the desired outcomes. It is apparent that the training takes place within a framework vacuum and that there is as yet no standard as to what capacity the staff at the various levels of local government need in order to achieve the stated objectives.

- **Lack of quality assurance**

There is currently no assurance that training material, the delivery mechanisms or the effect of training is of a satisfactory nature. Quality assurance could be attained by ensuring that the material, method of training or facilitators of the training adhere to established quality standards.
It appears that at present the training material provided is not verified or pre-screened. This could mean that, in some instances, the material presented could be totally inappropriate for the purpose for which it is being presented. There is also as yet no standardized assessment of trainees, i.e. whether they have achieved the prescribed competency standards.

There is also no validation of the effectiveness of the content of trained courses that are presented and there is no vivid monitoring and evaluation of the effectiveness or the outcomes of training interventions. This issue is compounded by lack of certification of different training courses.

➢ **Budgetary limitations**

Districts suffer from serious **budgetary limitations**. Districts’ own resources remain incredibly limited and are therefore never allocated to capacity building, but to other programs judged more important. Some receive CB support from a range of partners. However, the partners’ support envelope is itself seriously limited; it is earmarked by region or by sector, leaving some districts and/or some areas under serviced.

➢ **Weak coordination and M&E mechanisms for capacity building at LG**

Districts carry bias towards trainings when it comes to capacity building. Every unit or service organizes its trainings separately. Districts do not have adequate reports of performed trainings; very few can produce training modules and other training instruments. Lack of proper coordination and M&E leads to misuse and wasteful use of resources (funds, time, energy) as manifested in repeated trainings and some people being trained over and over on the same issues. Trainings are the business of everyone but no one is responsible or accountable. The human resource officers are usually charged with so many activities to the extent that CB is given only little consideration.
Poor maintenance of equipment and lack of energy to use the equipment

Districts have difficulties and lack technical capacity for maintaining provided ICT and other office equipment. Moreover, the equipment availed in many sectors is reported not to be in use for lack of energy source.

2.3.3. Opportunities

Strong political support

Both Rwanda’s Vision 2020 and EDPRS consider capacity building as an imperative investment the country must make to achieve its development ambitions. They emphasize the utmost necessity to upgrade the human capacity and operational skills for establishing strong institutions that can efficiently deliver, reduce poverty and boost economic development. The creation of institutions mandated specifically to foster capacity building, such as PSCBS and NDIS is a strong testimony of the political will.

The presence of several stakeholders

Different studies have pointed out wide range of active stakeholders in CB for local administrations such as MIFOTRA, Development Partners, MINALOC, PSCBS, NDIS, MINECOFIN, RALGA, RIAM, etc. The presence of the different stakeholders constitutes a strong foundation from which to build sustainable CB.

In particular, the Public Sector Capacity Building Secretariat (PSCBS) established in 2009, under the tutelage of MIFOTRA and later on under MINECOFIN, has got the mandate of coordinating capacity building initiatives including funds meant for CB across the public institutions. Creation of a body to coordinate resources mobilization for CB and ensuring a systemic approach to CB is a paramount basis for building on in furthering LG capacities.
2.3.4. Threats

- **Frequent structural changes**

Since 2006, there have been two administrative reforms, meaning that within only five years there have been two structural changes touching not only the number of staff, but also the terms of reference and job descriptions for staff in different positions and salary restructuring reform which is set to be completed by end January 2011. Those frequent changes disrupt efficiency and stability in the CB process, when the acquired experience and skills are no longer useful to the new position, and when LGs are compelled to adapt to highly versatile dynamics in their administrative structures.

- **Pressure and straining environment**

LGs personnel operate in a highly straining environment following numerous improvised requirements from central government institutions, including uncoordinated trainings, uncoordinated meetings, and participation in different gatherings to deliver a new political decision with a national interest, etc. Whenever such unplanned activities come up, it becomes the priority for the LGs. They are compelled to adjourn their own already planned activities in favor of those impromptu programs.

- **Diversity of training approaches**

Various CB providers continue to work in isolation. Modules used to train in the same field by different trainers do not necessarily send the same message. There are no minimum standards for preparing the modules and the training sessions; there are no guidelines regarding the selection of qualified and capable trainers.

- **High LGs staff turn-over rate**

Districts suffer from a high turn-over of staff, both political and technical. There are several reasons for the turn-over: promotions and transfers; dismissals for financial misconduct or embezzlement of public property; resignations for a variety of personal reasons among others.
Nevertheless, whatever the cause, staff instability is harmful to the capacity building process because it implies loss of capacitated, competent and experienced staff, and loss of continuity and significant institutional memory.

- **Lack of induction for new staff**

Induction is necessary to ensure that the new workforce adapts to the new working environment and develops a sense of belonging, while acquiring the minimum standards of administrative knowledge and skills to steer development and deliver public services. A well planned and coordinated induction process is believed to lead to greater motivation and productivity.

Such induction and orientation is however crucial for performance enhancement and effective career development, especially in view of the fact that the current LGs workforce are primarily made of fresh University graduates with no administrative experience, and who have dire need for proper guidance and basic knowledge and skills to find their way through. Failure to properly induce and orient this young workforce is believed to contribute to insufficient team work spirit.

3. **OBJECTIVES AND STRATEGIC ACTIONS**

Five (5) strategic objectives have been identified serve as goals for advancing a broad-based and holistic approach for developing capacity across the LGs and to address the issues highlighted in the above situational analysis. These five objectives illustrate to what end capacity investments will be directed, or more simply stated, they answer the question: “Building capacity for what?”

1. **Strengthening Coordination among institutions charged with Capacity Building in LGs:**

   The following strategies will contribute to the above objective:

   (1) Review the roles and responsibilities of concerned institutions, including the legal framework defining their attributions
(2) Clarify accountability and responsibilities over the LGCB between the PSCBS and NDIS

(3) Ensure that CB in LGs is embedded in a LT, development vision of the Local administrations

(4) Establish an MIS system for LGCB reporting

(5) Formalize a LG CB national coordination structure and providing it with appropriate operating instruments and means

(6) Promoting a continuous participatory process, involving Line Ministries, to define LG needs and priorities in implementing the new phase of decentralization

2. Establishing capacity building quality assurance and standardisation system:

The following strategies will contribute to the above objective:

(1) Establish national LG CB certification authority

(2) Developing required standards for learning and training materials per posts and position requirements

(3) Install a system of certification for CB providers

(4) Harmonization of LG approaches by all stakeholders

3. Integrating a large diversity of CB approaches:

The following strategies will contribute to the above objective:

(1) encouraging holistic approach to CB through introducing alternative ways of CB, including TA, Coaching and exposure of staff and leaders;

(2) conduct regular competency assessment and development process for LGs;

(3) Institutionalize systematic statutory and mandatory induction training for all categories of personnel in LGs;

(4) Improving and reorienting existing CB initiatives and approaches within different stakeholders engaged in local development matters to integrate identified priorities of 3rd phase of decentralization;
4. Sustainably addressing the issue of funding mechanism for LG Capacity Building:

The following strategies will contribute to the above objective:

(1) Clarify linkages, synergy, encroachment areas of various CB funding sources targeting LG in order to harmonize their management;

(2) Establish basket funding (pool funding) mechanism for LG Capacity Building and determine the institution responsible for its management;

(3) Render LG’ authorities more accountable vis-à-vis CB planning, funding, and implementation;

(4) Ensuring that Districts are responsible for management of CB funds;

5. Enhancing LG capacity to attract, recruit, motivate, and retain a critical mass of technical and professional skills:

(5) Revisit the legal and regulatory framework around the process of selection and remuneration and benefits in use for LGs;

(6) Establish progressively a specific status for LG employees and systems of career development;

(7) Conduct a regular assessment of working conditions and environment for LG employees and possible ways of improvement;

4. OPERATIONALIZATION OF THE 5 YEAR STRATEGY

Since the adoption of Decentralisation policy in 2000, its implementation stated in 2001. The policy was to be implemented 3 phases of five years each.

The strategy comes at the time when Local Government Capacity Building is a key priority to the Government. In the 3rd phase of the decentralization, the capacity of local Government has to be prioritized. In the last phase; the following has been already been implemented notably;
Different legal texts were developed and reviewed to enhance the implementation of the decentralization policy, including:

a) Territorial restructuring from 11 to 4 provinces and from 106 districts to 30 as well as sector 1545 to 416 as defined in the Organic Law no 29/2005 of 23rd December 2005 determining the Administrative entities of Republic of Rwanda. This strengthened the capacity and improved resource mobilization and utilization in the Local Government;

b) Laws governing provinces and districts were enacted. This improved the general functioning and role clarification as well as effectiveness in service delivery.

c) Fiscal and financial regulation as revised in 2006 was developed and operationalized to support decentralization;

d) Strategy for developing capacity for effective decentralized governance and local level service delivery in Rwanda was developed and implemented since 2006;

e) Rwanda Decentralization Strategic Framework (RDSF) was developed and adopted in 2007 which gave strategic orientation to implement the policy;

f) Similarly, in 2008, Decentralization Implementation Plan (DIP) was operationalized and highlighted key activities to implement the second phase of Decentralization;

g) District Capacity Building Needs Assessment and Planning was also conducted in March 2008. This helped to define and identify strength and weakness of capacity building in Local government which triggered capacity building planning in the District annual action plan. This also greatly influence and enabled the design of this 5 year capacity building strategy.

**Institutional set-up in the strengthening local government capacity building**

1. In 2002, Common Development Fund (CDF) was established to coordinate and harmonise the funding of the development initiatives in Local Government.

2. National Decentralization Implementation Secretariat (NDIS) was established in 2009 to coordinate, monitor and advise on the implementation of decentralisation in Rwanda.
3. Public Sector Capacity Building Secretariat (PSCBS) formerly HIDA was also established by the Government in 2008 to enhance the capacity building across central and local government.

4. In 2001, Rwandese Association of Local Government Authorities (RALGA) as revised in 2006 was established with a mandate to represent, lobby and advocate for Local Government entities and more specifically capacity building across the decentralised entities.

5. Joint Action Development Forums (JADFs) that brings together all development partners on the district level was established by the Ministerial Instruction in 2007.

Other on-going capacity building initiatives:

- Development of coaching and mentoring program
- Fiscal Decentralization Strategy was also developed and adopted for operationalization
- Induction course program for the local leaders and staff.

Several and varied trainings of capacity building have been provided to Local Government Ministry, Technical Ministries, agencies and Development Partners.

This strategy outlines the next steps and actions that will be implemented in the forthcoming Phase III of Decentralisation in Rwanda for next five years.

5. IMPLEMENTATION FRAMEWORK

The present Strategy for LG capacity Building is defined for a five-year period (2011-2015). A detailed plan of implementation shall be developed separately to complement this document and to clarify practical activities per each strategic action. The plan will also set benchmarks and targets with an indication of the timeline for their achievement. Below is a proposal of an implementation framework, which derives from the 2000 National Decentralization Policy. The policy clearly differentiates the roles and
responsibilities of central government bodies and LGs to reduce duplication, create synergies and avoid potential confusion.

As prescribed in the Decentralization Policy, Sectoral Ministries shall be responsible for establishment of sectoral policies, strategies and guidelines for local service delivery as well as monitoring and evaluation and capacity building. The following linkages will characterise the relationships between the central government, LGs, and other capacity building stakeholders and service providers:

- The main tasks of the central government are to ensure that needed capacity building tools and instruments are available from a wide variety of providers (public and private training institutions, professional associations, universities etc.). It will “pre-screen” such tools and instruments to ensure quality and relevance. It will guide and advise the LGs on available capacity building tools and instruments, and facilitate the exchange between local governments. It will also support and guide providers of capacity building services. Central government agencies such as PSCBS and NDIS will provide capacity building programmes as demanded by the LGs. The central government will consider to support the LGs to enable them to carry out their locally-specific capacity building programmes.

- The LGs have to define their locally specific capacity building needs. With own funds, plus additional support from central government and development partners, they can purchase capacity building services (like training programmes, consultancy services, information) from a wide variety of providers – government agencies, universities, private sector agencies, associations, private sector organization etc.

- Providers for capacity building activities will come from the public and the private sector. They will provide demand-oriented capacity building services to clients on the regional and national level. In many cases, services providers might need support from the central government and development partners to provide capacity building tools that are needs – oriented, focus on practical implementation and are in line with the specific conditions of the clients procuring them.
A detailed implementation plan and mechanism for measuring progress on capacity building for local government will be developed in collaboration with all stakeholders.

Chart 1: LG capacity building framework
6. MONITORING AND EVALUATION FRAMEWORK

An annual operational plan for LGs capacity building will be defined each year by LGs supported by NDIS in collaboration with the relevant sectoral Ministries. This plan will constitute the guiding framework of operation for all stakeholders involved in LG CB strategy implementation. The annual plan will be directly linked to the strategic objectives.

The M&E framework of the LG CB strategy will focus on performance monitoring to keep track on whether the agreed upon activities are being effectively and correctly implemented. The framework will allow for regular and consistent tracking of performance through reviews of various inputs and outputs for each strategic objective.

The LG capacity building M&E framework will be managed by NDIS in close collaboration with decentralization focal points in line ministries, LGs, and the District JADFs Secretariat. Progress reviews will be conducted under the guidance of NDIS. All the stakeholders will contribute to the semi-annual and annual reports that will inform the NDIS reviews. These reports will contain a case-by-case assessment of whether or not progress is on track to achieve each of the objectives.

Chart 2: LG Capacity Building Implementation and monitoring framework

A National Steering Committee for the implementation of the strategy chaired by MINALOC and composed of RALGA, PSCBS, MIFOTRA and MINECOFIN among others will be established. The committee will provide strategic direction for implementation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/N</th>
<th>OBJECTIVE</th>
<th>STRATEGY</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>Strengthening Coordination among institutions charged with Capacity Building in LGs</strong></td>
<td>Review the roles and responsibilities of concerned institutions, including the legal framework defining attributions</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clarify accountability and responsibilities over the LGCB between the PSCBS and NDIS</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ensure that CB in LGs is embedded in a LT, development vision of the Local administrations</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Establish an MIS system for LGCB reporting</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>750,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>860,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Formalize a LG CB national coordination structure and providing it with appropriate operating instruments and means</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>95,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Promoting a continuous participatory process to define LG needs and priorities in implementing the new phase of decentralization</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>90,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td><strong>Establishing Capacity Building Quality Assurance and Standardisation system</strong></td>
<td>Establish national LG CB certification authority</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Developing required standards for learning and training materials per posts and position requirements</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Install a system of providers certification</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>175,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td><strong>Integrating a large diversity of Capacity Building Approaches</strong></td>
<td>3,435,000</td>
<td>3,125,000</td>
<td>3,000,000</td>
<td>2,160,000</td>
<td>1,800,000</td>
<td>13,520,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Encouraging holistic approach to CB through introducing alternative ways of CB, including TA, Coaching and exposure</strong></td>
<td>2,700,000</td>
<td>2,700,000</td>
<td>2,700,000</td>
<td>1,500,000</td>
<td>1,500,000</td>
<td>11,100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conduct regular competency assessment and development process for LGs</strong></td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutionalize systematic statutory and mandatory induction training for all categories of personnel in LGs</strong></td>
<td>660,000</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>660,000</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>2,220,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Improving and reorienting existing CB initiatives and approaches within different stakeholders engaged in local development matters to integrate identified priorities of 3rd phase of decentralization</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 <strong>Sustainably addressing the issue of funding mechanism for LG Capacity Building</strong></td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>90,000</td>
<td>55,000</td>
<td>55,000</td>
<td>55,000</td>
<td>335,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Clarify linkages, synergy, encroachment areas of various CB funding sources targeting LG in order to harmonize their management</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Establish basket funding mechanism for LG Capacity Building</strong></td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Render LG’ authorities more accountable vis-à-vis CB planning, funding, and implementation</strong></td>
<td>55,000</td>
<td>55,000</td>
<td>55,000</td>
<td>55,000</td>
<td>55,000</td>
<td>275,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Enhancing LG capacity to attract, recruit, motivate, and retain a critical mass of technical and professional skills.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>275,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Revisit the legal and regulatory framework around the process of selection and remuneration and benefits in use for LGs</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>275,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Establish progressively a specific status for LG employees and systems of career development</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conduct a regular assessment of working conditions and environment for LG employees and possible ways of improvement</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GRAND TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>3,878,000</td>
<td>4,158,000</td>
<td>3,148,000</td>
<td>2,583,000</td>
<td>2,003,000</td>
<td>15,770,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>