1-1-2006

Governing through community: The UNDP's capacity 2015 initiative.

Heather Graydon
University of Windsor

Governing Through Community: The UNDP's Capacity 2015 Initiative

By

Heather Graydon

A Thesis
Submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research
Through Sociology and Anthropology
In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for
The Degree of Master of Arts at the
University of Windsor

Windsor, Ontario, Canada
2006

© 2006. Heather Graydon

Canada

...The whole mechanism [of development] is...a
'mushy mixture' of the discursive and non-discursive.
.... Systems of discourse and systems of thought are
thus bound up in a complex causal relationship with
the stream of planned and unplanned events that
constitutes the social world

-Ferguson 1994: 275-276

The Capacity 2015 Platform will be built upon this
new capacity development paradigm. It will assist
communities in developing their capacities to nurture
healthy local economies, societies and environments;
to effectively face the challenges of globalization; and
to derive the greatest possible benefit from actual and
emerging global trends, such as rapid changes in
information technologies. The platform will encourage
and empower people to take ownership of the processes
and decisions affecting their own lives

-Capacity 2015, 2004b: 2

iii

Abstract

Drawing on globalization and governmentality literature, this thesis examines how the United Nations Development Programme's Capacity 2015 platform creates relations of global governance. This initiative for capacity development implements advanced liberal discourses of community through the imaginaries, roles, responsibilities and micro-macro connections it produces. Networks and partnerships for knowledge exchange between communities, countries and international agents are the basis for its developmental strategies. While Capacity 2015 intends to alleviate poverty, it utilizes primarily market-oriented approaches toward integrating communities into the global economy. Consequently this initiative neglects power relations contributing to poverty and social inequality. More than anything, the Capacity 2015 programme appears to operate as a social technology for advanced liberal governance, emphasizing the creation of networks and connections between participants. Applying the perspectives of Wendy Larner and William Walters (2004b) and Barbara Cruikshank(1994), I outline Those governmental linkages Capacity 2015 fosters through its programmes, policies and practices.

Acknowledgements

I great fully acknowledge the generous financial support of the Canadian Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada through the Canada Graduate Program's Master's Scholarships. I extend heartfelt thanks to my supervisor Dr. Suzan Ilcan, second reader Dr. Glynis George and third reader Dr. Steven Palmer for all their wisdom, encouragement and patience throughout the writing of this thesis. I would also like to thank my family and friends for their support over the course of my post secondary education.

v

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

The United Nations Development Program (the UNDP) has emerged as an international network of the United Nations dedicated to "connecting countries to knowledge, experience and resources" (United Nations Development Programme, 2006b). In 2002, as part of its mandate to implement the Millennium Development Goals[1], the UNDP's Capacity Development Group launched their Capacity 2015 information and learning network. The stated mission of this 'network of networks' or 'co-ordination and implementation mechanism,' is to build upon pre-existing human, institutional and societal capacities in order to alleviate poverty and stimulate social and economic development (Capacity 2015, 2005b; Capacity 2015, 2004b: 6; Capacity 2015. 2004a). According to Capacity 2015 sources, a focus upon aligning policy and practice objectives in order to scale up resource capacities at individual, local, national and regional levels will contribute to overall sustainable development benefiting citizens in many nations.

To this end, Capacity 2015 acts as a decentralized knowledge and information sharing network and database for individuals, institutions and countries to use. Its purpose is to "ensure that lessons learned in one place will rapidly be shared and used, and that any partners will have the support needed to develop strategies and plans, drawing on a world of experience" (Capacity 2015, 2004a). Through its various networks, Capacity 2015 implements standardizing best practices and good governance policies, and coordinates aid money and resources toward pre-defined developmental

---

[1] The Millennium Development Goals broadly encompass the following: 1) Eradicating extreme poverty and hunger; 2) Achieving universal primary education; 3) Promoting gender equality and empowerment of women; 4) Reducing child mortality; 5) Improving maternal health; 6) Combating HIV/AIDS, malaria and other diseases; 7) Ensuring environmental sustainability; and 8) Developing a global partnership for development (United Nations, 2006).

1

goals (Capacity 2015, 2002; Capacity 2015, 2004b). Overall, Capacity 2015 can best be conceptualized as a UNDP umbrella initiative encompassing many other individual partnership-based initiatives for capacity development. This platform works as a network to enlist and connect interested communities, national governments, organizations, institutions, corporations and agencies as participants. These participants in turn are intended to forge their own partnerships and networks for capacity development using Capacity 2015's knowledge sharing systems, resources and best practices.

While Capacity 2015's stated purpose is to facilitate ecologically sustainable economic development, alleviate poverty and enable and empower the poor, I argue that it in fact negates these aims. Through the assemblage of programmes, policies and practices comprising it, Capacity 2015 erodes the sovereignty of nation states and mobilizes communities to govern themselves and their localities in an advanced liberal sense. This governance is premised upon the ideals of modernity, economic-based human rights and liberal democratization (United Nations Development Programme Regional Centre in Bangkok, 2006a). Within Capacity 2015, poor communities and localities are socially constructed as independent and cut off from economic and social relations. They are deemed to be in need of empowerment so that they may integrate themselves into the global economy through market-based approaches. In this manner Capacity 2015 oversimplifies the causes of poverty. Its' collapsed, universalistic solutions to what are in actuality dimensions or facets of globalization reproduce a logic of global economy. Capacity 2015's inability to acknowledge or engage alternative narratives and interpretations of globalization lead it to espouse unlikely solutions. The fact that often to their detriment, most poor communities and localities are already connected to the global

2

economy and enmeshed in power relations with numerous internal and extra-local agents is neglected[2]. Because Capacity 2015 ignores these pre-existing power relations, it inadvertently tends to responsibilize communities as having the sole capacity to end their own poverty.

The present critical discourse analysis uncovers how as a development initiative Capacity 2015 operates simultaneously as a technique of advanced liberal social control and global governance. As will be discussed below, Capacity 2015 governs through the complexity of hybrid discourses it produces. These discourses overlap and interconnect, yet also seemingly disjuncture. Despite such contradictions and points of divergence, Capacity 2015's discursive programmes, policies and practices inscribe particular roles and responsibilities onto communities. By instrumentalizing citizens as community members, and harnessing their collective agency as exercised in the localities of their daily lives, Capacity 2015 intends to stimulate the economic growth of poor nations and regions. It shapes the agency and choices of participants and sets parameters within which these may unfold. These boundaries of inclusion and exclusion reproduce advanced liberal rationalities of decentralized government, self-sufficient citizens and responsibilized communities. The subjectivities Capacity 2015 fosters among participants are those of entrepreneurs with the ability to innovate, monitor, adapt and launch flexible profit generating ventures within the global economy.

---

[2] Numerous critiques have illustrated how nations and populations (especially within the South) have become increasingly excluded and exploited through social relationships formed via the global economy, international development and neoliberalism. Case studies detail that these nations have often been subjected to punitive financial loan and debt repayment schemes, severe restructuring and privatization adjustments and forfeiture of ownership of national resources (Escobar, 1995; Lewellen, 2002). Industrial development has frequently entailed disruptions to social life, cultural patterns and previously established means of government. The spread of advanced liberal economic practices has integrated nation states all over the globe into restrictive conditions whereby external foreign agents have more control over resource use, commodity production and consumption and policy-making than actual citizens (Hubbard and Miller, 2005; Kiely, 2005).

3

The central focus upon capacity development which Capacity 2015 invokes at local, national and regional levels likewise implements advanced liberal governance. This occurs through how capacity development is intended to be undertaken and maintained from the grassroots up, as opposed to past models of top-down, outside intervention. Within the Capacity 2015 platform, strategic processes for enabling capacity development include: networking; public and private sector partnerships; technology transference; knowledge and information sharing; and entrepreneurship[3]. Social realities are created through how these discourses are together produced, interpreted and responded to (Parker, 1992 as cited in Phillips and Hardy, 2002: 3; Fairclough, 1992: 269). Theorists posit that discourses do not merely reflect reality, but rather operate in combination so as to give rise to particular dynamics of power and social realities (Phillips and Hardy, 2002; Wood and Kroger, 2000).

I contend that through how its processes for capacity development unfold, Capacity 2015 creates new local, national, regional and global power relations. As a network, it forges relationships between community members, governments, voluntary and private sector agents, other communities, professional development organizations and financial institutions. These networks of social relations in fact function as regimes of governance.

The present study is a discursive analysis of Capacity 2015's programmes, policies and practices, as outlined in UNDP documents and resource materials. The conceptual framework combines previous theoretical critiques of global governance and studies of

---

[3] For this study I take the term discourse to encompass interrelated: practices; policies; programs; processes; strategic goals; conceptualizations; technologies; networks; relationships; patterns of communication and knowledge sharing; agency; identities; and other forms of knowledge production (e.g. Foucault, 1991, 1989: 3-85; Fairclough, 2005; Prichard 2002; MacDonald, 2003; Perren and Jennings, 2005; Fairhurst and Putnam, 2004; Chiapello and Fairclough, 2002).

4

how advanced liberal rationalities reconfigure nations, communities, civil society, the private and public sectors and geographic spaces. Capacity 2015 provides a compelling case study due to the fact it operates as a global initiative for capacity development by purposively engaging and coordinating communities, localities, countries and regions. The purpose of the current research therefore is to critically examine the multiple cross-cutting and inter-connected relations of governance arising from the Capacity 2015 platform.

Based on my examination of this initiative and its unique strategic processes, I conclude this initiative contributes to regimes of global governance. More specifically, Capacity 2015 re-organizes (or produces new imaginaries of) communities, localities, nation states and regions as interconnected social and geographic spaces. According to Larner and Walters (2004b), these spaces become re territorialized or rearranged into 'geo economic' relations (508). This initiative's attempts to democratize the global economy for the poor world-wide to participate in are unrealistic and replicate the problems that made past development initiatives ineffective. That is, by neglecting non market-oriented approaches, mentalities and agency, Capacity 2015 ultimately fails to address the very power relations that contribute to poverty.

Paradoxically, this initiative employs a seemingly open-ended, flexible and organic approach that mobilizes the possibilities of opportunity, choice, agency, freedom and innovation while simultaneously restricting these. The freedom of agency and choice (as well as the formation of networks and partnerships) are oft cited governmental strategies within advanced liberalism. An analysis of governance within the context of advanced

5

liberalism is concerned with examining how subjects are compelled to think and behave. According to Rose (1999), contemporary studies in governing or governmentality:

> ...do not seek to describe a field of institutions, of structures, of functional patterns or whatever. They try to diagnose an array of lines of thought, of will, of invention, of programmes and failures, of acts and counter-acts...[S]tudies undertaken from this perspective draw attention to the heterogeneity of authorities that have sought to govern conduct, the heterogeneity of strategies, devices, ends sought, the conflicts between them, and the ways in which our present has been shaped by such conflicts (21).

For the above reasons, discourse analysis is the most practical methodology to apply in this study. It permits one to trace how the various practices and other forms of knowledge production within Capacity 2015 potentially shape thought, choice and agency (e.g. Milller, 2001). Further, it permits researchers to account for the fact that vacuous, shifting complexities or systems of hybrid discourses contribute to governance (Raco, 2005; Higgins and Lockie, 2002; Schofield, 2002). This is particularly significant in the case of Capacity 2015 as it appears to operate exactly as a vague and vacuous complexity of hybrid discourses. Finally, discourse analyses are subjective social constructions whereby the researcher draws upon their personal knowledge, insight, and opinions to theorize the multifaceted ways in which discourses may connect, converge and diverge (Phillips and Hardy, 2002: 61). The researcher may articulate and reflect upon the narratives and discourses their sample materials point to, based on what is included within and excluded from these sources (Foucault, 1989, 62-70; 1990, 17-35; Escobar, 1995: 5, 39).

The picture having emerged of Capacity 2015 based on those UNDP sources (on-line publications and materials) examined herein is that of a collection of hybrid

6

discourses which reproduce the very goals of advanced liberal governance. Capacity 2015 as an umbrella initiative invites communities, governments, civil society and private and public sector agents to design and participate in their own capacity development initiatives. It provides the means of connecting these groups and agents to one another, so that they may use their own creativity, analytical judgment, resources and agency to address poverty and other problems of globalization. Capacity 2015 does not so much create solutions, as it does provide the opportunities for participants, within partnerships, to formulate and implement their own concrete solutions. By focusing upon networks for knowledge, experience and resource exchange, and by emphasizing capacity development, Capacity 2015 simultaneously 'empowers' and responsibilizes localities and countries to self-develop by way of their own ideas, resources and strategic solutions. A Capacity 2015 source explains, "local and national actors need to achieve ownership, defining their own needs and implementing their own solutions" (Capacity 2015, 2004b: 5). This dynamic is comparable to Larner's (2005, 2000) concept of 'hybrid neoliberalisms', which refers to the fact that advanced liberalism has not unfolded universally or monolithically across regions and localities. Rather, advanced liberal rationalities and discourses manifest differently across localities depending upon their individual historic, cultural, economic, political and social circumstances. In the case of the Capacity 2015 network, nations state governments propose capacity development initiatives and Capacity 2015 network and participants agree to support those undertakings (See Appendix A).

The UNDP sources on Capacity 2015 are vague with regard to specific details of how the network actually operates, and in terms of how it is actively involved with

participants. Notably, what these sources do include are the central Capacity 2015 goals and strategic ideals, as well as descriptions of participant partnerships and projects. The discourses which these Capacity 2015 materials convey exclude alternative forms of political economy, negative interpretations and experiences of globalization and presume a state of non-conflict between communities, community members and governments. Those discourses they are inclusive of highlight rationalities of citizens and governments becoming empowered to participate in a democratized global economy. These groups are socially constructed as advanced liberal subjects who can attain development, ecological sustainability, social equality, justice and global peace through networking and partnering for capacity development.

The remainder of this paper explores the multiple ways in which the Capacity 2015 initiative operates as an advanced liberal technique of social control. Specifically, it examines the new social meanings that have come to be attached to communities, localities and regions, and how the field of international development has re-aligned to constitute citizen agency, knowledge, choice and imaginary as the central loci of development. Within the contexts of this new global developmental paradigm and advanced liberalism, the onus for development has shifted onto citizens and communities.

ADVANCED LIBERALISM AND GOVERNING THROUGH COMMUNITY

Of particular significance for this study, the decline of social welfarism in industrialized nations is associated with diverse discursive re-constructions of community, citizenship and civil society (e.g. Berner and Phillips, 2005; Raco, 2005; Triantafillou and Nielsen, 2001). Social roles, identities and responsibilities have come to be re-inscribed onto each of these concepts through various practices, policies and

8

programs. Rose (1999: 137-166) and Dean (1999a), among others, characterize this as part of the new rationality of governance termed advanced liberalism.

Shifts toward decentralized government, deregulated national economies, privatization of public services and globally mobile industries and capital have been accompanied by a simultaneous conceptual recasting of who has the power or capacity to govern, and how governance is to be effectively exercised. To achieve greater levels of economic efficiency and modernization, nation state and municipal governments have gradually moved away from the ideologies and practices of the welfare state, delegating more responsibility for service delivery and social benefit provision directly onto citizens. The term advanced liberalism refers to social, political and economic power relations (or manifold discourses) that make individuals and populations self-governing and self-sufficient.

As a centralized government authority with the capacity to manage, direct and provide for populations is considered less viable, communities, citizens and localities are held to be more effective (and inexpensive) objects to focus governing efforts around. For example, in July of 2005 John Ferguson Godfrey, then Canadian Minister of State announced Infrastructure Canada's 'New Deal for Cities and Communities' initiative. This programme was intended to "connect community-focused research, policies and initiatives across all federal departments, agencies and institutions so that they reinforce each other more coherently and help to achieve national goals" (Infrastructure Canada, 2004).

A theoretical framework positing how social control is exercised in multi-faceted ways through freedoms, choices, thought and conduct informs the present study. Drawing

9

from Foucault's writings on governmentality my line of inquiry focuses upon how knowledge production and other discursive practices re-invent citizens and communities as subjects and objects of governance (e.g. Foucault, 1989, 1980). It has been under the political economic nexus of advanced liberalism that governing through community has gained momentum. Community has been discursively conceptualized in many instances as a 'Third Way,' or separate sphere operating between governments and markets, having the potential to effectively ensure economic and social development (Price, 2003; Callinicos, 2001). For example, in Great Britain both the Thatcher and Blair administrations fostered the discourse of community as society, which individuals as citizens bear obligations to participate in and contribute to (Raco, 2005; Rose, 1999: 27, 138-140). In the United States such discourses of community were likewise implemented under the Reagan and Clinton administrations. In Canadian policy and practice, community has been strategically mobilized in the areas of Aboriginal self-governance, policing and restorative justice (Voyageur and Calliou, 2003; Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 2005; Indian and Northern Affairs Canada. 2002). Also within the Canadian context, community has been instrumentalized in initiatives for mental health and rural and urban economic re-development (Canadian Mental Health Association, 2003; Rural Development Institute, 2005).

Through multiple programs, policies and practices community members, civil society groups and other agents of the voluntary sector come to be incorporated into relations of governance. While such processes may vary in their strategic goals, or hold conflicting underpinning philosophies, what they most commonly share are tendencies to normalize expectations of: 1) predominantly market rule and state non-intervention into

10

economic processes (e.g. Schofield, 2002: 663-683; Higgins and Lockie, 2002: 419-428); 2) rolled back citizens' entitlement to social welfare; and 3) the responsibilization of communities, civil society and the private sector as providers (Berner and Phillips, 2005: 17-29; Rose and Miller, 1992).

Advanced liberal discourses of community typically require members to give to and care for one another. However, while people are encouraged to bear such responsibilities toward each other, they are simultaneously held to a similar standard of duty to provide for themselves as individuals. As governments are less obliged to ensure social security, an onus to not permit ones self to become in need of social assistance is displaced onto citizens. Rather than problematizing the status of work or industry in a region, poverty is now viewed more so as the fault of communities for not having invested, planned, generated sufficient income or managed risks properly. Segments of the population are redefined as either deserving or undeserving of assistance based on perceptions of improper conduct and bad choices on their part. In a paradoxical sense, mentalities of collective voluntarism and giving are fostered alongside those of economic competitiveness and individual responsibility. As a result, advanced liberal discourses which govern through community are seemingly contradictory and conflicting. Larner and Walters (2004a: 11-20) and Schofield (2002) propose that programmes, policies and practices which produce social constructions of community are assemblages of hybrid discourses. This is due to the fact that they often merge a number of different rationalities such as ecological sustainability, poverty alleviation, social justice, gender equity, empowerment and economic-based agency.

11

Despite that freedoms of choice and action are central tenets of advanced liberalism, communities and citizens are not so free as to be permitted to create entirely separate methods of governance, or alternative models of political economy. Rather, governance is exercised 'at a distance' through enabling and empowering communities to participate in existing political and economic relations (Rose and Miller, 1992). Specific governmental strategies are designed to engage citizens, community groups and other civil society agents in processes deemed to be necessary for their development. These strategies influence the thoughts and actions of individuals involved by including certain practices and forms of knowledge, while excluding others. Programs, regulatory policies, social practices and patterns of communication, interaction and knowledge production are in effect technologies of governance. Dean (1999b: 167-170) and Higgins and Lockie (2002) use this idea of social technologies to refer to the many governmental techniques which reproduce advanced liberalism.

Forms of conduct and subjectivities compatible with advanced liberal aims of governance conform to liberal democratic ideals of modernity and economic rationality. Therefore, characteristics encouraged among citizens and community members include economic entrepreneurship, self-sufficiency, innovation, investment and self-regulation (Abrahamsen, 2004; Higgins and Lockie, 2002). Within recent decades, discourses of community have predominantly unfolded within the field of development. Community-based initiatives for development in particular have become especially popular. These are planned and carried out so as to enhance the capacities of communities to alleviate their poverty. Such initiatives frequently involve the creation of self-owned and operated industries and wage employment, and self-delivered or privatized social services.

12

The uniqueness of community-based development is in how it is considered holistic, self-owned and guided, ecologically sustainable and culturally appropriate (Raco, 2005; Rubin, 2000). It is argued such a model for economic development is beneficial and liberating in that it enables communities to become more independent and self-controlled (e.g. Davis and Daly, 2004; Roseland, 2000; Gage and Hood, 1997). As a result, communities are thought to be made less economically dependent upon government, mobile industries and corporations that migrate across international boundaries. Due to the history of development failures involving outside intervention and planning, it is often supposed that community-based development projects provide a more effective, democratic forum for community members to run their own lives and localities. This community-based approach for development emphasizes that, more so than outsiders, community members themselves are the most suitable agents for achieving effective economic and social development. This is believed to be due to their unique perspectives derived from the experiences of living within their specific geographic and social localities (e.g. Rubin, 2000). Community-based development is also held up as the solution to problems of corrupt government, oppression and top-down governmental control. Overall, these characteristics of community-based development are compatible with the logic of devolved governmental power and the elimination of the social welfare state.

The means by which these types of initiatives seek to stimulate economic and social development likewise produces advanced liberal discourses of community. The logic of community-based development operates around natural and human resource[4]

---

[4] Those resources which Capacity 2015's seeks to develop and productively incorporate include: financial capital; work skills; knowledge and information; time; natural resources; existing institutions and

13

capacity building so that communities and countries as economic agents may both "face

the challenges" and "reap the benefits" of globalization (Capacity 2015, 2004b: 2;

Capacity 2015, 2002b: 5). This in effect responsibilizes communities for their own

economic success, livelihoods and well-being. A focus upon capacity building is

prevalent among both local and international development initiatives. Capacity building

frequently involves taking stock of the resources existing within a locality and assessing

how to best use these toward implementing developmental goals and generating income.

Within the context of Capacity 2015, the specific idea of 'capacity development', rather

than capacity building is used to highlight the perceived need to draw upon a localities'

or nation's pre-existing resources for initiating sustainable, self-induced development.

The UNDP defines capacity as:

> the ability of individuals, organizations and societies to
> perform functions, solve problems, and set and achieve
> goals. Capacity Development... entails the sustainable
> creation, utilization and retention of that capacity, in order
> to reduce poverty, enhance self-reliance, and improve
> people's lives
> (United Nations Development Programme, 2006a).

In this manner, a discourse is created wherein developmental processes are to be

controlled and maintained internally rather than by outsiders. Capacity 2015 similarly

makes targeted efforts for scaling up the capacities of institutions, individuals and groups

within a locality, as well as the capacities of local and national governments.

While community-based capacity development strategies are meant to be

community led, other agents and organizations collaborate in these initiatives. Local,

national and international governments, banks, financial institutions, corporations,

---

governmental networks; agencies and organizations; technology; cultural identities and values; social
networks, and finally, social relationships among community members.

14

businesses, voluntary and civil society groups, NGOs, professional development agencies and experts participate in community-based development with communities. These agents frequently contribute by providing access to capital, financial services, technology, information and markets which community members as economic actors would require. These partners also facilitate 'best practices' and 'good governance' strategies for achieving development goals. It is said this interaction and knowledge sharing creates synergies that enhance community capacity and strengthen both policy level and ground-up initiatives (United Nations Development Programme Capacity Development Group, 2005). At multiple levels, Capacity 2015 seeks to engage the "societal dimensions" of capacity development (United Nations Development Programme. 2003a). In this sense, rather than community capacity development initiatives being entirely community planned and led, the choices and actions of participants may be shaped by and restricted based upon the needs and agendas of partner agents (e.g. Bryant, 2002; Miraftab, 2004; Abrahamsen, 2004).

Partnering and networking with extra-local actors for community-based capacity building reproduces advanced liberal rationalities or 'regimes' of governance in a double sense. As discussed above, partnerships and networks may operate as technologies of governance because as spaces of social interaction, they set boundaries around how participants may exercise their choices and conduct. It is in this manner that social constructions of communities as responsibilized, self-governing and self-sufficient entities are discursively produced at local and national levels.

In a similar vein, Larner and Walters (2004a: 1-20; 2004b), Phillips and Ilcan (2004) and Salskov-Iversen, Hansen and Bislev (2000) have provided insightful accounts

15

on the theoretical concept of global governmentality. Their studies point to how localities and communities can be discursively incorporated into relations of governance at a global level through partnerships and processes of networking for capacity building. International aid organizations and professional development agencies often seek to form partnerships and networks among financial sector agents, governments, civil society groups and communities. By incorporating these actors and entities into strategies for capacity development, these processes create new global imaginaries of regions, or delineate new geographic and social spaces (e.g. Larner, 2005; Larner and Walters, 2002). Capacity 2015's programmes and practices are described as leading to "...the creation of spaces within which people can interact, [and] construct new realities out of the environment and circumstances in which they live..." (Capacity 2015 Africa Regional Coordination, 2005b: 1). In general, international capacity building development projects involve expansive world wide programs, policies and practices designed to reorganize countries, localities and communities into new regional and social relations. These often focus upon achieving global security and peace, sustainable development and poverty alleviation through building capacities and opening global markets. For example:

> Capacity 2015 will be implemented by developing active partnerships, supporting networking and the exchange of ideas, and by actively engaging in programmes and projects which encourage the development, retention and extension of existing capacity. It will use the process to support initiatives which promote both capacity development and projects which increase incomes and which link local communities to the global economy (Capacity 2015, 2005d).

16

International capacity building initiatives are technologies of governance which standardize and coordinate development practices. This is despite the fact that these initiatives are often expected to unfold differently across localities depending upon their individual circumstances. Larner and Le Heron (2004) refer to comparative standardization measures and practices for attaining idealized developmental milestones as 'global benchmarking' (212-232). Codifying and sharing local knowledge and experiences among different localities is one of Capacity 2015's central goals (Capacity 2015, 2005c). The platform utilizes "a heavy emphasis on local level implementation, but with adaptability for cross-learning between regional and global entities" (Capacity 2015, 2005b). Overall, international development initiatives, such as Capacity 2015, tend to re-work localities, countries and regions into nodal clusters and to link populations, governments and agents into flexible networks.

This study seeks to analyze how the many discursive programmes, policies and practices that comprise the UNDP's Capacity 2015 platform for development reproduce advanced liberal discourses of community. Examination of Capacity 2015 reveals that it operates as a complexity or assemblage of hybrid overlapping, converging and diverging discourses. These discourses serve as technologies of governance through how they re-configure and re-inscribe communities, nation state governments, professional development agents and regions across a global level. Capacity 2015's capacity enhancing strategies appear to govern by producing particular forms of agency, knowledge, mentalities and global imaginaries.

17

THE UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME'S CAPACITY 2015 PLATFORM

Capacity 2015 was officially launched in 2002 at the World Summit on Sustainable

Development in Johannesburg as a follow up to the UNDP's concluding Capacity 21

initiative[5]. Based on the "results, success, achievements, and lessons" of Capacity 21,

Capacity 2015 was designed to assist UN member states to use international aid more

effectively and to achieve the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). Its premise is

that synergies may be fostered by increasing resource capacities, networking and forging

public-private partnerships so that the poor may "reap the benefits from globalization and

meet or surpass the Millennium Development Goals" (Capacity 2015. 2002b :1). Besides

capacity development and knowledge and information sharing, Capacity 2015 fosters

decentralized local control and organic participatory stakeholder ownership of

developmental processes such as project experimentation, test piloting, monitoring,

evaluation and modification (Capacity 2015, 2005b; The United Nations Development

Programme, 2003a). Where it is applied, the platform seeks to "address capacity

constraints that cut across or underlie the traditional sectoral divisions of economic and

social activity" (United Nations Development Programme, 2003a).

The present case study primarily focuses upon how the regimes of governance or

relations of power that emerge from Capacity 2015 derive largely from how this

initiative's programmes, policies, and practices produce networks. Capacity 2015 forges

---

[5] Capacity 21 was established as a trust fund to support sustainable development methodologies and capacities after the 1992 Earth Summit in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil. Operating in over 75 countries until the year 2000, its aim was to implement Agenda 21, the Earth Summit's official plan of action for sustainable development (United Nations Development Programme Regional Centre in Bangkok, 2006b). Agenda 21 sought "to build the capacity of local institutions to integrate economic, social and environmental issues into the development process at the national, provincial and local levels" (Capacity 2015, 2002b: 11).

18

networked-based social relationships and produces discursive networked linkages of socio-geographic spaces. These networks connect and coordinate communities, localities, countries and regions into "South-South, East-East, local-local and local-global partnerships" (Capacity 2015, 2005b). The decentralized network-like structure that Capacity 2015 operates via also connects communities, localities, national governments and regions into new imaginaries and discursive regional spaces. Capacity 2015's regional centres are located in Bangkok, Beirut, Bratislava, Dakar and Panama City. Its main headquarters are located in New York. At present, there are active Capacity 2015 offices in over 30 countries in Africa, the Arab States, Asia, Eastern Europe and Latin America (Capacity 2015, 2005c).

Of Capacity 2015's social networks, it is apparent that these local to global connections (regimes) are integral to its developmental strategies. According to one Capacity 2015 source:

> [l]ocal and national actors…include communities and
> their informal representatives, local and national authorities,
> entrepreneurs, media, community-based organizations and
> other civil society groups and academia. Regional and
> global actors… include bi- and multilateral development
> agencies and banks, information networks and global
> foundations" (Capacity 2015, 2004b: 6).

Network-based social relations and partnerships are fostered across local, national, regional and global levels so as to enhance capacities in an effort to stimulate local and national development. Part of the rationale of forging partnerships for knowledge sharing is that these are considered to be cost-effective strategies reducing the likelihood of duplicating efforts (Capacity 2015, 2005a). It is important to note this capacity development of existing public and private institutions, communities, governments and

19

networks actually creates relations of governing at a distance (e.g. Rose and Miller, 1992). This is due to the fact that these agents are enlisted and supported as resources to carry out, monitor and evaluate the impacts of Capacity 2015's practices, programmes and policies. Dynamics of exclusion and inclusion manifest through these processes, as participating actors and institutions are influenced to conform to developmental criteria and standard protocol outlined by Capacity 2015. This is similar to many other empowerment initiatives in that "...the political field of intervention is highly structured in advance of the actual inclusion of the beneficiaries in the project phase" (Triantafillou and Nielsen, 2001: 74).

In order to ensure that Capacity 2015's predefined procedures and goals would be adhered to, the first phase of the initiative involved extensive preparations and dialogues with partner organizations and regional and local actors. The purpose of this stage was to foster country and institutional management of Capacity 2015's processes and programmes. It disseminated and consolidated the findings of Capacity 21 into Capacity 2015's practices. The second phase has revolved around implementation of the initiative within localities and countries. The third phase is described as an 'exit strategy' (Capacity 2015, 2005d). This last phase points to an expectation on the part of the UNDP that Capacity 2015 will succeed to the extent that poor communities and nations will be entirely self-sufficient and self-providing as economic actors. It constructs a discourse that local, institutional and national capacities may be developed to the point that citizens and communities will be fully enabled to lift themselves out of poverty and maintain that state of well-being without need of external support.

20

Capacity 2015 is administered by a unit within the UNDP that functions as a secretariat and technical support agency. In partnership with other organizations, this unit controls Capacity 2015's funding, manages the network, advises nations on how to implement Capacity 2015 programmes and ensures that partner agencies, communities and governments participate and contribute according to their ability. Its headquarters in New York serve as a knowledge database for all Capacity 2015 data and related information gathered from around the globe. Participants can use this on-line source to access the UNDP's *Toolkit for Localizing the Millennium Development Goals* (2005) and other 'how- to' development materials. Partners in Capacity 2015 are required to agree to:

> take part in designing and implementing a rigorous programme of participatory monitoring and evaluation, following methodologies jointly defined by Capacity 21 and UNDP-Global Environment Facility, including regular scheduled case studies, surveys/interviews and monitoring indicators" (Capacity 2015, 2004a).

Examined through the lens of governmentality, it is clear that Capacity 2015's design and implementation does not allow for agency that is incompatible with, or unrelated to its own pre-conceptualized strategic aims. Funding, resources and other means of support are invested solely toward the aforementioned goals of capacity enhancement, knowledge sharing, project ownership and management, innovativeness and entrepreneurship. Effective participation in the global economy is held up as the key criteria for eradicating poverty and inequality. Networks and specifically aligned linkages between communities, localities, nations and regions are viewed as the only viable solution. Increased capacity to monitor, maintain and be responsible for these pre-conceived strategic undertakings is deemed to be empowering for participating

21

communities and nations (Capacity 2015, 2005d). The monitoring, evaluation,

participation, strategic practices and comparative standardization (global benchmarking)

required of participants in effect confines their choices and actions.

According to theories on globalization and governmentality put forward by Dean

(2004: 53) and Rojas (2004: 105-115), Capacity 2015 fits the definition of a programme

for global governance, in that it attempts to induce a particular global system of order.

That is, its purpose is to democratize and permit equal access to existing global systems.

Capacity 2015 seeks to create an advanced liberal global economy that implements the

MDG's, sustainable development and Multilateral Environmental Agreements, but which

also addresses gender inequity, cultural and ecological preservation, human rights abuses,

political, economic and social marginalization, risk management, and service provision.

The discursive analytical approach highlights the extent to which these diverse and

potentially incompatible and conflicting goals are lumped together within Capacity 2015.

According to one publication "the platform will support capacity development at the

individual, institutional and societal levels, emphasizing gender equality" (Capacity 2015,

2004b:7). Another explains that Capacity 2015:

> will assist communities in developing their capacities
> to nurture healthy local economies, societies and
> environments; to effectively face the challenges of
> globalization; and to derive the greatest possible benefit
> from actual and emerging global trends, such as rapid
> changes in information technologies. The platform will
> encourage and empower people to take ownership of the
> processes and decisions affecting their own lives
> (Capacity 2015, 2004b: 2).

The Millennium Development Goals themselves are strikingly far-reaching,

consolidating many facets of (or idealized aspirations for) well-being. It should be noted

22

that the sample of UNDP documents within the present study do not describe in detail how the Capacity 2015 network operates so as to facilitate capacity development or empower communities. How Capacity 2015 is implemented at local, national and international levels is not specified. Rather, the impression that one gains from reading these resources and publications is that of a media campaign advertising the possibilities of development and well-being; those potential developmental milestones that communities and nations could reach of their own accord, with the assistance of public and private sector agents. Consequently, one may interpret Capacity 2015 as a vacuous complexity or network of crisscrossing, open-ended discourses. Or, it may be considered as a conglomerate of local, national and international actors undertaking their own development initiatives and strategic solutions in partnerships. It is in this sense that Capacity 2015 appears as an overarching umbrella initiative. In fact, most of Capacity 2015's on-line resources provide links to their participant and partner project websites where one may read about those. For example, one may link to the "Development Gateway" programme which details the role of information technology within a number of development initiatives (Development Gateway, 2006). Or the Seed Initiative which is another multiple partner-based programme supporting small business enterprises in developing nations by providing access to micro-credit and micro-financing services. The Seed Initiative also brings communities and individuals together with private sector entities and corporations to address how service delivery needs may be reached through joint projects (Seed Initiative, 2006). According to its website:

> Through an international award scheme, intensive
> capacity-building activities and a research programme,
> the Seed Initiative will stimulate and build the capacity
> of entrepreneurial, nascent partnerships executing action

23

on the ground; create a conduit for investment in partnerships; disseminate good practice and lessons-learned from successful partnerships to inspire further new partnerships; and generate evidence-based research to assist policy makers

(Seed Initiative, 2006).

Capacity 2015's multiple objectives, as highly unrealistic and incompatible as they are, are also irreconcilable with market functions and dynamics of capital accumulation such as investment for profit and zero-sum gain (e.g. Brandt, 1995; Marx, 1906). From the standpoint of Capacity 2015 however these objectives "cannot be split nor can they be disconnected from the need to create an enabling global and national environment to achieve these goals in a coherent way" (United Nations Development Programme in Lebanon, 2006).

While Capacity 2015 as an initiative cannot conclusively or with certainty guarantee the outcome of such a successful global economic system, its discursive programmes, policies, practices and forms of knowledge do not require it to. The onus for how effective these processes may be is inscribed directly upon citizens, communities and governments within the boundaries of nation states. Their potential for success or failure rests upon how those actors choose to carry out their designated responsibilities and roles within Capacity 2015's suggested strategic framework. As a social technology of governance, Capacity 2015 obliges people to act in accordance with pre-conceived advanced liberal ideals, practices and rationalities pertaining to modernized development.

Similar to Barbara Cruikshank's (1994) findings of American community-based development programmes during the 1960's Capacity 2015 exercises governance by compelling citizens as community members to participate in existing political and economic systems. Capacity 2015 does not so much alleviate poverty and stimulate

24

development, as it does strive to enable or 'empower' participants to do so by targeting their capacities and abilities. In the UNDP context this community empowerment is viewed as both "a means and an end of human development" (United Nations Development Program, 2003b: x). In a sense, the Capacity 2015 initiative absolves itself of any responsibility to concretely contribute to social or economic development by delegating those roles to partners and participants who join. It acknowledges that how these strategic processes for development are to unfold will vary among localities and nations depending upon their individual economic and political circumstances, but aims to universally reproduce self-governing, self-providing citizens and communities.

The remainder of this study categorically traces in greater detail how communities, governments and other agents become coordinated in relation to one another, and inscribed with roles and responsibilities through the Capacity 2015 network. Beginning with the conceptual category of Community (Locality) and moving through those of National Government (Nation State) and International Partners (Countries and Agents), the various social and spatial micro-macro linkages that discursively instrumentalize communities within advanced liberal networks of global governance are articulated more in depth.

(i) COMMUNITY (LOCALITY)

Key to how it integrates localities into relations of global governance, Capacity 2015 claims to politicize collective community-based agency. This 'politicization' is notably grounded within a modernized governmental framework. A prevalent theme surrounding community unfolds wherein "...the administrative, the spatial and the social..." are merged (Berner and Phillips, 2005: 23). Or, in the words of Schofield (2002: 676) the

25

community becomes an administrative technology. Within the context of Capacity 2015, hybrid discourses of political activism, social mobilization and participatory democracy implement advanced liberal self-governance, economic rationalities and modernization (e.g. United Nations Development Programme Albania, 2005; United Nations Development Programme Regional Centre in Bangkok, 2006a; Schufton, 2005). Individuals as community members acting strategically within their localities are emphasized as the fundamental drivers, managers and loci of development. The combination of their personal and collective actions, attitudes, beliefs and perceived needs are abstractedly and concretely inscribed as development catalysts. Localities and living and work spaces become instrumental mechanisms in this regard.

The aim of capacity development in Capacity 2015's community centred methodology presupposes a need "to encourage and empower people to take ownership of the processes and decisions affecting their lives" (United Nations Development Programme in Lebanon, 2006). Local level capacity development efforts are said to permit community members to pursue "opportunities presented by the processes of globalization" (Capacity 2015, 2004a).

In these instances, community-based capacity development is reframed as a process of citizen democratic participation that reinvents a quasi-privatized, economic oriented, public space of the commons. Writing for the UNDP, Schuftan (2005) explains that capacity development processes for empowerment create "'political space' within which Assessment-Analysis-Action processes" can occur (1). Community members as rational, calculating actors are expected to observe, evaluate and undertake strategically planned courses of action to address their capacity development needs. These needs as described

26

within Capacity 2015 sources, most frequently pertain to goals of economic empowerment and self-governance. Citizens are expected to actively develop capacities and form partnerships in order to generate income in a continuous manner and achieve the MDGs. Both Capacity 2015 and one of its sub-network groups, Community Action 2015, emphasize a need for access to financial services and a "vibrant and widely-dispersed local micro-enterprise/private sector which fosters more equitable development and improves the quality of life of disadvantaged sectors of the population" (United Nations Development Programme Capacity Development Group, 2005).

In the Philippines, the Bangkok Capacity 2015 regional centre assists in small and medium enterprise development. In Cambodia it has contributed to community fisheries as part of an environmental management project there. Its work in Indonesia has facilitated that national government's participation in the Arafura and Timor Seas Experts Forum (ATSEF) and supported local government and community involvement in a private-sector initiated energy project (United Nations Development Programme Regional Centre in Bangkok, 2006c). The combination of individual and collective resource mobilization, knowledge exchange and strategic planning in capacity development, coupled with enterprise-generated capital, is partly intended to provide community services. The activities of "[m]anaging water, energy and biological resources, health services and sanitation" are expected to occur at the local level with national and global assistance (Capacity 2015, 2002a).

Structures, institutions, meeting places and information technology within localities are fundamental to community-based capacity development. The Capacity 2015 African regional centre relies upon, among other resources, churches, mosques, schools, women's

27

groups, community newsletters, radio stations, kiosk systems and tele-centres to engage communities in capacity development (Capacity 2015 Africa Regional Coordination, 2005a). Public use of these facilities, resources and technologies are perceived to enable democratic, transparent citizen guided governance. Interestingly, community-based capacity development, which is posited as empowering in that it permits communities to become self-governing and economically independent, is also idealized by some sources as a scaffold for lobbying national governments for social change.

Activities of the Capacity 2015 regional centre in Bangkok for instance include "fostering parliamentary development; strengthening electoral systems and processes;[and] supporting public administration and anti-corruption reform" (United Nations Development Programme Regional Centre in Bangkok, 2006a). Interestingly, the UNDP and Capacity 2015 designate communities and local governments as the key agents to push for national level policy and legislation changes. Development and policies in this sense are regarded as demand and need driven by citizens and arrived at through communicating that to higher level policy makers (United Nations Development Program Capacity Development Group, 2005; Development Co-operation Directorate and Development Assistance Committee, 2006: 4). Reforming policies and legislation at national levels so as to support community-based capacity development and devolved, decentralized local governance is viewed as critical to successful sustainable economic development and poverty alleviation (Capacity 2015, 2004a; Capacity 2015, 2005b, 2005c). For these reasons the mentalities, perceptions, attitudes and actions of policy makers at national levels also contribute to how communities and localities are integrated as self-governing subjects and objects within advanced liberal global governance.

28

(ii) NATIONAL GOVERNMENT (NATION STATE)

The Capacity 2015 platform places almost equal importance on the capacities of the developing nation states[6] and public sectors where it is to be implemented, as it does upon the capacities of localities. From Capacity 2015's standpoint, communities, civil society, local governments and national governments within a country need to share the same objectives. This requires a "two-way flow" of information sharing between localities and national governments (*Toolkit for Localising the Millennium Development Goals*, 2005: 11-12). Therefore, commitment of national governments to align their policies and resources toward achieving the MDG's, and supporting localities in their own development efforts is considered paramount. Within Capacity 2015's discursive processes the boundaries and distinctions between the local and the national blur. The two appear to become confused. For instance, capacity development is described as occurring "first and foremost at the local level" (Capacity 2015, 2005b: 2). The UNDP's *Toolkit for Localising the Millennium Development Goals* (2005) on the other hand takes the view that:

> ...national MDG strategies are generally regarded
> as having pre-eminent and overarching status, and
> ...local plans and local MDG strategies and targets
> are expected to 'nest within, and take very clear
> account of, the national level action frameworks (12).

The idea of country 'ownership' and country responsibility for Capacity 2015 projects and capacity development in general, are referred to virtually as often as locality and citizen ownership. In contrast to the above citation from the UNDP's *Toolkit* yet another Capacity 2015 source claims that:

---

[6] Capacity 2015 and other UNDP bodies use the term developing nations to refer to countries implementing United Nations affiliated development programs

29

> Progress at the country level thus depends on the
> local capacity to manage the reform process, and
> bring about reforms for which the national feels a
> sense of ownership and commitment
> (United Nations Development Programme. 2003a)

Discursive power relations appear wherein the developing nation state is expected to support communities, who are responsible for their own capacity development initiatives. At the same time, communities are considered to be the agents who shape national level policies for capacity development. Seemingly equal degrees of accountability and responsibility are delegated to national governments and localities for achieving capacity goals and for influencing each other. Despite these overlapping and ill-defined roles between countries and localities, there are some characteristics attributed directly to nation state governments.

In order for a developing country to join Capacity 2015, they must commit to enhancing national capacities. The country must have pre-established operating resources such as think tanks, NGO's and public and private sectors that are sufficiently able to tap into Capacity 2015's various networks (Development Co-operation Directorate and Development Assistance Committee, 2006: 4-5). There is a perceived need for these capacities to be strengthened and harmonized so that donor aid may be used as effectively and efficiently as possible so that resources are not diverted or efforts fragmented. One United Nations affiliated organization writes that national capacities and resources must "…allow mediation among the plurality of interests and constituents within the country, so that compromises and shared commitments can be arrived at" (Development Co-operation Directorate and Development Assistance Committee, 2006: 4). The Capacity 2015 platform creates a discursive expectation that participating communities, citizens,

30

civil society, public sectors and national governments cooperatively support one another and that they are united around the same objectives for capacity development.

Participating national governments must abide by the same rationalities as those constituting the MDG's. For example they must adhere to democratic rule, the rule of law and standards of human rights (including the right to development) as determined by United Nations agencies (United Nations Development Programme Regional Centre in Bangkok, 2006a). National governments must also demonstrate a mandate to "tackle corruption" and to invest in citizens' capacity development efforts (Capacity 2015, 2002b: 1).

Finally, developing nation states are encouraged to enact policies and legislation supporting advanced liberal community-based self governance. They bear responsibilities to contribute to decentralized local governance systems, local-level economies, privatized locally-owned services and to reform any "institutional bottlenecks" which hinder these (Capacity 2015, 2002b: 2; Capacity 2015, 2004a). Devolving governmental power away from centralized authorities to the local level is viewed as an important step toward reaching sustainable economic and local development. These proposed solutions regarding the nation state's role in development and poverty eradication parallel those aforementioned Third Way strategies advocated by governments in Canada, Great Britain and the United States (Raco, 2003; Callinicos, 2001). Capacity 2015's proposed solutions to poverty in essence promote the offloading of responsibility for service delivery, social support systems, employment and wage labour onto communities and localities.

The platform's programs, policies and practices discursively eliminate the distinctions between the local and the national as the former becomes re-inscribed as the

31

locus of governance and development. Civil society, the voluntary and private sectors and communities are held up as the more knowledgeable and more capable governing authorities than public sectors and national governments, which take on supportive roles. While many of Capacity 2015's strategies to maximize the impact and cost-effectiveness of aid, resources and capacities are targeted within the borders of a developing nation state, others attempt to reproduce that efficiency through regional and international linkages. This tendency to organize and manage international social and economic connections makes Capacity 2015 an initiative for global governance; it incorporates many different countries and international agents into idealized pre-conceived social relationships with one another.

(iii) INTERNATIONAL PARTNERS (COUNTRIES AND AGENTS)

As knowledge and experience sharing is the core of Capacity 2015's capacity development strategies, networks and partnerships are critical to ensuring widespread access to large volumes of such information. Those networks and partnerships which Capacity 2015 seeks to form may be conceptualized as socio-spatial re-configurations of geographic regions, countries and international agents. Participant countries are organized into clusters "based on the similarities in their economic, social and environmental conditions, and according to well-defined criteria" (Capacity 2015, 2005d). This is apparent in how Capacity 2015's networks (or its nodal centres) are categorized by region: Africa, Asia, The Arab States, Europe and the Common Wealth of Independent States, Latin America, and Small Island Developing States (The United Nations Development Programme, 2005).

32

The Small Island Developing States network includes islands in the Pacific, Caribbean, Atlantic, Indian Ocean, Mediterranean and Africa (United Nations Development Programme Small Island Developing States Network, 2006). In particular it is geared toward addressing natural disaster risk management and the perceived problems of small markets and the isolation of island states. All together, these socio-spatial configurations, premised around cost, time and resource effectiveness conform to Larner and Walter's (2004) descriptions of 're-territorialization' and 'geopolitical rationalities' (497-498, 500-501). These terms refer to how globalization is comprised of economic and political power relations arising from the combined social and geographic spaces of nation states and localities. Combining nation states and international agents into these social networks instills a system of management at the global level.

One of the guiding rationalities of Capacity 2015 is that integrating poor communities and nations into the global economy will contribute to increased global security. This is an incentive for donor countries and agencies to support Capacity 2015 and development initiatives (Capacity 2015, 2002b:1; Development Co-operation Directorate and Development Assistance Committee, 2006: 11). It is relevant to note that many of the international partners involved in Capacity 2015 are either organizations, programmes and branches within the United Nations or corporate bodies (see Appendix B). These agents share Capacity 2015's logic of maintaining existing markets, and expanding economic privatization into greater social and geographic areas (Miraftab, 2004). By investing knowledge, technologies, financial support and other resources, corporations form private-public partnerships and gain a stake and influence within capacity development initiatives. Communities and governments become consumers of

33

their products and services and assume contractual obligations to them (e.g. Seed Initiative, 2006).

CONCLUSION

As an initiative for capacity development, Capacity 2015 operates as a technology for global governance in that it seeks to create an advanced liberal global economic system. It attempts to democratize the existing global economy and make it accessible for the poor to participate in. Through its various programmes, policies and practices this platform creates new imaginaries and linkages between participating communities, localities, nation states and international agents. Despite its aims, Capacity 2015 falls short of addressing the actual exclusionary social, political and economic power relations that create poverty. Instead, Capacity 2015 proposes among its solutions to replace centralized nation state authorities with self-governing, self-sufficient communities and citizens who are enabled and empowered to attain their own development. The networked based linkages and partnerships it seeks to foster are in fact regimes that constitute governing from at a distance through how they include certain mentalities, practices and ways of knowing while excluding others.

Capacity 2015 excludes non-market based approaches to poverty alleviation and economic and social development, as well as those strategies which would problematize or disrupt the existing political and economic global order; the possibilities of protest, counter-narratives or revolution as a means of social change are erased (e.g. Klein, 2002, 2000; Conway, 2004). Within its context, the very ideas of social mobilization and advocacy are re-inscribed to refer to advanced liberal roles and responsibilities for communities. This initiative exercises governance through how it does not allow for

34

agency that is incompatible with its predefined strategic aims and goals. It discursively presupposes harmonious relationships between nations and their citizens, other countries and international agents. Positing that the global economy and global linkages are the only means to eradicate poverty, Capacity 2015 in effect discounts alternative narratives, critiques and negative experiences of globalization.

This 'network of networks' is perhaps best conceptualized as a complexity of hybrid discourses (e.g. Larner, 2005, 2000; Raco, 2005). Unrealistically, Capacity 2015 collapses diverse, conflicting and contradictory goals for social and economic development and participant well-being into its strategic aims. Due to the fact this initiative inscribes the choices, freedoms, attitudes, agency, capacities and localities of participants as the central mechanisms for development, people are inadvertently responsibilized to end their own poverty. Those nations and localities which do not choose to, or are not able to adhere to the United Nations pre-conceived ideals and strategies for development are subject to exclusion on this basis.

The drawbacks of using the present sample of UNDP Capacity 2015 source materials has been the fact that these have provided primarily positive and vague descriptions of the initiative, without any in depth explanation of how it has operated as a network linking participants, or how it has facilitated projects on the ground. Capacity 2015's on-line resources have for the most part provided links to partner agencies and projects subsumed under the Capacity 2015 initiative. The information contained within these resources demonstrates discourses and rationalities which are palatable and inspirational to middle to upper income earners in the North/West who represent the global minority. The idea of a democratized economy to which all may have access speaks to their

35

experiences of the social world. To gain a more comprehensive understanding of how Capacity 2015 itself works and the impacts that it has had would require a triangulation approach in order to compare and contrast a variety of sources, authors and perspectives beyond the present sample (Denzin and Lincoln, 2003: 8; Richardson, 2003: 517-519). A research methodology that combines interviews of Capacity 2015 workers and participating community members, discourse analyses of actual on-the ground policy and practice documents and observations of interaction between participants and partners would illustrate how this initiative crystallizes or takes shape within a locality (e.g. Kemedjio, 2002; Van Halen-Faber and Diamond, 2002). In other words, a combined technique drawing from many types of sources would more so reveal the nuanced and multi-faceted ways in which Capacity 2015 is implemented and the impacts it has.

Ultimately, Capacity 2015 points to how the field of development has shifted in recent decades. Processes for modernization which underscored the project of development at the end of the Second World War have become modified and adapted. International development agencies and organizations no longer claim to provide concrete results and answers. Rather, there is a move to provide access to information and knowledge sharing so that communities are enabled and empowered to undertake their own development. International aid organizations and agencies such as the United Nations Development Programme also tend to downplay their roles as leaders and experts, but compel participants to conform to predefined standards of protocol and conduct. It may be concluded that these organizations operate as technologies of governance. The case of Capacity 2015 reveals that social control is exercised through how development initiatives foster decentralized nation states and deregulated

economies, and through how they discursively mobilize communities to act as self-governing entities, responsible for their own poverty.

37

REFERENCES

Abrahamsen, R. 2004. "The power of partnerships in global governance." *Third World Quarterly*, 25(8): 1453-1467.

Berner, E. and B. Phillips. 2005. "Left to their own devices? Community self-help between alternative development and neo-liberalism." *Community Development Journal*, 40(1): 17-29.

Brandt, B. 1995. *Whole life economics: Revaluing daily life*. Gabriola Island, B.C.: New Society Publishers.

Bryant, R.L. 2002. "Non-governmental Organizations and Governmentality: 'Consuming' Biodiversity and Indigenous People in the Philippines." *Political Studies*, 50(2): 268-292

Callinicos, A. 2001. *Against the Third Way. Cambridge*, UK: Polity Press

Canadian Mental Health Association. 2003. *Mental Health Promotion: Train-the Trainers Manual*. on-line publication: http://www.cmha.ca/ttm/info.html; accessed 11.11. 05.

Capacity 2015 Africa Regional Coordination. 2005a. *The Capacity 2015 ILN*. UNDP Capacity 2015 Africa. on-line resource: http://www.capacity.undp.org/1; accessed 06.01.06.

Capacity 2015 Africa Regional Coordination. 2005b. *United Nations Development Programme Capacity 2015 Africa Local Level Integrated Information Systems Brief*. on-line publication: http://www.capacity.undp.org/indexAction.cfm?module=Library&action=GetFile&Doc mentID=5564; accessed 06.01.06.

Capacity 2015. 2005a. *Arab States: Informing, Learning, Networking Platform*. on-line resource: http://www.c2015as-iln.org/index.cfm?loc=Partners.html; accessed 29.03.06.

Capacity 2015. 2005b. *Capacity 2015 Information and Learning Network (ILN)*. United Nations Development Programme/Bureau for Development Policy. on-line publication: http://www.capacity.undp.org/indexAction.cfm?module=Library&action=GetFile&Docu mentID=4170; accessed 06.01.06.

Capacity 2015. 2005c. *Capacity 2015: Localising the MDGs. A partnership platform focused on capacity development at the local level to achieve the MDGs*. United Nations Development Program. on-line publication:

http://capacity.undp.org/indexAction.cfm?module=Library&action=GetFile&Document
AttachmentID=1510; accessed 06.01.06.

Capacity 2015. 2005d. *Capacity 2015: Program Implementation.* United Nations
Development Programme. on-line resource:
http://capacity.undp.org/index.cfm?module=ActiveWeb&page=WebPage&s=africaprogr
ammeimple; accessed 29.03.06.

Capacity 2015. 2004a. *Capacity 2015: Building capacity to benefit from globalization
and realize the Millennium Development Goals while achieving sustainable development.*
Partnerships for Sustainable Development. on-line resource:
http://webapps01.un.org/dsd/partnerships/public/partnerships/50.html; accessed 08.06.06.

Capacity 2015. 2004b. *Developing Capacities for Sustainable Communities.* United
Nations Development Program. on-line publication:
http://www.undp.org/biodiversity/biodiversitycd/CAPbrochure2015.pdf; accessed
06.01.06

Capacity 2015. 2002a. *Financial Information Engine on Land Degradation: Capacity
2015.* on-line resource: http://www.gm-unccd.org/FIELD/Multi/UNDPR/FR_2015.htm;
accessed 08.06.06

Capacity 2015. 2002b. "Local Results: A Global Challenge: Capacity Development to
benefit from Globalization and meet the MDGs to achieve Sustainable Development."
Joburg Information Kit. The United Nations Development Programme. on-line
publication: http://www.undp.org/wssd/docs/capacity2015-LocalResults-a-Global-
challenge.pdf; accessed 08.11.05.

Chiapello, E. and N. Fairclough. 2002. "Understanding the new management ideology: a
transdisciplinary contribution from critical discourse analysis and new sociology of
capitalism." *Discourse & Society,* 13(2): 185-208.

Conway, J. M. 2004. *Identity, Place, Knowledge: Social Movements Contesting
Globalization.* Halifax, N.S.: Fernwood Publishing.

Cruikshank, B. 1994. "The will to empower: technologies of citizenship and the war on
poverty." *Socialist Review* 23(4): 29-55.

Davis, H. and G. Daly. 2004. "From Community Government to Communitarian
Partnership? Approaches to Devolution in Birmingham." *Local Government Studies*
30(2): 182-95.

Dean, M. 2004. "Nomos and the politics of world order" in Larner W. and W. Walters
(eds) *Global Governmentality: Governing International Spaces.* Routledge Advances in
International Relations and Global Politics. London: Routledge: 40-58

39

_____1999a. "Basic Concepts and Themes." Chapter 1 in *Governmentality: Power and Rule in Modern Society*. London: Sage.

_____1999b. "Neo-Liberalism and Advanced Liberal Government" in *Governmentality: Power and Rule in Modern Society*. London: Sage.: 149-175.

Development Co-operation Directorate and Development Assistance Committee. 2006. *The Challenge of Capacity Development: Working Towards Good Practice*. DAC Network on Governance. DCD/DAC/GOVNET(2005)5/REV1. on-line publication: http://www.undp.org/oslocentre/docs05/OECD-DAC%20paper.pdf; accessed 13.06.06.

Denzin, N.K. and Y.S. Lincoln (eds.) 2003. "Introduction" in *Collecting and Interpreting Qualitative Materials*. Second Edition. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications: 1-45

Development Gateway. 2006. "Putting the internet to work for developing countries." on-line resource: http://www.developmentgateway.org/; accessed 13.06.06.

Escobar, A. 1995. *Encountering Development: The Making and Unmaking of the Third World*. Princeton Studies in Culture/Power/History. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press

Fairclough, N. 2005. "Discourse Analysis in Organization Studies: The Case for Critical Realism." *Organization Studies*, 26(6): 915-939

_____1992. "Intertextuality in Critical Discourse Analysis." *Linguistics and Education*, 4: 269-293.

Fairhurst, G.T. and L. Putnam. 2004. "Organizations as Discursive Constructions." *Communication Theory*, 14(1): 5-26.

Ferguson, J. 1994. *The Anti-Politics Machine: "Development," Depoliticization and Bureaucratic Power in Lesotho*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. As cited in Ted, C. Lewellen. 2002. *The Anthropology of Globalization: Cultural Anthropology Enters the 21st Century*. Westport, Connecticut: Bergin & Garvey: 81

Foucault, M. 1991. "Politics and the Study of Discourse." Chapter 2 in G. Burchell, C. Gordon and P. Miller (eds.). *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality*. Chicago: University of Chicago.

_____. 1990. *The History of Sexuality. Volume 1: An Introduction*. New York: Vintage Books.

_____. 1989. The Archaeology of Knowledge. London: Routledge.

_____. 1980. Power/knowledge: selected interviews and other writings, 1972-1977/ Michel Foucault. C. Burchell (ed). New York: Pantheon Books.

Gage, S. and R. Hood. 1997. *The CED Tool Kit: A Step-by-Step Manual of Community Economic Development*. Victoria, B.C.: Victoria International Development Education Association with the Greater Victoria CED Corporation

Higgins, V. and S. Lockie. 2002. "Re-discovering the social: neo-liberalism and hybrid practices of governing in rural natural resource management." *Journal of Rural Studies*, 18: 419-428.

Hubbard, G. and D. Miller (eds). 2005. *Arguments Against G8*. London: Pluto Press.

Indian and Northern Affairs Canada. 2002. *Good Public Works Management in First Nations Communities: Building Capacity for Sound Public Works in First Nations Communities, a planning handbook*. Ottawa: Public Works and Government Services Canada. on-line publication: http://pwgsc.gc.ca/rps/inac; accessed 08.11.05.

Infrastructure Canada, 2004. "Sustainable Canadian Communities: A 'New Deal for Canada's Cities and Communities'." *World Urban Forum*, 2004. on-line publication: http://www.infrastructure.gc.ca/publications/comm/200409_e.pdf; accessed 01.10.05

Kemedjio, C. "Founding-Ancestors and Intertextuality in Francophone Caribbean Literature and Criticism." *Research in African Literatures*, 33(2):210-229.

Kiely, R. 2005. *Empire in the age of globalization: US hegemony and neoliberal disorder*. Critical Introductions to World Politics. London: Pluto Press.

Klein, N. 2002. "Farewell to 'The End of History': Organization and Vision in Anti-Corporate Movements." Pp. 1-14 in L. Panitch and C. Leys (eds.), *Socialist Register 2002: A World of Contradictions*. London, ON: Merlin Press.

_____. 2000. *No Logo, Taking Aim at the Brand Bullies*. Toronto: Vintage Canada

Larner, W. 2005. "Neoliberalism in (Regional) Theory and Practice: the Stronger Communities Action Fund in New Zealand." *Geographical Research*, 43(1): 9-18.

_____. 2000. "Post-Welfare State Governance: Towards a Code of Social and Family Responsibility." *Social Politics*, 7(2): 244-265.

Larner, W. and R. Le Heron. 2004. "Global benchmarking: participating 'at a distance' in the globalizing economy" in Larner W. and W. Walters (eds) *Global Governmentality: Governing International Spaces*. Routledge Advances in International Relations and Global Politics. London: Routledge: 212-232.

Larner W. and W. Walters (eds) 2004a. *Global Governmentality: Governing International Spaces*. Routledge Advances in International Relations and Global Politics. London: Routledge.

_____2004b. "Globalization as Governmentality." *Alternatives*, 29: 495-514.

_____2002. "The political rationality of 'new regionalism'": Toward a genealogy of the region." *Theory and Society*, 31: 391-432.

Lewellen, T.C. 2002. *The Anthropology of Globalization: Cultural Anthropology Enters the 21st Century*. Westport, Connecticut: Bergin & Garvey.

MacDonald, C. 2003. "The value of discourse analysis as a methodological tool for understanding a land reform program." *Policy Sciences*, 36: 151-173.

Marx, K. 1906. *Capital: A Critique of Political Economy. Vol. 1. The Process of Capitalist Production*. Chicago: Charles H. Kerr & Co.

Miller, P. 2001. "Governing by Numbers: Why Calculative Practices Matter." *Social Research*, 68(2): 379-396.

Miraftab, F. 2004. "Public-Private Partnerships: The Trojan Horse of Neoliberal Development?" *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 24: 89-101.

Parker, I. 1992. *Discourse dynamics*. London: Routledge.

Perren, L. and P.L. Jennings. 2005. "Government Discourses on Entrepreneurship: Issues of Legitimization, Subjugation, and Power." *Entrepreneurship, Theory and Practice*, 29(2): 173-184.

Phillips, N. and C. Hardy. 2002. *Discourse Analysis: Investigating Processes of Social Construction*. Qualitative Research Methods Series, No.50. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications

Phillips, L. and S. Ilcan. 2004. "Capacity-Building: The Neoliberal Governance of Development." *Canadian Journal of Development Studies*, 25(3): 393-409.

Price, R. 2003. "Transnational Civil Society and Advocacy in World Politics." *World Politics*, 55(4): 579-606.

Prichard, C. 2002. "Creating Selves? Critically Reading 'Creativity' in Management Discourse." *Creativity and Innovation Management*, 11(4): 265-276.

Raco, M. 2005. "Sustainable Development, Rolled-out Neoliberalism and Sustainable Communities." Antipode, 37(2): 324-347.

_____. 2003. "Governmentality, subject-building, and the discourses and practices of devolution in the UK." *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 28(1): 75-95.

Richardson, L. 2003. "Writing: A Method of Inquiry." Chapter 4 in N.K. Denzin and Y.S. Lincoln (eds.) *Collecting and Interpreting Qualitative Materials.* Second Edition. Thousand Oaks CA: Sage Publications: 499-541.

Rojas, C. 2004. "Governing through the social: representations of poverty and global governmentality" in W. Larner and W. Walters (eds). *Global Governmentality: Governing International Spaces.* Routledge Advances in International Relations and Global Politics. London: Routledge: 105-115.

Rose, N. 1999. *Powers of Freedom: Reframing Political Thought.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Rose, N. and P. Miller. 1992. "Political Power Beyond the State: Problematics of Government." *British Journal of Sociology,* 43(2): 172-205.

Roseland, M. 2000. "Sustainable community development: integrating environmental, economic and social objectives." *Progress in Planning* 54(2): 73-132.

Royal Canadian Mounted Police. 2005. *Safe Homes, Safe Communities: Community, Contract and Aboriginal Policing.* on-line resource: http://www.rcmp.ca/ccaps/cjf_e.htm; accessed 01.11.05

Rubin, H.J. 2000. *Renewing Hope Within Neighborhoods of Despair: The community-based development model.* Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Rural Development Institute. 2005. *Rural Development Institute Annual Report 2004 Providing academic research and leadership on issues affecting rural and northern communities in Western Canada.* Brandon, M.B.: University of Brandon. on-line publication: http://www.brandonu.ca/organizations/rdi/publications3.html; accessed 12.11.05

Salskov-Iversen, D., Hansen, H.K. and S. Bislev. 2000. "Governmentality, Globalization, and Local Practice: Transformations of a Hegemonic Discourse." *Alternatives,* 25: 223-245.

Schofield, B. 2002. "Partners in Power: Governing the Self-Sustaining Community." *Sociology* 36(3): 663-683.

Schuftan, C. 2005. *The Community Development Dilemma: When are Service Delivery, Capacity Building, Advocacy and Social Mobilisation Really Empowering?* on-line resource:
http//hdr.undp.org/docs/network/hdr_net/GDI_GEM_Schuftan_Empowerment.pdf; accessed 06.01.06.

Seed Initiative. 2006. *About the seed initiative: Introduction.* on-line resource: http://seedinit.org/mainpages/about/introduction/index.php; accessed 24.01.06

43

The United Nations. 2006. *The Millennium Development Goals Report*. New York. on-line publication:
http://mdgs.un.org/unsd/mdg/Resources/Static/Products/Progress2006/MDGReport2006.pdf; accessed; 15.08.06.

The United Nations Development Programme Albania. 2005. *Terms of Reference: Social Mobilization Assistant (one post), Kukes Regional Development Initiative: Community Infrastructure Project (KRDI)*. on-line resource: http://www.lgp-undp.org.al/download/Soc_%20Mob_Assistant_ToRs.pdf; accessed 29.03.06.

The United Nations Development Programme. 2006a. *Capacity Development*. on-line resource: http://www.capacity.undp.org/; accessed 29.03.06.

_____.2006b. *Who we are & What we do: A World of Development Experience*. on-line resource: http://www.undp.org/about/; accessed 03.07.06.

_____.2005. *Capacity 21*. on-line resource: http://www.capacity.undp.org/index.cfm?module=ActiveWeb&page=WebPage&s=capacity21home; accessed 19.01.06.

_____. 2003a. Capacity 2015- The Rationale. on-line publication: http://www.c2015as-iln.org/PDF_Files/c2015%20Flyer.pdf; accessed 29.03.06

_____. 2003b. *Thailand Human Development Report 2003*. on-line publication: http://www.undp.or.th; accessed 06.11.05

The United Nations Development Programme Capacity Development Group. 2005. *UNDP and Community Action: The Concept behind the Community Action 2015 Group*. on-line resource: http://www.undp.org/community/concept2_CA.htm; accessed 08.11.05

The United Nations Development Programme in Lebanon. 2006. *The World Summit on Sustainable Development, Johannesburg 2002*. United Nations Development Programme. on-line resource: http://www.undp.org.lb/communication/spotlight/2002/wssd.html; accessed 29.03.06.

The United Nations Development Programme Regional Centre in Bangkok. 2006a. *Serving Asia and the Pacific*. United Nations Development Programme. on-line publication:
http://regionalcentrebangkok.undp.or.th/documents/about/UNDP_RCB_Leaflet.pdf; accessed: 05.06.06.

44

The United Nations Development Programme Regional Centre in Bangkok. 2006b. *Capacity 21 and Capacity 2015*. United Nations Development Programme. on-line resource: http://regionalcentrebangkok.undp.or.th/practices/cap2015/capacity21_and_capacity2015.html; accessed 29.03.06.

The United Nations Development Programme Regional Centre in Bangkok, 2006c. *Capacity 2015 Asia*. United Nations Development Programme. on-line resource: http://regionalcentrebangkok.undp.or.th/practices/cap2015/; accessed 29.03.06.

The United Nations Development Programme Small Island Developing States Network. 2006. on-line resource: http://capacity.undp.org/index.cfm?module=Networks&page=Network&NetworkID=1; accessed 29.03.06.

Toolkit for Localising the Millennium Development Goals. A UNDP Capacity Development Resource. 2005. UNDP/Capacity 2015 New York. on-line publication: http://www.capacity.undp.org/indexAction.cfm?module=Library=&action=GetFile&DocumentID=5669; accessed 19.01.06.

Triantafillou, P. and M.R. Nielsen. 2001. Policing empowerment: the making of capable subjects." *History of The Human Sciences*, 14(2): 63-86.

Van Halen-Faber, C. and C.T. P. Diamond. 2002. "Depths of (Un)knowing: Arts-Based Spinning and Weaving." *Curriculum Inquiry* 32(3): 251-266.

Voyageur, C. and B. Calliou. 2003. "Aboriginal Economic Development and the Struggle for Self-Government." Pp. 121-144 in *Power and Resistance: Critical Thinking About Canadian Social Issues*, edited by L. Samuelson and W. Antony. Halifax: Fernwood Publishing.

Wood, L.A. and R.O. Kroger. 2000. *Doing Discourse Analysis: Methods for Studying Action in Talk and Text*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

45

APPENDIX A: CAPACITY 2015 PROJECTS*

*From: Capacity 2015. 2002b. "Local Results: A Global Challenge: Capacity Development to benefit from Globalization and meet the MDGs to achieve Sustainable Development." *Joburg Information Kit*. The United Nations Development Programme. on-line publication: http://www.undp.org/wssd/docs/capacity2015-LocalResults-a-Global-challenge.pdf; accessed 08.11.05.: 3

46

- Stimulating sustainable development in the Small Island States while reducing their vulnerability. *(The Small Island Developing States need support to interpret and implement the principles of Capacity 2015 in terms of their unique and vulnerable situations)*.
- Creating knowledge, learning and information networks for capacity development. *(Access to knowledge is a pre-requisite for benefiting from globalization and empowering local communities and governments)*
- Promoting decentralization and increased participation at the local level by strengthening local leadership and improving human resources development. *(Local leadership always has been, and always will be, where change takes place)*

IMPLEMENTING CAPACITY 2015

Since the launch of Capacity 2015 at WSSD PrepCom IV in Bali, people around the world have been working to make this new and vital concept a reality.

Capacity 21 has a network of coordinators and partners all around the world. They have worked with most of the countries in their regions to help them to prepare their reports to WSSD. In the last few months they have used their knowledge of the regional WSSD preparation processes to begin to prepare regional strategies for Capacity 2015. The regional strategies will be available at WSSD. The regional strategies have in their turn contributed to the overall global planning of Capacity 2015.

Delegates from a large number of countries went home from Bali and began to prepare proposals for their own national Capacity 2015 programmes. There are draft programmes from all regions of the world. For instance, the Philippines proposes to develop a Capacity 2015 programme that will increase the economic growth and output of small and medium enterprises and their contribution to poverty reduction and improvement of the environment, so that communities are more able to cope with globalization. Nepal hopes to concentrate on capacity building to mainstream sustainable development into government policies and programmes at all levels. Indonesia's capacity development initiative plans to link the latest ecological knowledge at the local level with new opportunities in regional autonomy, partnership building and poverty reduction. Russia will aim to promote new approaches to regional planning to integrate the policies of Agenda 21 into national policies, whilst Bulgaria will concentrate more on building capacities at the local level for implementing Agenda 21. Norway aims to increase the participation of local communities and create a strategy for public-private partnerships. El Salvador's proposed programme aims to create favourable conditions for increased and more efficient employment at the local level. The programme in the islands of Socotra and the Galapagos will ensure that tourism in these islands bring benefit to the residents and while avoiding unsustainable pressures on the natural environment and services.

These are just examples of a growing number of proposals that have been received. The demand for Capacity 2015 has been amply demonstrated. UNDP is now embarking on the establishment of a broad partnership and on securing the resources needed to put Capacity 2015 into action.

APPENDIX B: CAPACITY 2015 PARTNERS**

A Global Partnership Programme:

Capacity 2015 works with external institution partnerships, partnerships with the UN system, and UNDI programme and knowledge facilities. A few illustrative examples:

External Partners

British Petroleum – Supports a natural gas project aimed at empowering local government members toward sustainable use of natural resources.

LEAD International - Works on local leadership development, by training local champions as a key leverage point in reaching for the MDGs.

SNV - Works on quality improvement in capacity development methodology for local level development by producing 10-15 resource kits, a knowledge sharing network and publications.

Millennium Institute - Promotes national visioning and scenario building across environmental, social, and political sectors through models such as Threshold 21.

Open Society Institute – Supports capacity development of local governance and decentralisation efforts in Eastern Europe & CIS

Universities Consortium – Partners Small Island Developing States (SIDS) Universities in forging agreed curricula based on vulnerability reduction and resiliency.

UN Partners

Equator Initiative - Helps to develop capacities at the grassroots level to reduce poverty through the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity.

Global Environment Facility (GEF) - Aims to broaden the impacts of capacity development activities, including national capacity assessments, indicators to monitor progress, and learning from small grants experiences.

Small Grants Programme (SGP)- this strategic partnership combines the coverage of the SGP with Capacity 2015 ability to synthesise lessons from the experience and consolidate knowledge products

Local Initiative Facility for the Urban Environment (LIFE) – Works toward sustainable development through local-level dialogue, stakeholder participation, and partnerships.

Special Unit for South-South Cooperation – Fosters south-south and triangular cooperation through information and learning exchanges.

United Nations Capital Development Fund (UNCDF) – Contributes to achievement of MDGs in LDCs through microfinance and local development initiatives.

United Nations Fund for the Empowerment of Women (UNIFEM) – Provides strategies that foster empowerment and gender equality.

UNDP Knowledge Facilities

Capacity Development Innovation Facility (CDIF) – Mainstreams the knowledge base on capacity development in the UN and supports country-level innovation with a small grants facility.

Capacity Development Website and Network – Provides current capacity development resources, tools, expert rosters, and facilitates vertical and horizontal knowledge networking.

Capacity Development for MDGs Development Gateway – Provides MDG-related capacity development resources, access to networks, and interactive discussions

PPPUE (Public-Private Partnerships for the Urban Environment) - Supports public-private partnerships at the local level.

Resilience Building Facility – Assists SIDS and LDCs to develop capacities to reduce vulnerability through building resilience.

VITA AUCTORIS

Heather Graydon was born in 1980 in Winnipeg, Manitoba. She graduated from Westgate Mennonite Collegiate in 1998. From there she attended the University of Winnipeg and graduated with a Bachelor of Arts degree in Sociology with honours in 2004. Heather is currently a candidate for the doctoral programme in Sociology at the University of Windsor, and is graduating with a Master's degree in Sociology from that department in Fall 2006.