

The Bolivia case study

In Bolivia a completely different picture characterised the RAC. The institution is young, freshly created around a strong political agenda at the core of the government's political priorities. People were committed and eager to profit from any opportunity to improve their personal and collective performance. They found that the RAC was instrumental to a process of institutional learning and consolidation. The process was much more collective than in Ukraine, different systems and techniques of coaching and joint learning were put in place, and some improvements to procedures and methods were also suggested.

BRIEF PRESENTATION OF THE PROGRAMME

The PAPS program comes at a time of change in the government's policy towards the coca sector. The shift from an approach based on alternative development via crop substitution, to one based on integral development with coca led to a rift with some partners, particularly USAID, and facilitated greater presence of EC cooperation. This fact, coupled with the development of the new sectoral approach by the government of Bolivia (with plans and strategies for the medium term), cleared the way for the new mode of EC aid: budget support.

The overall objective of the PAPS program is to support the Government of Bolivia in its fight against drug trafficking within a framework of dialogue and social peace. The specific objective of the program is to support the design and implementation of certain components of the sectoral policy of integral development, defining the latter's scope, limits, and interaction with other sectors and sub-national levels in order to achieve a shared political vision. The program's specific areas of intervention are coca-producing areas, migrant areas, and sensitive areas (protected areas).

The expected results of the PAPS are:

A comprehensive sectoral policy for integral development that is firmly defined, interrelated with related sectors, socially shared by stakeholders and institutions in the context of the problems of coca cultivation, and in concert with the international community on the basis of the principles of sovereignty and national dignity.

Acceptance and support by the international community of a shared vision for integral development that fits within the wider framework of a common responsibility, particularly in the context of established international policies that aim to combat drug trafficking;

An institutional framework within the Bolivian state that is consolidated, dynamic and flexible, and able to generate institutional and sectoral synergies to promote implementation of sectoral policy for integral development. in areas touched by the problems of coca cultivation (production, forced migration, and sensitive natural environments), the framework runs, manages, monitors, and evaluates sectoral policy.

Pressure from sectors and stakeholders concerned with the problem of coca for actions and initiatives to be carried out in a manner that is sustained, coherent, and consistent with technical and administrative capacity.

Social investments and productivity investments by public and private stakeholders in the areas of intervention, based on project portfolios that line up with the objectives of integral development and conflict mitigation.

For implementation of the PAPS program, provision by the EC of external professional advice for the institutional and programmatic strengthening of the Vice-Ministry of Integral Development with Coca (VCDI) and other governmental agencies involved in combating drug trafficking.

PAPS' design Quality criteria

The quality of the PAPS design is reflected by the following features:

Suitable design for the sectoral context as based on the sectoral policy of the Government (and supports development of that policy) and contributing to its effective implementation.

Sufficient demand and high buy-in by the Government. The design also addresses the strategy in place to achieve greater national sovereignty.

Good harmonization of proposals and clear definition of administrative mechanisms, via the Program's TA component, through promoting greater inter-institutional coordination between the different actors of the program. The design also aims to strengthen the technical and administrative capacities of stakeholders so as to improve the calibre of future project proposals seeking funding.

Dialogue and coordination. At the inception of PAPS, the government's leadership in respect of donor coordination was limited. However the very design of PAPS called for greater coordination with the international community as an output. In addition the design included acceptance by the international community of integral development with coca.

Peer relationships. Through the aid it provides, the EC can hold dialogue with the Government and target its assistance, focusing support on defining and implementing the government's sectoral policy (with the specific exception of the industrialization and value assessment of coca).

This positive picture of the design of the program is further improved and supported by a number of contextual elements that create a very favourable window of opportunity.

ASSESSMENT OF THE OPPORTUNITY FRAMEWORK

The preliminary question that must be posed in order to assess the window of opportunity is:

To what extent was the context already fertile for the development of capacities at the time the program was launched?

The second question is:

What are the contextual factors that have facilitated or limited the actions of the PAPS in the development of the capacities of the partners?

The main enabling factors are:

- The high priority of the Desarrollo Integral con coca in the government strategy and the very important role of the EU-Bolivia partnership in supporting such a policy
- The high degree of organization and the bargaining power of the institutions, partners and beneficiaries
- The independence and autonomy of dialogue, both between the government and donors, and between the government and the end-beneficiaries. Furthermore, the quality of the leadership displayed by the Government's counterparts is improving
- The promotion of values of equity and inclusion in the State apparatus
- The existence of a concerted sector strategy among the stakeholders, along with heightened inter-sectoral coordination
- Continued support from the EC which tends to generate the necessary tools and results that facilitate implementation of PAPS.

The main limiting factors are:

- The beneficiaries' lack of a comprehensive vision (macro) in project proposals to PAPS. It is believed that this challenge is currently being addressed but has not yet been fully resolved
- Lack of sufficient policy coordination between the policy against drug trafficking and the policy for integral development with coca
- Negative impact of the conflicting individual interests of territorial and political stakeholders, both on the distribution and definition of competences, and on the role of sectoral institutions.
- Incipient development of civil service careers and recognition of their merit
- The lack of coordination at regional level
- Prevalence of international cooperation in financing the sector.

ASSESSMENT OF THE CAPACITY-OUTPUTS

The underlying initial question is:

What have you learned through your interaction with PAPS?

This list of capacity outputs has been subdivided into individual and organizational items. Those presented below are the most important to the process of learning to interact with PAPS, according to the various stakeholders.

Individual Capacities

Personal and Relational:

- Greater realization and appreciation of personal career development and its impact on making one more competitive
- Dialogue, cooperation between the State and civil society organizations
- Increased capacity to develop sectoral and regional agreements

Organizational and Managerial:

- Increased knowledge of resource management, planning, monitoring and evaluation
- Results-based management
- Management of indicators
- Process visioning (from conception to final customer)
- Knowledge of the region: production potential, future prospects, difficulties

Organizational Capacities

Relational:

- Negotiation and coordination with international cooperation bodies, the government, etc.
- Capacity to interact with stakeholders in the formulation of strategies (ownership and participation)
- Consultation
- Teamwork

Organizational and Managerial:

- Capacity for organizational restructuring and for improving the definition of responsibilities for each department or unit
- Increased capacity to acquire local funding through plans that are well publicized and understood by the general public
- Transparency
- Planning capacity and strategic capacity
- Increased use of national norms and processes
- Capacity to track administrative processes

ASSESSMENT OF THE CAPACITY-OUTCOMES

The five categories into which the capacities are grouped do not represent independent blocks. Rather, they are interrelated, together forming a unique capacity-learning process. It is also important to recognize that, in addition to the actions undertaken via the PAPS, other institutional initiatives are also involved in this field.

Synthesized observations by category of capacity:

Ability to Survive and Act appears to be more individual and acts as an organizational impetus to the same end. Furthermore it is recognized that the ultimate beneficiaries (associations of municipalities) have a great capacity for initiative that contributes to rapprochement and interaction.

However, the Ability to Achieve Results is more organizational and includes factors such as risk prevention, use of indicators, and setting of targets - and the presence of good staff skilled at executing projects without conditions; also increased autonomy of beneficiaries in presenting and formulating proposals and in their technical execution.

Ability to Relate capacities are simultaneously developed at individual and organizational levels. In terms of valuing the community network the use of the "community liaison" is an approach that has recently become institutionalized throughout the rest of the State apparatus.

Ability to Self-Renew is seen as a predominantly individual category. The importance of evaluations or assessments prior to decision-making stands out as a key factor. Finally, the importance of the capacity of beneficiaries to correct and reorient the allocation of resources must also be stressed.

Ability to Link Strategic and Operational Levels is a more organizational category of capacity and consists of a capacity for greater transparency and accountability, coherence between national and sectoral policies, and synergies and organizational learning through experiential learning

CORRELATION BETWEEN CAPACITY-OUTPUTS AND CAPACITY-OUTCOMES

Studying the correlation between capacity-outputs and capacity-outcomes helps complete an understanding of the learning process in capacity development to which PAPS has contributed. The paths

followed by the various capacity outputs and their combined significance as components of a capacity outcome make it possible to measure quantitatively the impact of the program.

The statistical results of the correlation analysis seek to outline the impact of PAPS on capacity development as a set of general trends within a complex and varied phenomenon. Indeed the learning processes are not necessarily sequential and cannot be boiled down to a simple statistic. Rather, it is important to remember that each individual participant in the PAPS is distinct, possessing a particular set of characteristics and traits that contribute to a complex overall system that is itself unique and difficult to replicate. However despite this complexity we believe that this statistical exercise helps to define and prioritize the flow from outputs to outcomes. This analysis is accomplished by identifying the most significant correlations within the capacity categories.

The capacity output of consultation, considered to be a capacity of organizational nature, has been selected as having the most significant influence on the development of capacity outcomes. It is interesting to note that the second most important capacity is that of dialogue, identified as a capacity pertaining to the area of individual learning

These two capacities are of different scope, yet both are relational in nature. These abilities, in addition to being complementary, are also necessary for the application and development of the government's overall strategy in general, and in the sector in particular. We can therefore say **that the PAPS has contributed largely to the development of relational capacities of a strategic nature for the implementation of government policies.**

The statement above is reinforced by the fact that administrative and managerial capacities occupy third and fourth places in order of importance.

The capacity outcome most developed by the variety of capacity outputs is "rapprochement to the beneficiary." It belongs to the first of the five categories of outcome: Ability to Survive and Act. This lines up with what we have seen previously (the relational capacity outputs are those most strongly correlating with the development of outcomes). This impact of the PAPS is underlined not only as a logical continuation of the learning process, but also for having facilitated a **qualitative professional leap forward by generating an increased capacity for autonomy when interacting with the beneficiaries.** Furthermore, the capacity to "build awareness and generate confidence" among the beneficiaries ranks fourth in importance and belongs to the Ability to Relate category.

The PAPS contributes to development of capacity outcomes at the Ability to Achieve Results level, but also goes beyond them, affecting all the other categories with the exception of Ability to Self-Renew. The latter, albeit mentioned, is not significant.

CONCLUSIONS

The activities and interactions generated by the PAPS between the different stakeholders have had a significant impact on capacity development, at both individual and organizational levels. The main factors behind this positive impact are:

Proper design of the program which, through its Technical Assistance component and the outputs and induced outputs that it planned to generate, aimed to encourage improvement of capacities, particularly those pertaining to the realm of greater inter-agency and inter-sectoral consultation and coordination. This is coupled with the fact that capacity development is seen as an ongoing learning process and, in the light of this, the PAPS further encourages a process of institutional support and capacity building that was launched many years ago by the EC in Bolivia through various programs aimed at supporting the sector.

The context in which the PAPS exists is highly conducive to its further growth and development. First, it ties in with the Government's evolving development strategy in the coca sector. The latter strategy grants the government greater autonomy from donors, and increased leadership in defining and implementing the strategy. Second, it feeds on the actions of those individuals and structures that are highly motivated to implement the sectoral strategy. Third, it can be said that the PAPS has favoured a qualitative leap in professional capacity, facilitating increased professional autonomy in interactions between multiple stakeholders (institutions or beneficiaries). This is doubly important as these types of relational, consultation, and dialogue capacity are precisely those which can, and indeed do, influence implementation of government policies. Finally, administrative and managerial capacities have also been strengthened by the program and these, organizational in nature, also have a direct impact on achieving strategic objectives.

LESSONS LEARNT FROM THE BOLIVIA CASE STUDY

The Bolivian case study introduced a number of innovations in the RAC procedure, although probably not all can be generalized and assumed as standard. As mentioned, the Bolivian counterparts' willingness to participate and commit since the first mission has been particularly strong.

Moreover the introduction of specific participatory tools for information gathering and analysis has elicited the interest of the Bolivian counterparts, since the exercise appeared particularly useful to the participants for increasing their awareness of the effects the project has had on their individual and organizational capacity development paths.

a. Simplification of the terminology.

The Bolivia case has shown that the distinction between competences and capacities is difficult to grasp during the exercise. The team has suggested suppressing the use of the word "competences" and referring instead to "capacity outputs" and "capacity outcomes". This change has been incorporated into the standard version of the RAC.

To explain the transition through different stages, the term "learning" has been introduced to explain the open individual and organizational processes – with a past, a present, and a future – within which the program operates, strengthening and valuing acquired knowledge or introducing new knowledge. Capacity development is nourished by the learning process and, as such, the flow from capacity outputs to capacity outcomes is likewise a process that takes time.

b. Coaching sessions.

The capacity outputs and capacity outcomes were identified by the stakeholders themselves during individual interviews, group interviews and group-coaching sessions.

Collective coaching was addressed to a group of people within the same institution that is part of or collaborates with the activities of the programme.

The coaching sessions were carried out after an individual interview with the person in charge of the relevant institution. The terms of the coaching were agreed with him.

c. Workshop.

Organisation of an in-depth half-day working session with all stakeholders (governmental counterparts, technical assistance team, EU Delegation staff) for analysis of the opportunity framework and of the capacity outputs and capacity outcomes. The workshop was therefore less a dissemination exercise than a joint exercise for analysis of individual and organisational capacity development experiences gained through interaction with the PAPS.

The workshop allowed confirmation, updating and ranking of the list of individual and organisational capacity outputs and capacity outcomes identified during the coaching sessions.

The workshop concluded with identification, by the same stakeholders, of the main correlations between capacity outputs and capacity outcomes.