



EMBARGOED

**CREATING CAPACITIES AND BUILDING CAPABILITIES
FOR THE CIVIL SOCIETY SECTOR IN SOUTH AFRICA**

**FINAL
COMPREHENSIVE REPORT**

COMPLETED

BY

**DEVELOPMENTAL, CAPABLE AND ETHICAL STATE
(DCES) DIVISION OF THE HSRC**

5 OCTOBER 2020

CREATING CAPACITIES AND BUILDING CAPABILITIES FOR THE CIVIL SOCIETY SECTOR IN SOUTH AFRICA

5 OCTOBER 2020

Submitted to: National Development Agency (NDA)

Contact Person: Mr Thami Ngwenya

Contact: Tel +27 11 018 5528

Email: thamin@nda.org.za

Project Leader: National Development Agency (NDA)

Mr Thami Ngwenya

Contact: Email: thamin@nda.org.za

Submitted by: Human Sciences Research Council

134 Pretorius Street, Pretoria CBD

Contact Persons: Professor Modimowabarwa Kanyane

Contact Tel: 012 302 2809

Email: bkanyane@hsrc.ac.za

Research Team Members (Name of service provider): Human Sciences
Research Council

Prof Modimowabarwa Kanyane (Principal Investigator)

Dr Gregory Houston

Dr Paul Plantinga

Prof Narnia Bohler Muller

Mr Ngqapheli Mchunu

Steering Committee Members (National Development Agency):

Mr Thami Ngwenya

Ms Nthabiseng Nkhatau

Mr Tshepo Morake

Ms Nthabiseng Kraai

Mr Simon Baloyi

COPYRIGHT

This Policy Paper remains the joint property of the National Development Agency and Human Sciences Research Council. As the publication of results in journals is encouraged, we will do so after the reports have been submitted and approved by the NDA Management

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table of Contents.....	ii
LIST OF TABLES.....	4
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	5
Background.....	5
Objectives.....	5
Methodology.....	5
Key findings from the literature review and empirical research.....	5
Key recommendations.....	8
ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS.....	11
GLOSSARY OF KEY WORDS/TERMS.....	13
3. Background to the Study.....	15
4. Research Objectives.....	15
5. Key Research Questions.....	16
6. Research Methodology.....	16
7. Research Design.....	17
7.1 Approach.....	17
7.2 Data Collection Methods.....	17
8. Instrument Design.....	18
9. Ethical Considerations.....	19
10. LIMITATION OF THE STUDY.....	19
11. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK – CRITICAL ISSUES OF CAPACITIES AND CAPABILITIES FOR CONSIDERATION.....	19
9.1 Understanding civil society and CSOs and their types and roles.....	20
9.2 The concepts capacity and capacity-building.....	25
9.3 Existing international and regional challenges and methods to inform civil society sector capacity and capability building in South Africa.....	28
9.3.1 Key capacity and capability constraints within the civil society sector.....	28
9.3.2 Reasons for capacity and capability constraints within civil society sector.....	34
9.3.3 Mechanisms for capacity-building within the civil society sector.....	36
9.3.4 Methods to capacitate the civil society sector in South Africa.....	42
9.4. The positive and negative impact of civil society sector capacity-building mechanisms.....	49
9.5 Government involvement in capacity development.....	54
9.6 Private sector involvement in capacity development.....	54
12. EMPIRICAL ANALYSIS.....	56

10.1 Understanding of the meaning of the terms: capacities and capabilities.....	56
10.2 The most important capacities and capabilities required in the civil society sector	58
10.3 The key challenges currently experienced by the civil society sector	61
10.4 Specific skills required in the civil society sector to ensure that CSOs can execute their activities and achieve their goals	64
10.5 The role and responsibility of the government and business sector in building the capacity of the civil society sector	65
10.6 Processes that CSOs engage in to assess their organisational capacity in order to determine their capacity and skills challenges	70
10.7 Funding for capacity-building of CSOs in South Africa	72
10.8 International and regional capacity-building interventions that have been adapted for the civil society sector in South Africa.....	75
10.9 Service providers of capacity-building.....	77
10.10 Accreditation and certification requirements or professional associations for CSO capacity-building service providers	79
10.11 The key mechanisms for capacity-building	80
10.12 Sustainable measures to ensure the sector retains and grows its own skills and capabilities	82
10.13 Ways to improve existing mechanisms for capacity-building	84
13. CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS, BEST PRACTICES AND LEASONS LEARNERD.....	86
14. REFERENCES	91
15. ANNEXURE 1 CATEGORISING CSOS	104
16. ANNEXURE 2 INTERVIEW INSTRUMENT	109
17. ANNEXURE 3 CONSENT FORM.....	113
18. INFORMATION SHEET AND CONSENT FORM	113

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1 Key informants interviewed	17
---	-----------

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Background

Civil society organisations (CSOs) in South Africa play an important role in the social, political and economic development of the country. This has particularly been the case since the turn to democracy in 1994. The increasing needs of society have underscored the requirement for CSOs to have the appropriate capacity to address the demands of society. At the same time, however, they experience many challenges in their role of bridging the gap between the state and society, while also bridging the gap between themselves, which are manifested in a variety of ways.

Objectives

The primary objectives of this study were: to identify the key capacity and capability challenges faced by CSOs in South Africa; to determine the most appropriate mechanisms to capacitate them in order to overcome these challenges; to identify interventions required to sustain capacity within this sector; and to identify which sector of society should take the lead in building the capacity of CSOs in the country.

Methodology

The study relied largely on relevant international, regional and local literature on the roles and types of civil society organisations, the key challenges these organisations face, the reasons for these challenges, and the main mechanisms used to build the capacity of CSOs internationally, regionally and locally. This was complemented by interviews with key Stakeholders in the civil society sector in South Africa and a content analysis of the qualitative data arising from the interviews.

Key findings from the literature review and empirical research

The literature review and empirical research gave rise to several findings:

- That CSOs in the developing world have a wide range of capacity challenges, ranging from challenges at the level of individuals such as poor leadership and access to learning opportunities, and at the organisational level, such as inadequate funding, weak management and accountability systems, unskilled staff as well as over-reliance on international donors for funding and sustainability problems.
- That government and the business sector have a critical role in supporting the civil society sector in a coherent and integrated manner through functional public-private partnerships.
- That, while there are diversified approaches to capacity-building among donor organisations, the capacity challenges of CSOs differ from organisation to organisation.
- That there are a wide-range of mechanisms for capacity-building, including mechanisms aimed at developing skills among the leadership and staff, such as mentoring and training courses, others aimed at transforming the organisation, such as introducing strategic planning and democratic internal decision-making processes, and still others aimed at establishing networks/partnership and improving the organisation's external relations.
- That mechanisms to develop skills will differ from organisation to organisation, and that once the skills have been developed in the CSO, the organisation must identify appropriate ways to retain such skills and to sustain skills development capacity within the organisation.
- That there is thus no single approach to building the skills of organisations that focuses only on a particular skill need or set of skills needs, and a multi-pronged approach is required to deal with capacities and capabilities of the CSOs.
- That the main challenges faced by South African CSOs are poor leadership and management skills, and inability to attract the right people for the right job, lack of staff with the requisite finance and technological skills, inadequate funding and resources, a lack of accountability (corruption and poor financial reporting), dearth of strategic planning capacity (developing implementation and business plans), competition and contestation, and incompetent or over-involved boards.

- That the main capacity and capability requirements of CSOs in South Africa are in the following areas: good governance, sufficient funds, capable and skilled human resources (leadership, financial management capacity, general management skills – operational efficiencies, people skills – administrative capacities, compliance (leadership, vision and mission and reporting), co-ordination, the requisite technical and other material resources, effective service delivery (ability to carry out mandate, communication with clients and other stakeholders), and sustainability (resourcing, retaining skilled staff).
- That the main skills needed by CSOs in South Africa are financial management, fundraising, communication and stakeholder engagement, mentoring and talent nurturing, leadership, project management, strategy and planning, legal, organisational and administrative, content-specific skills in the area of activity (e.g. human rights), conflict resolution, research, and technological skills.
- That, while both government and the private sector in South Africa have not done enough to build the capacity of CSOs, they can both play a significant role by providing funds, partnering with CSOs, supporting them by providing critical public-sector human resources in support of their activities (e.g. social workers), including the staff of CSOs in government and private sector staff development programmes, including an organisational development component in their budgets for CSOs they fund, and building the monitoring and evaluation capacity of CSOs.
- That most CSOs in South Africa do not have the capacity or funds to engage in organisational capacity assessments, while some do assess their capacity in their strategic planning and review processes, are in networks that engage in capacity and performance assessment, or are required to provide a capacity assessment by donors when seeking funds.
- That it is becoming increasingly difficult for CSOs in South Africa to source funding, and in instances where funding is sourced it is insufficient for the needs of the CSOs and does not characteristically cover their running costs.
- That CSOs, especially those with significant understanding of the context and needs of the civil society sector in South Africa, are best placed to provide capacity-building interventions.

- That the most appropriate mechanisms for capacity-building are dependent on the needs of the particular CSO, and may include skills transfers by the private sector and government, training courses, workshops, mentoring and coaching, and learning exchanges.
- That sustaining the capacity of CSOs is best achieved through investing in training staff, providing incentives to staff, ensuring that staff earn a living wage with guaranteed job security, aligning staff compensation with their professional skills, and investing in leadership capacity with soft skills that ensures a healthy organisational culture and that sustains the passion of the staff for the work they do.

Key recommendations

Two broad sets out recommendations have arisen from this study.

Capacity and capabilities

- Government should develop a clearly articulated typology and mapping of CSOs as well as critical skills and services (if this does not exist) to inform the broad types of support different CSOs may require.
- Government and its entities should actively engage with CSO forums around capacity-building needs in order to enable CSO-led processes for driving capacity-building.
- Government should prioritise the active involvement of a wider base of smaller CSOs in shaping the direction of capacity-building in the civil society sector.
- Government should assist in the expansion of CSO-tailored training on topics related to leadership, financial management, conflict resolution, fund raising and reporting.
- Government should encourage mentoring and peer-learning-based models of capacity-building as well as learning exchanges across the civil society sector to enhance diversified skills sets.
- Government should review the relevance of current capacity-building accreditation and general funding application processes to determine whether

these are not creating unnecessary red tape and affecting the sustainability of CSOs.

- Government should work towards improving public officials' and the public's understanding of the positive role that many CSOs are playing in communities, and the need for highly skilled individuals (and associated resources) to sustain these activities.
- Government should develop a structured approach to Public-Private Partnerships (PPPs), and extend monitoring and evaluation mechanisms to partnerships with civil society as part of the social contract, including identifying areas where government can partner with CSOs on their capacity-building processes without necessarily providing funding.
- Government should develop a database of all CSOs and a functional monitoring and tracking system to ensure that they are operating optimally and taken care of.
- Government should consider establishing an Ombudsman for civil society to handle complaints and to assist with providing necessary interventions to build the capability and capacity of the civil society sector.

Financial sustainability and value propositions

- Government should develop a regulatory framework for CSOs that provides for capacity-building, and should set aside a specific budget for CSOs to enable them to be financially sustainable.
- Government should review how funding is allocated to CSOs, especially to what extent it supports 'core' operational activities (beyond projects), including annual assessments of skills needs, and whether this enables them to retain leaders and skilled staff.
- Government should promote the use of the skills levy to support capacity-building of the civil society sector.
- Government should find ways to encourage the Private Sector to have CSI budgets dedicated to the funding of the civil society sector, not for stakeholder relations, but for social investment.
- Government should ensure that every ministry has a set of corresponding CSOs to support.

- Government should find ways to encourage the development of a stronger philanthropic spirit in South Africa.

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

AFIT	Association of Fairness in Trade
CB	Capacity-building
CBAOs	Community-based Advice Offices
CBOs	Community Based Organisations
CBR	Community Based Rehabilitation
CCFD	Comité Catholique contre la Faim et pour le Développement
CCR	Centre for Conflict Resolution
CDRA	Community Development Resource Association
CIDA	Canadian International Development Agency
CREATE	CBR education and training for empowerment
CSC	Civil Society Sector
CSI	Corporate Social Investment
CSOs	Civil Society Organisations
CSVR	The Centre for the Study of Violence and Reconciliation
DSD	Department of Social Development
EMG	Environmental Monitoring Group
EU	European Union
FHR	Foundation for Human Rights
FORUT	For Development (translated from Norwegian)
GBV	Gender-Based Violence
GTZ	German Technical Cooperation
HSRC	Human Sciences Research Council
INTRAC	International Non-Governmental Organisation Training and Research Centre
IRAM	Institut de Recherches et d'Applications des Méthodes de Développement
JAW	Justice and Women
KSG	Khulumani Support Group
KZNCC	KwaZulu-Natal Christian Council

LRS	Labour Research Service
NACOSA	National AIDS Committee of South Africa
NDA	National Development Agency
NGOs	Non-Governmental Organisations
NPOs	Non-Profit Organisations
OD	Organisational Development
OUTA	Organisation Undoing Tax Abuse
OVC	Orphan and Vulnerable Children
PCRD	Project for Conflict Resolution and Development
PPPs	Public Private Partnerships
RLT	Rural Legal Trust
SANCB	South African National Council for the Blind
SAQA	South African Qualifications Authority
SCLC	Southern Cape Land Committee
SDGs	Sustainable Development Goals
SETA	Skills Education Training Authority
TAC	Treatment Action Campaign
TCOE	Trust for Community Outreach and Education
ToR	Terms of Reference
UNCAC	United Nations Convention Against Corruption
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNODC	United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime

GLOSSARY OF KEY WORDS/TERMS

Capacity

Hilderbrand and Grindle (1994: 10) define capacity as ‘the ability to perform appropriate tasks effectively, efficiently and sustainably’. Morgan (1998) defines capacity as the ‘organisational and technical abilities, relationships and values that enable countries, organisations, groups and individuals at any level of society to carry out functions and achieve their development objective over time’.

Capacity-building

The National Development Agency (NDA), which lists capacity development as one of its primary mandates, defines capacity-building as “strengthening the institutional capacity of CSOs, which provide services to the poor communities. This implies building the capacity of CSOs to enable them to carry out development work effectively.” Groenendijk (2012) states that capacity development is a process by which individuals, groups, organisations, institutions and societies increase their abilities to 1) perform core functions, solve problems, and define and achieve objectives; and 2) understand and deal with their development needs in a broad context and sustainable manner.

Civil Society

Van Leeuwen and Verkoren (2012: 81) define civil society as a sphere of society which exists independently of government and the private sector with the intention of pursuing wide ranging interests including governance, labour, media and public health.

Civil Society Organisation

Civil Society Organisation is a structure of the civil society that interacts with the state to be responsive to the needs and welfare of community members. Civil Society

Organisation is diverse and includes, but is not limited to, faith-based organisations, trade unions, professional organisations, social movements, coalition and advocacy groups, non-governmental organisations and women organisations (Kastrati, 2010: 65).

Civil Society Sector

The civil society sector consists of the groups or varieties of civil society organisations that operate outside of the governmental and for-profit sectors, such as labour unions, non-profit organisations, churches, and other service agencies.

3. BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY

Civil society organisations (CSOs), including more formalised and well-resourced non-government organisations (NGOs) such as think tanks and research bodies, as well as less formalised and less well-resourced community-based organisations (CBOs), play an important role in the social, political and economic development of the country. They are expected to contribute to strengthening governance and transparency, and, therefore, to hold the state and private sector accountable. They are also crucial for influencing and advocating for the state and private sector to variously respect, protect and promote the public's rights and legitimate interests, and to meet people's needs and interests. These needs include, but are not limited to, healthcare, welfare support, an environment that is not harmful to their wellbeing, and various labour and economic rights. However, the increasing needs of society have underscored the requirement for CSOs to be appropriately capacitated with certain essential and critical "operational" skills and capabilities to be able to address the demands of society. At the same time, they experience many challenges in their role of bridging the gap between the state and society, while also bridging the gap between themselves, which are manifested in a variety of ways.

This study was conducted to ascertain the most critical needs, and how best to enhance and create capacities and build capabilities for the civil society sector in order to inform training and capacity-building interventions that would strengthen constructive engagements between the developmental state and civil society, and thereby promote the objective of improving the quality of service delivery.

4. RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

As reflected in the ToR, the objectives of the study are to:

- a) Identify the existing methods used to capacitate the civil society sector in South Africa
- b) Describe and analyse existing methods and mechanisms used to capacitate the civil society sector as well as their limitations towards efficiency
- c) Analyse identified skills challenges faced by the sector

- d) Determine the skills and capacity areas required by the sector to strive to produce and deliver quality services and manage organisations operating in the sector
- e) Identify measures that could be put in effect to ensure the sector retains and grows its own skills and capabilities; and
- f) Determine and propose methods and mechanisms that could be used to build capacities of the sector and identify key role players that must drive this process.

5. KEY RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The key research questions for this study are as follows:

1. What accounts for the capacity and capability challenges that this sector is experiencing?
2. What capacity interventions take place locally, regionally and internationally to enhance the civil society sector?
3. What are the methods and mechanisms that could be used to build capacities of the sector and which key role players should drive this process?
4. In what sustainable way could the measures be put in effect to ensure the sector retains and grows its own skills and capabilities?

6. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

A detailed work plan was developed, and the nature and extent of activities was agreed upon with the NDA. This was encapsulated in the Inception Report prepared by the HSRC research team. The HSRC proposed a methodology that focused largely on desktop analysis supported by qualitative research. The desktop analysis proposed involved a literature review on capacity-building challenges of the civil society sector to inform the theoretical and skills capacity assessment approach adopted by the study. The desktop analysis was complemented by empirical research, primarily interviews with key informants aimed at exploring the minimum competency requirements of the sector and ways to improve the capabilities and capacities of CSOs in South Africa.

7. RESEARCH DESIGN

7.1 Approach

In its empirical research, the study employed a qualitative approach as opposed to quantitative research methods. This involved telephonic interviews with key informants drawn from the government and the civil society sector.

7.2 Data Collection Methods

The desktop research relied on relevant documents drawn from online platforms.

Primary data

Key informants were interviewed to inform the empirical analysis of the capacity and capability of the civil society sector. The interviews aimed at, among other things, developing an understanding of how key players view the state of capacity and capabilities of the sector in providing quality services and effectively managing their organisations through responsive capacity-building interventions. As this study was designed to be largely desktop, only 6 Key Stakeholders were interviewed. These Stakeholders are anonymized and categorized by gender and the focus of their organisations (see Table 1 below).

Table 1 Key informants interviewed

Key Participants	Gender	Focus
Key Participant A	M	Registered NPC purpose-driven organisation for technology capacity-building of civil society organisations across Southern Africa
Key Participant B	F	National Government Department
Key Participant C	M	Registered NPO which is concerned about religious issues and development in society
Key Participant D	F	Registered NPC that deals with safety and crime prevention statistics

Key Participant E	F	An independent NGO that seeks to understand and prevent violence, heal its effects and build sustainable peace at community, national and regional levels
Key Participant F	F	A disability-inclusive civil society organisation underpinned by community-based rehabilitation (CBR) and disability rights
Total		6

These stakeholders are labelled as Participant A-F under Section 10 of the report.

Secondary data

The review of relevant literature on CSOs helped in many ways to contextualize the study. It sharpened the research team’s understanding of the capacity and skills constraints of the civil society sector, and thus provided better understanding of the landscape. The literature review led to an understanding of, among other things: what is meant by the terms capacity and capabilities; the roles and types of CSOs found in the sector in South Africa; the key capacity challenges in the civil society sector; and mechanisms to build capacity in this sector. This was complemented by the empirical analysis derived from the interviews.

The literature review also provided a more detailed basis for devising the methodology and research instruments and enhanced understanding of the findings gathered to inform the policy discussion paper that was developed from this study.

8. INSTRUMENT DESIGN

The design of the research instrument focused on questions about measures, methods and mechanisms to enhance capacities and capabilities in the civil society sector. This includes skills capacity interventions engendered in the civil society sector. The interview instrument design was informed by studies of the capacity challenges of CSOs locally, regionally and internationally, and mechanisms to build

capacity at all three levels. The design of the interview instrument considered different conceptual themes and constructs about the capacities and capabilities of the civil society sector.

9. ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS

The HSRC subscribes to a strict internal Code of Ethics. The research team submitted the study design and research tools (Interview instrument and consent forms) for approval to the Research Ethics Committee (REC) of the HSRC. The interview instrument was designed by the HSRC research team and fielded only once the REC of the HSRC had approved it. At all times, the research team kept in mind the confidentiality of information that it had at its disposal. The REC of the HSRC reviewed all instruments, consent forms and ethical considerations before the target groups were engaged.

All invited participants agreed to participate in the study and signed written consent form. Participants were assured of anonymity and confidentiality at all times and informed of their right to withdraw from the study at any given time.

10. LIMITATION OF THE STUDY

The study was limited largely to analysis of the desktop studies within the civil society sector in the first phase. In the second phase, a small number of stakeholders were interviewed, and the data generated from the interviews was analysed. A classification table of CSOs was developed to indicate the types of organisations in terms of which this study is framed (Annexure 2 below), and is indicative of the wide variety of CSOs in the sector.

11. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK – CRITICAL ISSUES OF CAPACITIES AND CAPABILITIES FOR CONSIDERATION

This section examines: (a) key concepts of civil society and civil society types and definitions of roles, capacity, capability and capacity-building, (b) the literature that

identifies key capacity and capability constraints of the civil society sector; (c) the literature that identifies the reasons for the capacity and capability constraints of the civil society sector; (d) the literature that identifies the mechanisms used to build the capacity and capabilities of CSOs; and (e) the literature on capacity-building mechanisms used in South Africa.

9.1 Understanding civil society and CSOs and their types and roles

Civil Society is a contested concept, and a variety of different definitions exist. Beate Kohler-Koch and Christine Quittkat (2009: 14) argue that civil society as a concept is broadly used and its meaning differs depending on context and theoretical orientation. In attempting to define civil society, one must bear in mind the contested conceptual nature that is often associated with it.

Van Leeuwen and Verkoren (2012: 81) define civil society as a sphere of society which exists independently of government and the private sector with the intention of pursuing wide ranging interests, including governance, labour, media and public health. Furthermore, according to Botchway, CSOs advance the needs and interests of its members or of society. In doing so, CSOs often act as an intermediary organisation, liaising between citizens of the state and the state itself (Botchway 2018: 4). This means that an important feature of CSOs is their ability to call for an improved interaction between citizens and the state without compromising their individuality as citizens (Ahrne 1996: 109).

There are several different types of CSOs. Clayton, Oakley and Taylor (2000: 2) point out that CSO is a broad term encompassing several types of entities. Typically, CSOs include, but are not limited to faith-based organisations, trade unions, professional organisations social movement, coalition and advocacy groups, and non-governmental organisations (Kastrati 2010: 65). Within the South African context, there are different CSOs that have been actively involved in ensuring that there is government accountability, service delivery and protection of the most vulnerable from unjust legislation and state action, such as opposing evictions and destruction of houses belonging to low-income earners.

Fourie and Kakumba (2011: 54-55) write that CSOs are able to encourage and promote the doctrine of accountability on a democratic government in order to discourage the abuse of public power. Often, the positive role played by CSOs in a democratic dispensation is not highlighted enough and sometimes downplayed (Iwilade, 2010: 136).

Taking into consideration the tumultuous and conflict-ridden past that most African states have experienced, civil society's role in creating peace, security and democratic stability is paramount on the continent (Ekiyor, 2012: 16). Moreover, CSOs' ability to promote the participation of citizens in society is highlighted in the work of Nzimakwe (2008:47), who states that participation takes place in the local lowest level of the community, and must involve more aspects such as involvement in the governance of the country through non-isolated participation. Hyden (1996) further outlines the roles and responsibilities of CSOs, which, among other things, involves disseminating of information, advancing and promoting democratic norms, containing of state power and encouraging political participation by citizens.

The roles played by CSOs are wide- ranging, and, regardless of the type of CSO, there is a common objective amongst all of them, which is to protect and advance democracy (Pedahzur, 2002: 141). Mavrikos-Adamou (2010: 516) writes that, in liberal democracies, CSOs fill the gap between the State and its citizens and seeks to pursue the interests of the citizens and apply pressure on the State with the intention of ensuring that the State is acting in the citizen's best interest. The role of CSOs further includes holding a government accountable without interfering in the work of government and navigating and carefully weighing the interests of all parties involved (Katsios, 2016:2). This includes, particularly within the African context, the establishment of organisations whose primary objective is to serve the interests of a particular type of people within the public; examples of such CSOs include advocacy groups, philanthropic organisations and welfare and developmental organisations (Orji, 2009: 83).

In addition to mobilising resources to support their own activities, CSOs can influence the allocation of public sector resources to vulnerable communities. There are several

critical roles to play in this area. Ramkumar and Krafchik (2005: 6) note that auditing of government spending is critical for ensuring that money is spent correctly, with an emphasis being paid to socio-development programmes in developing democracies. More so, governments have an underlying responsibility to disclose their financial activity, including the money spent to promote transparency and good financial conduct. In many instances, CSOs play an important role in ensuring that this is indeed the case (Abdullahi and Gana, 2017:7). As a result, the best way to achieve financial accountability is to have an active involvement from civil society which ensures that the financial resources earmarked for the community or for community development do get utilised for those purposes (Ngwakwe,2012: 321). Moreover, Phago (2013: 111) adds that the involvement of CSOs has historically been important in African democracies because many citizens rely on them to ensure that there is good accountability and that governments have remained answerable to citizens.

The South African constitution posits an important role for CSOs by, for instance, stating that the national assembly must facilitate public involvement through consultation with interest groups such as CSOs, which include Non-Profit and Non-Governmental organisations. Habib (2005: 678) substantiates this point by noting that the post-apartheid government acted swiftly to ensure that CSOs become part of the post-apartheid discourse through the introduction of the: Nonprofit Organizations Act, 1997 (Act 71 of 1997) , which effectively gave legitimacy to CSOs and their role in the democratic South Africa.

Added to the legislative framework were the legal requirements and regulations aimed at ensuring that CSOs meet and comply with the statutory provisions that the state has outlined, such as the registration of CSOs (Fioramonti 2005: 78). Therefore, CSOs can function if they meet the requirements of the frameworks, including being registered and having the adequate capacity to carry out their duties.

The diversity of civil society organisations enable them to promote shared interests that are centred on the interests of the people while acting independently of the state (Ndou, 2016: 32). Asulime, (2012:50), also writes that CSOs can be categorised under different categories such as capacity builders, citizen champions, advocates and watchdogs. This may be because, in the democratic dispensation, CSOs are the only

role players who are able to effectively hold government to account. Beyond holding government accountable, CSOs can also act as lobbies for the people by trying to influence governments to shift its focus and act in the best interest of the people and advocate for policies that are likely to benefit the most vulnerable in society (Glaser, 1997: 7).

The role of CSOs was best illustrated in the engagement between the Treatment Action Campaign (TAC) and the government of South Africa over the provision of Antiretroviral drugs (ARVs) to people living with HIV/AIDS. The TAC wanted the state to commit to a timeframe in relation to when it would begin rolling out the distribution of ARVs after delays on the part of government in which it had cited affordability and financial feasibility issues. The government only launched the roll-out plan after the TAC launched a civil disobedience campaign (Evensen and Stokke, 2010: 153). An instance such as this best describes how influential and important a role civil society continues to play in democratic South Africa. In addition to that, South African CSOs active in the health sector have been instrumental in shifting the government's focus by increasing access to health services, especially for the most vulnerable and marginalised people in townships, informal settlement and the rural areas.

The focus of CSOs in South Africa has also expanded to matters of governance and accountability. Gumede (2018) argues that South Africa's civil society has become the 'last line of defense in the fight against corruption, abuse of state power and service delivery shortcomings by the government'. The role of CSOs, according to Villanueva (2019: 553), expands beyond just holding government accountable, but also to raising awareness, mobilising and ensuring there are checks and balances that are functioning and effective. An illustration of this can be seen in the nuclear deal agreements that were set aside by the Western Cape High Court after Earth Life Africa and the South African Faith Communities' Environment Institute approached the court to declare the deal unconstitutional (Kings, 2017).

Bruce (2016: 50) highlights the importance of CSOs in the fight against corruption and enforcing public sector accountability. A case in point is the role played by Corruption Watch, Right2Know and the Organisation Undoing Tax Abuse (OUTA) in the anti-corruption campaign. Since the turn to democracy, CSOs have been relentless in their

drive for government accountability and curbing of corruption, including the pursuit of corruption-related court cases whereby CSOs such as Right2Know challenged former president Jacob Zuma in court on corruption allegations (Gumede, 2018). In addition, the North Gauteng High Court recently set the Seriti Commission findings aside after CSOs like Right2Know and Corruption Watch brought forward a review and application for the findings to be set aside (Ngcobo, 2019). The fight against corruption therefore relies on the ability and involvement of civil society. This is because civil society has the ability to rally the masses, approach courts and in some instances conduct their own work without the interference of big business and government which enables it to do its work free of external influence (Barati, Sharifi, Nemati and Birgani, 2017: 180).

There are several different ways to categorise CSOs: the de facto approach categorises them as nongovernment and nonprofit; the de jure approach as structurally legally incorporated. Categorisation on the basis of activities give rise to 12 different categories of CSOs, including CSOs that are welfare providers or advocacy NGOs; by geographical focus, for instance, 'Southern' NGOs (serving developing countries) and 'Northern' NGOs (advocating in developed nations); on the basis of CSO management/control, for example, as either mutual (member-controlled) or independently managed; by mode of obtaining funds, for example, either 'donative' (receive donations) or 'commercial' (charging for goods and services); and the purpose behind funds, i.e. CSOs that are either fundraisers or grantors (Cordery & Sim 2018: 4).

Cordery and Sim (2018: 4) suggest that CSO categorisation should be based on CSOs' funding and activities, giving rise to six categories: Classic Charities, Membership, Infrastructure, Trusts/Grantors, Service Providers, and Advocacy organisations.

- Advocacy CSOs: advocate for better government or corporate policies for disadvantaged groups/causes (for example, Amnesty International, Greenpeace). These are CSOs that bring change by advocating on behalf of disadvantaged and vulnerable communities, and are distinguished by their activities which give voice to those 'from below'.

- **Classic Charities:** are resourced mainly by public donations and support beneficiaries. Included here are religious organisations, environmental charities, and those assisting youth, the aged, and animals (for example, the Salvation Army). These CSOs receive donations of money and goods and are staffed by volunteers and staff who are paid less than market value.
- **Infrastructure CSOs:** provide facilities, structures and systems to support and coordinate front-line CSOs to enable them to deliver their services effectively (for example, renting an office block, hospital or community hall they own to CSOs cheaply). Another role they play is the building of alliances with, for example, local government or schools, to support the CSO sector. They enable a service provider CSO to focus on specialist services.
- **Membership CSOs:** exhibit different revenue and expenditure patterns to other CSOs, with membership fees providing most funding. Membership CSOs focus on serving the interests of their members and include, for example, amateur sports clubs and local orchestras.
- **Trusts/Grantors (Philanthropist CSOs):** include self-funded, company sponsored or community funded trusts/foundations whose major revenue is investment returns from which they make philanthropic grants.
- **Service Providers:** mainly receive revenues from delivering goods and services in the health, legal, museum and theatre sectors, and international aid, mostly from governments.

Carolei (2019: 37-42) categories CSOs based on the geographical area, distinguishing between international-NGOs and national CSOs; organisational size, distinguishing between large, medium and small CSOs; and organisational type, distinguishing between membership-based, advocacy and service-provider CSOs. Nevertheless, a snapshot survey of CSOs in South Africa reveals that most fit into more than one category, as indicated in Annexure 1.

9.2 The concepts capacity and capacity-building

Blagescu and Young (2006: 2ff) draw attention to different definitions of capacity and capability in the literature. For instance, Hilderbrand and Grindle (1994: 10) define capacity as 'the ability to perform appropriate tasks effectively, efficiently and

sustainably'. Loubser (1993: 23) argues that capacity consists of a number of elements, including specified objectives, including vision, values, policies, strategies and interests; efforts, including will, energy, concentration, work ethic and efficiency; capabilities, including intelligence, skills, knowledge and mental sets; resources, including human, natural, technological, cultural and financial; and work organisation, including planning, designing, sequencing and mobilising. Finally, Morgan (1998) defines capacity as the 'organisational and technical abilities, relationships and values that enable countries, organisations, groups and individuals at any level of society to carry out functions and achieve their development objective over time'.

Antlöv, Brinkerhoff and Rapp (2010: 422) state that the capacity of CSOs can be looked at from two aspects: internal capacity and external capacity. Internal capacity would include leadership capacity, product and performance while external capacity focuses more on external relationships with funders, governments and clients. Moreover, both internal and external capacity is important for CSOs. Van Leeuwen and Verkoren (2012: 84) argue that CSOs ought to support both internal and external capacity-building, and the focus on external capacity above internal capacity is not in the interest of CSOs and their role in the democratic space.

Banerjee (2006:1) defines capabilities as the ability of an organisation to develop the capabilities that are required for them to carry out their work effectively and how the capability of members in a group feed into the organisation's capacity. The capacity of an organisation, on the other hand, involves a combination of individual capabilities and strengths (Banks and Hulms, 2012: 6). As a result, capabilities speak mostly to individual ability that has room for improvement and upskilling.

Hailey, James and Wrigley view organisational capacity-building "as conscious and holistic interventions which aim to improve an organisation's effectiveness and sustainability in relation to its mission and context. Interventions focus on identifying and developing the elements of capacity within an organisation, such as skills, systems, leadership, but also the organisation's programme performance and external relations. Interventions can happen at a variety of different levels, for example providing training courses for individual staff members, team building, mentoring for

senior managers and visioning and strategic planning at an organisational level” (Hailey, James & Wrigley 2005: 4-5).

Yachkaschi (2008: 22-23) provides a list of donor definitions of capacity-building:

- The National Development Agency (NDA), which lists capacity development as one of its primary mandates, defines capacity-building as “strengthening the institutional capacity of CSOs, which provide services to the poor communities. This implies building the capacity of Civil CSOs to enable them to carry out development work effectively”.
- The Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) defines capacity-building as: “Activities, approaches, strategies and methodologies which help organisations, groups and individuals to improve their performance, generate development benefits, and achieve their objectives over time”.
- The European Commission uses the phrase capacity-building to mean: “To develop and strengthen structures, institutions and procedures that help to ensure transparent and accountable governance in all public institutions; improve capacity to analyse, plan, formulate and implement policies”.
- The German Technical Cooperation (GTZ) sees capacity-building as: Strengthening the abilities of “individuals, organisations and societies to make effective use of resources, in order to achieve their own goals on a sustainable basis”.
- The United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) sees capacity-building as: “The process by which individuals, organisations, and societies develop abilities to perform functions, solve problems, and set and achieve goals premised on ownership, choice and self-esteem” and is the “sustainable creation, retention, and utilisation of capacity in order to reduce poverty, enhance self-reliance, and improve people’s lives”.

A definition of capacity-building is provided by Groenendijk, citing the UNDP (2010: 17), who state that: “Capacity development is a process by which individuals, groups, organisations, institutions and societies increase their abilities to 1) perform core functions, solve problems, and define and achieve objectives; and 2) understand and deal with their development needs in a broad context and sustainable manner”.

9.3 Existing international and regional challenges and methods to inform civil society sector capacity and capability building in South Africa

9.3.1 Key capacity and capability constraints within the civil society sector

A study of the capacity-building approaches of French NGOs found that there were different challenges in different parts of the world, for different types of civil society organisations, partly because of distinct cultural circumstances. Sorgenfrei finds that:

...capacity-building work in Africa often has to start from scratch by building basic capacities such as literacy, and in organisations where individuals have certain capacities, management competencies are poor, and quality of performance low. In more developed regions such as Eastern Europe, the Middle East, or Latin America, the emphasis is placed on resource mobilisation, fundraising, and establishing local networks. ... Human rights organisations ask for support to travel and network with peers, as well as training in information dissemination, lobbying, advocacy and policy influencing – while local grassroots organisations need to build physical capacity and learn about project management. ... In many Eastern European countries, capacity-building efforts have been impeded by a less developed analytical and critical capacity, as well as a different notion of individual responsibility – and in Cambodia, it has proved difficult to engage people at the grassroots in active learning, as they are not used to making decisions individually (Sorgenfrei, 2004: 24).

Sorgenfrei adds that it is “important to avoid generalisations with regards to different continents or even countries” (Sorgenfrei, 2004: 25). Bentley, McCarthy and Mean identify three key conditions that need to be fostered if CSOs are to carry out successful work, illustrating another set of capacity constraints. These are:

- Gaining/maintaining the trust of the communities they serve and a stable relationship with funding bodies that cover core running costs as well as project work.
- The quality of leadership that exists across the full range of stakeholders, including the absence of both strong internal leadership, as well as resources of both formal and informal leaders in the communities they serve.
- Limitations on financial resources and learning opportunities (Bentley, McCarthy & Mean, 2003. Cited in Blagescu & Young, 2006: 28).

Bentley, McCarthy and Mean draw attention to the existence of several tools for the self-assessment of organisational capacity, including the Pact Organisational Capacity Assessment tool¹ and the Discussion-Oriented Organisational Self-Assessment.² These tools enable organisations to identify their strengths and weaknesses on their own and develop a plan for organisational capacity-building.

In a study of CSOs in China after a massive earthquake struck Sichuan province on 12 May 2008, Teets (2009: 345-346) found that several mechanisms were required to improve the capacity of the organisations. First, there was a need for civil society groups and international capacity-building organisations to focus on building human resources and professional skill levels in transparent auditing processes and in professional management skills, especially project management. Second, in order to increase trust levels of civil society groups, training was required for CSOs to publicize their activities and work processes. Third, there was a need for reform of laws about social group status, role in the policy process, donations and registration. Regulations in China at the time maintained costly and difficult registration procedures that most civil society groups did not understand, did not allow domestic fundraising except for certain registered charities, and did not legitimise a role for groups in either the social or political life of China.

The capacity challenges of NGOs involved in democracy promotion in Indonesia in the late 2000s include shallow organisational capacity, inability to cooperate to leverage impact, limited outreach to indigenous constituencies and sustainability problems

¹ Refer to http://www.pactworld.org/services/oca/index_oca.htm.

² Refer to <http://www.edc.org/GLG/CapDev/dosafile/>.

(Antlöv, Brinkerhoff & Rapp, 2010: 417). However, Antlöv, Brinkerhoff and Rapp (2010) provide a useful list of factors that affect capacity. Included here are:

- Internal factors that affect capacity include vision and mission, leadership, management structures and procedures, resources, stakeholder relations, and products and performance. A lack of capacity in any of these areas may impact on the capacity of the organisation as a whole.
- External capacity factors, which include the degree of operational and political space created by government; norms and values, such as religious and ethnic tolerance, attitudes toward authority and democracy, and entrepreneurialism; the legal and regulatory framework that relate to CSOs; and socio-economic factors such as access to education, economic growth to support the rise of a middle class, and social polarisation.

Antlöv, Brinkerhoff and Rapp (2010) find that the leadership of NGOs involved in democracy promotion in Indonesia were well-educated and sufficiently skilled to be effective. However, budgeting, accounting, reporting, proposal writing, and planning systems have been weak, while international donors have consistently noted weak management and accountability systems; they are highly dependent upon international donors for funding and support and sustainable financing is of concern to almost all; while most assiduously cultivate their relations with international funders, and are well connected to like-minded groups in the country, many remain detached from the everyday reality of common people; and there is a general lack of accountability to citizens – in terms of their performance in delivering the services they are set up to deliver – which donors see as a problem in a situation where funding is increasingly related to performance.

Several capacity constraints were identified in community- and faith-based organisations, child rights committees and orphans and vulnerable children (OVC) groups in Ethiopia in a study conducted by Kastro and Dullea (2018). Among the main challenges identified were the lack of technical and financial capacity in these organisations to achieve the goals they were set to achieve, which include ensuring the protection of children from any type of exploitation. For instance, the Committee on the Rights of Children relied largely on volunteers who lacked the resources and the authority to help families in crisis. The study also identified the need for financial

and human resources to run shelters and provide support to children and families. Similarly, a study of CSOs in Tanzania identified several strengths and weaknesses in these organisations. It was stated, however, that it would be meaningless to generalise on the civil society in Tanzania as a whole. Thus, the organisations had different financial and organisational resources, with some strong in one area and weak in the other. For instance, while the community development agencies studied had strong grassroots involvement, they lacked organisational and management skills and were donor dependent. On the other hand, while elite-based advocacy organisations had competent and well-educated personnel and were capable of using the media, they were also donor dependent (Lange, Wallevik & Kiondo, 2000: 14-16).

A study of 12 community-based organisations in the Western Cape, South Africa, in the mid-2000s found that:

A challenge for many [CSOs] was a lack of stability for various reasons, e.g. personal and organisational crises, poor health of leaders, poverty and/or family demands to provide (8). Many were running a variety of activities and did not have a particular focus (this could be a strength, but could also lead to overload and high expectations from the community). Six organisations had rather autocratic leaders centralising authority and decision making ...; and also internal conflicts. There was often not enough skill to 'comply' with donor requirements; and some funders pushed CBOs to 'professionalise. Four organisations had issues regarding transparency/accountability; and finances had been misused in the past. Two cases had pioneers (from affluent backgrounds) wanting to move on, leaving behind a skills gap.

Additional challenges included a general lack of material resources; limited capacity and skills for financial and project management and fundraising, which led to people moving on to paid jobs after being trained; a decrease in (youth) volunteerism; as well as a shortage of space for programmes. Some of the organisations had a high dependency on leaders and their personality; coupled with apathy from other members, leading to a lack of discipline, accountability and following democratic

processes, and a slowness in delivering tasks. Some lacked organisational focus and did not commit enough time to internal development. Further difficulties were posed through mistrust from other community organisations; the lack of access to government support and policy influencing; and not having time for one's family (Yachkaschi, 2008: 77).

In addition, despite significant government funding of non-profit organisations in South Africa, there is a lack of awareness among CSOs of the level of government funding and the process to access such funds (Ratlabiyana, Mkhonza & Magongo, 2016: 46). A survey of CSOs active in the social justice sector in South Africa has concluded that they rely more heavily on international rather than local funding, and nearly a third of the surveyed organisations are unable to raise sufficient funds to meet their organisational expenses (Chipkin & Meny-Gibert, 2013: 21-22). In addition, many South African CSOs are led by unseasoned leaders who replaced those who had left for government employment, leading to crippling governance issues. This situation is exacerbated by a lack of capacity of many CSO boards to govern (Hendrickse, 2008).

Sterland (2006:34) states that CSOs seem to have more difficulty in developing internal capacity and could not meet the level of capacity that is required to run their organisations effectively with much impact. Moreover, gaps and capacity shortcomings in the CSOs have mostly been centred on the local capacity, and they include monitoring and evaluation experience, accounting procedures and bureaucratic hindrances (Marita, Oule, Mungai, Thiam and Ilako, 2016: 4). Furthermore, James and Malunga (2006:56) state that part of the challenges faced by CSOs in South Africa is the lack of leadership, which affects their functioning. The lack of leadership in turn affects how CSOs work in certain countries, and, in some instances, hostile governments undermine the work of CSOs and do not adhere to the laws and policies that governments ought to adhere to in allowing CSOs to thrive in the work that they do (Munene and Thakathi, 2017: 5). On this point, Brown and Kalegaonkar (1999: 3) argue that CSOs are likely to face different challenges in different settings and environments; however, poor leadership is likely to be a weakness of a civil society organisation regardless of the environment. A weakness in leadership therefore presents another challenge that CSOs have to deal with which

affects CSOs both internally and externally. The leadership inadequacies are also likely to affect many other aspects of the civil society sector.

Having looked at a broader picture of capacity challenges in the civil society sector, we turn now to the requisite resource mobilisation skills and capacity that is required by organisations in the sector that would enable them to strive and meet their objectives. Batti (2014: 57) states that resource mobilisation is the process of putting together resources that would be used to support the organisation. Such resources can be both financial and human. Moreover, Fioramonti and Heinrich (2007: 26) state that a core internal requirement for CSOs is the ability to mobilise a variety of resources as a key determinant of how effective an organisation is going to be. Fidelis (2015: 340) also highlights the important role that CSOs have played, mostly due to their ability to mobilise people and resources in order to advance a just cause.

In support of this, Larmer (2010:259) makes a compelling argument that mobilisation has been utilised by CSOs and social movements to advance social change, as well as regime change. At a local level, there is plenty of evidence pointing to CSOs' ability to make a huge impact in terms of mobilising people and resources. To this end, Brouwers (2011: 37) correctly points out that community mobilisation has been able to create an environment whereby CSOs can have a voice, be heard and make the desired changes that they aspire to make. Mobilisation of resources in the civil society space has become a critical aspect in determining how successful CSOs are going to be. Kumi and Hayman (2019:12), state that many CSOs in the global south are mobilising resources through membership fees, donations from business and accessing of local and national government funding.

Through the mobilisation of domestic resources, CSOs can ensure that they remain sustainable and less dependent on external funding. Local resource mobilisation is likely to last longer while external financial resources tend to have a shorter life span, lasting between a year and five years, which can put the sustainability of the resources in jeopardy (Kumi, 2017:4). Hence, domestic resource mobilisation is the most viable and realistic route that CSOs can utilise to ensure their financial sustainability, and this can be done through utilising effective communication strategies (Duong, 2017: 135). In saying this, resource mobilisation in CSOs is also something that requires a different

skillset in and of itself. As a result, CSOs are required to have a skillset that enable them to mobilise funding and financial resources.

Financial capacity in CSOs can be looked at from two perspectives; the first being financial management within the institutions themselves in order to ensure that there is financial viability that enables the organisation to sustain itself. The second aspect being the ability to raise funds. Both aspects of financial capacity are important in enabling CSOs to both remain financially viable and impactful in their line of work and to demonstrate a credible record of accomplishment while doing so.

As previously outlined, internal capacity in CSOs draws on the internal skill set that is readily available to a CSO. As pointed out by Blair, Dayao, Hasan and Salomo (2002: 66), CSOs require institutionalised internal capacity in financial management to ensure that the funds raised are spent with frugality. Due to resources being scarce and limited, funding accessed by CSOs have to be managed efficiently and effectively so as to ensure that there is value for money in how resources are used (Karanth, 2015: 117). Whilst CSOs may be non-profit organisations, Kingma (1993:106) notes that there is still a need to manage variations in risk from different revenue streams. Therefore, an onus has to be on the organisation to ensure that sourcing and using funds is well managed. Nomsenge (2018: 7) argues that lack of funding for CSOs has put added pressure on them to manage their funding. In addition, any decrease in funding affects the projects that CSOs are undertaking; therefore, the previously neglected financial management aspect of CSOs has now become the most important in order to ensure the financial viability of the civil society sector as a whole (Gwandure and Mayekiso, 2013: 64).

9.3.2 Reasons for capacity and capability constraints within civil society sector

A study of CSOs in Botswana established in response to the HIV and AIDS pandemic in the country provides several significant reasons for the capacity challenges of CSOs in developing countries. The study by Chibamba (2011: 216-8) found that:

- CSOs do not have enough resources to meet their growing needs due to limited skills in resource mobilisation and development, the lack of government

investment in CSOs, and changing political agendas of the donors from which the CSOs derive much of their funding.

The lack of resources has several consequences for organisational capacity, such as the inability to attract suitably qualified leadership and staff, to acquire the necessary technical and other resources of an office, and the ability to carry out programmes. Similar findings emerged from a study of Syrian CSOs where the lack of resources undermined their stability and staffing as they were unable to provide the salaries they need to attract skilled professionals (Crawford, 2014: 18).

- CSOs rely on leadership and staff that have little formal education with a paucity of skills in management as well as in information technology.

This has a host of implications for CSOs, including the inability of the leadership to, amongst others, understand and interpret policies, develop funding proposals, document their activities and report on them (Chibamba, 2011: 218. See also Ojiambo, 2013: 12-14):

- The increasing demands placed on CSOs to scale up their activities without the necessary preparation and resources being put in place.

CSOs that are forced to expand their operations and their impact often become overwhelmed with the new responsibilities and fail to achieve their broader objectives. This affects staff morale and consequently increases staff turnover.

- An over-reliance on funding from donors and outside partners (Chibamba, 2011: 219. See also Ojiambo, 2013: 12-14).

This reliance of CSOs on donors leads to a loss of independence and the organisations are vulnerable to influence by external parties whose interests might dictate activities that the organisations do not have the capacity to perform. In addition, the study of Syrian CSOs discussed above found that international engagement with these organisations had led to a loss of skilled individuals who found better-paying jobs in international NGOs active in the country (Crawford, 2014: 18).

Other studies (Antlöv, Brinkerhoff & Rapp, 2010: 417; Sorgenfrei, 2004: 24) draw attention to several other reasons for capacity challenges. Included here are:

- The lack of clear vision and mission in some CSOs
- Cultural barriers which mitigate against the development of certain skills in some communities
- The economic, political and social environment within which CSOs operate, including the degree of operational and political space created by government; norms and values, such as religious and ethnic tolerance, attitudes toward authority and democracy, and entrepreneurialism; the legal and regulatory framework that relate to CSOs; and socio-economic factors such as access to education, economic growth to support the rise of a middle class, and social polarisation.

9.3.3 Mechanisms for capacity-building within the civil society sector

In the book edited by Fukuda-Parr, Lopes and Malik (2001), it is illustrated that capacity-building needs to be addressed at three levels: individual, institutional and societal.

- Individual: This involves enabling individuals to embark on a continuous process of learning.
- Institutional: This involves building organisational capacity.
- Societal: This involves building capacities in society (Fukuda-Parr, Lopes & Malik, 2001: 9. Cited in Blagescu & Young, 2006: 30-31).

Fukuda-Parr, Lopes and Malik (2001) contend that capacity-building at these three levels is mutually dependent and must therefore be carried out together.

Eade (1997) developed a guideline on Oxfam's approach to capacity-building in which capacity-building is seen as taking various forms. The first is education and training, focusing on the education and skills that individuals need. The second is a focus on the various ways of supporting organisational capacity, such as planning, institutional learning and financial management) and alliance and network formation in the context of capacity-building, and how information technology can be used to support this.

Blagescu and Young (2006) provide details of capacity-building mechanisms employed by a host of institutions internationally. They point out that, in general, capacity-building approaches for CSOs focus “on improving the leadership, management and/or operation of an organisation: the skills and systems that enable a CSO to define its mission, to gather and manage relevant resources and, ultimately, to produce the outcomes it seeks. The logical entry point has been at the individual level, through those who lead the organisations that work for change” (Blagescu & Young, 2006: 8). In summary form, the key mechanisms of a select group of institutions that provide support for capacity-building internationally discussed by Blagescu and Young (2006: 11-21) include:

- The African Capacity-building Foundation’s focus on mobilising and providing funding, intellectual information and research support to capacity-building in Africa in areas of the Foundation’s core competencies;
- The Canadian International Development Agency’s focus on broadening and deepening the skills and knowledge of CSOs it supports on global policy issues, and exploring and testing ways for CSOs to develop and sustain their capacity to distil from their experience policy-relevant knowledge on global poverty issues;
- The Center for International Forestry Research’s focus on providing researchers with some combination of methodological tools, technical backstopping, training, reference materials and funds, including providing training in short courses and seminars, supervision of graduate student thesis research, and in-service training and sponsoring or cosponsoring workshops and seminars on various policy and biophysical aspects related to tropical forests;
- The INTRAC Praxis Programme’s focus on building capacity of CSOs by generating, exchanging, and providing CSOs with access to innovative and contextually appropriate practice and research in organisational capacity-building arrived at through engagement with practitioners, academics and decision makers around critical issues in organisational capacity-building, with a particular emphasis on networking with civil society support providers and local practitioners in developing and transitional societies.

- The Japanese International Cooperation Agency's focus on building organisational and individual capacity through the identification of selected capacity development aspects that require special attention: leadership of the CSO; role of the CSO in the related sector and its credibility; relationship with other organisations; capacity for fiscal management; technical capacity; incentive level of the organisation; capacity of individual staff to plan, implement, manage, monitor and evaluate activities; incentives and turnover of staff; and human resource development programmes for staff.

A study of capacity-building approaches adopted by French NGOs providing support to CSOs in the South indicate several different customised approaches according to Sorgenfrei (2004: 22-5, 29), including:

- IRAM's³ combination of different forms of support during longer-term development interventions: needs assessments are followed by regular interventions such as training (workshops with case studies adapted to the organisation in question), information dissemination, technical support, field visits, shared experiences between organisations from neighbouring countries, and exchange visits between the organisations from the South and IRAM.
- CCFD's (the largest Catholic Development NGO in France)⁴ enhancement of internal organisational procedures and practices by dedicating financial support to improve the management and administrative functions and making the internal decision-making processes more democratic in NGOs and community based organisations (notably in Africa).
- The French NGO umbrella organisation SUD's assistance to partner networks in the South with respect to exchanges on strategic reflection, lobbying and advocacy, as well as dissemination of information regarding French and international developments.
- The emphasis of French NGOs in their capacity-building exercises on the notion of partnership because they primarily see capacity-building as a development activity taking place in the South.

³ Institut de Recherches et d'Applications des Méthodes de Développement.

⁴ Comité Catholique contre la Faim et pour le Développement.

- The tendency to target the individual through mentoring, training, and personal advice for project management.

While Blagescu and Young conducted a study of the capacity-building mechanisms applied by various donor organisations at a general level, Horton et al. (2003: 9-17) focus on capacity-building projects implemented among several CSOs in the developing world. They note that:

- The capacity-building mechanisms applied to a rural-development NGO⁵ in Bangladesh involved providing management and staff with training in participatory approaches to rural development that helped the organisation to develop its ability to innovate and change, to manage itself strategically, to use participatory management methodologies, and to mobilise resources.
- The capacity-building mechanism applied to a research institute, the Swine Research Institute, in Cuba involved the staff attending a number of regional and national workshops on agrifood chain analysis that enabled the participants to reach “consensus on the chain, its key links, and segments, its critical factors, and the implications of their findings for research and development activities”.
- Capacity-development support given to a plant genetic resource centre in Ghana involved external training, technical, and information support that helped the centre to “develop its infrastructure, strengthen its administrative and technical staff, improve its research methodologies, and increase its engagement with national and international stakeholders”; “diversify its services and products, which, in turn ... helped attract more financial resources”; and ensured greater autonomy from the government and thereby “freed the” centre “to carry out its mandate and manage its own budgetary resources more effectively”.
- Capacity-building for an agricultural facility in Nicaragua focused on upgrading the teaching, research, and extension skills through “joint research, technological and financial support, institutional capacity development, and information exchange” that aimed at the “development of enthusiastic leadership, professional staff, appropriate, flexible, and functioning

⁵ NGO here refers to CSOs to maintain terminological consistency

organisational structures, and strong alliances with a variety of national, regional and international organisations”.

- Capacity-building to strengthen the participatory research capacities of a root crops research centre in the Philippines included collaborative projects with an Asia-wide network of research and development professionals that also provided training, information services, and facilitation of exchanges of expertise leading to the enhancement of “capacities spanning the entire process of research planning and implementation, and extending beyond the research realm” to include enabling the “staff to teach on university courses and organise training session”.
- Capacity-development given to a rural development institute in Vietnam included a “mix of networking and research support activities, training workshops, and grants” that led to improvements in the leadership, use and dissemination of innovative research approaches and methodologies, personnel management, funding, infrastructure, programmes and projects, and networking, both nationally and internationally.⁶

One capacity-building approach applied in poorly resourced communities is ‘co-management’, in which external actors co-manage organisations with the local community. Al Mamun, Brook and Dyck (2016) conducted a study of capacity-building approaches applied at six co-managed community-based organisations involved in open waters fisheries systems in southern Bangladesh. International agencies like UKaid provided funding to the implementing agency, the WorldFish Center, to support co-management programmes. The technical agency worked with a government department to supervise the co-management programme, while the implementing agencies organised community members and helped form CSOs and to provide training. The capacity-building mechanisms employed included livelihood-focused training and economic tools such as micro-credits and grants. Microcredit loans were generated through co-management and monthly savings raised by each CSOs. Funding in the form of grants were essentially revolving funds, i.e. funds that were used to meet the temporary needs but had to be reimbursed later. These funds from donors were used to establish community centres, maintain operational costs of CSOs

⁶ The book contains more details about the capacity-building interventions in each of the case studies.

and to promote microcredits at community level. Training, which was outsourced, involved multiple techniques to achieve human resource development goals (i.e., training on how to generate alternative incomes, create gender awareness, and build skills at microcredit and office management).

Finally, several capacity-building guides have been developed. For instance, the book written by Cammack (2018) presents practical ways to build financial management capacity in a not-for-profit organisation. It describes good practice in the specific tasks of financial management – for example, planning and budgeting and financial controls. It gives examples of how groups and organisations build their own capacity. It also considers what leadership teams can do to guide their organisations' longer-term direction and improve governance; and it also describes other financial management aspects such as building reserves that can be built into an organisation's structure to make it more sustainable (Alite, Guštafík, Miková & Paulíniová, 2016).

There is a need for an identification of different role players in the capacity-building of CSOs. However, capacity-building requires a holistic effort, which involves the growth of advocacy, internal capacity and networking that need to be developed in order to achieve the best results for a CSO (EUROSIS, 2012:22). A relationship between both the public and private sector is a critical component of capacity-building in CSOs. In addition, through fostering of such relationships, there is a need for the involvement of international organisations such as the United Nations, which, through the United Nations Convention against Corruption (UNCAC), facilitate training programmes for CSOs with the intention of increasing capacity (United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, 2013: 8). Moreover, different CSOs have ranging skills and capacity; in consequence, Albareda (2018: 1220) suggests for capacity development to be realised there needs to be active member involvement in building capacity.

Although it is clear that the capacity-building mechanisms were specific to different organisations, it is possible to identify a list of similar enabling activities such as funding for capacity-building interventions, training, supply of training and learning infrastructure, sharing of information, facilitation of exchanges, and improving local knowledge-sharing networks.

9.3.4 Methods to capacitate the civil society sector in South Africa

It is quite clear that there are many different approaches to, and mechanisms for building the capacity of CSOs. This is also reflected in capacity-building efforts in South Africa. For instance, in the 1990s, the Community Development Resource Association (CDRA) in South Africa coached leaders of CSOs as part of its development practitioner formation programmes. This mechanism was used to complement and strengthen organisational capacity-building. The Barnabas Trust, on the other hand, applied its coaching interventions in South Africa to CSOs' broader leadership teams as opposed to a more traditional focus on one-to-one leader development. The Trust has found that it is more effective to mentor leaders in conjunction with either the core leadership group of three or four people, or the wider organisation, and only occasionally and informally with the leader alone (Deans & Oakley with James & Wrigley, 2006).

Yachkaschi (2008) outlines several mechanisms used to build the capacity of a small number of civil society organisations in the Western Cape in South Africa: training courses around HIV and AIDS and organisational skills courses given to staff of the Impiliso HIV & AIDS Organisation, as well as annual strategic planning workshops with a service provider. The strategic review workshops were aimed at reviewing the strategy and structure of the organisation, identifying other challenges that needed to be addressed, and developing strategies aimed at financial sustainability. An initial diagnostic review was followed by a two-day strategic workshop that focused on these areas, and a series of changes were suggested, and follow-up review and planning workshops were held. This was complemented by mentoring of one staff member on fundraising and annual report writing. The organisations also received various other forms of capacity-building support from the National AIDS Committee of South Africa (NACOSA), Community Chest, the University of Cape Town, Hope Worldwide and Child Welfare; and strategic reviews and mentoring in a similar manner provided by the same service provider to the Uxolo Community Health Organisation.

The Foundation for Human Rights (FHR), a grant making institution supporting civil society organisations in South Africa, has facilitated a number of capacity-building exercises over several years. In the first phase implemented in 2010 the focus was on sixteen projects that were supported to strengthen forum and networking approaches to organising by CSOs, with most having a component of education or skills building (some more formalised than others) built into the project. Sixteen partner organisations were commissioned to conduct capacity-building in different parts of the country, and the partners adopted a variety of different capacity-building mechanisms (McKinley, 2012).

- The Black Sash, which conducted capacity-building in several provinces, made use of workshops with the staff of the CSOs they worked with, including providing training materials and hosting a forum for discussion, debates and information-sharing.
- The Southern Cape Land Committee (SCLC), which targeted advice offices and farm committees in the Central Karoo, identified a range of areas where capacity-building was needed, e.g., organisational development and sustainability in case of advice offices, and rights/information awareness and knowledge support in case of farm committees. The delivery ‘vehicle’ took the form of workshops, which made extensive use of case studies, popular education, mapping, storytelling and action-participation, with materials/manuals produced and distributed.
- Khanya College, which concentrated on social movements, CBOs and independent unions in Gauteng alongside one CBO from the Free State, focused on the training of leadership for organising. Use was made of a series of almost weeklong, residentially based ‘teaching-lecture and information provision’ course modules (with various manuals and materials produced and provided) framed by a ‘participatory’ approach.
- The CBR Education for Training and Empowerment (CREATE) service provider, which concentrated on members of Human Rights Forums in rural KwaZulu-Natal that had a core focus on advocacy for people with disabilities, children and women, developed a range of human rights and legal materials and manuals that were used in a series of standard educational-informational workshops.

- The Rural Legal Trust (RLT) focused on formal legal and technical training for their own staff and paralegals from organisations that are part of their network in a course it provided through a university law clinic centred on a case management database system.
- The KwaZulu-Natal Christian Council (KZNCC), which concentrated on its own church-based activist groups at a district level alongside several largely rural-based CSOs, facilitated capacity-building in ‘human rights based approaches’ in a wide range of areas (e.g. land, local food production, local governance, LGBTI people, refugees, conflict resolution and elections). Use was made of a series of workshops held in various localities across the province which adopted a ‘catalyst’ methodology (involving bringing a range of people and organisations together, letting them talk and find solutions) and that were centred on materials and manuals produced by KZNCC.
- Justice and Women (JAW), which concentrated on internal and lobbying-advocacy capacity-building for the rural-based Mthonjaneni Home-Based Care Network (MHBCN), ran workshops using an ‘action-participant’ methodology wherein participants were capacitated to become independent ‘owners’ of their organisations, actions and advocacy efforts.
- The South African National Council for the Blind (SANCB) trained part-time field-workers in selected provinces with a standard method of rights awareness and knowledge generation and then deployed them to identify blind and partially sighted women to attend SANCB staff-run meetings and workshops. The meetings-workshops were designed to provide capacity-building around access to information, leadership, economic participation and rights awareness and support on gender-based violence and HIV/AIDS using descriptive tools, large print material and assistive devices.
- The Nkuzi Development Association, which concentrated on rural farm dwellers and workers in two provinces with one of the key goals being to facilitate the formation of local farm dweller and worker forums, centered on a centralised rights-awareness workshop combined with a series of more local (municipal-level) workshops designed to provide information on associated rights and legislation (through the provision of materials) alongside local-level advocacy-lobbying training (using role playing and case studies).

- The Trust for Community Outreach and Education (TCOE), which concentrated on strengthening the organisational and institutional capacity of six rural women’s forums in the Western and Eastern Cape, arranged a series of regional workshops (tied to each forum) that encompassed standard skills training, information-sharing and knowledge generation and media training along with the provision of materials and posters. Extensive use was made of the creative arts to convey key messages.
- Sikhula Sonke, which concentrated on strengthening the farmworkers’ union’s own leadership staff (at both an office and shop-steward level) and structures (including farm committees), used a range of capacity-building activities that included labour rights and political education workshops as well as farm level information sessions. Depending on the level of intervention, different methods were employed such as standard presentations, participatory discussions, role playing, case studies as well as basic skills development and information-sharing using prepared materials/manuals.
- The Environmental Monitoring Group (EMG), which concentrated on building the capacity of the Association of Fairness in Trade (AFIT – comprised of various CSOs) as well as independent trade unions organising amongst and on behalf of farmworkers, focused on raising human and labour rights awareness. The core mechanism used was through rolling out education and training workshops focused at the level of union shop-stewards and farm workers committees. A participatory approach was adopted that brought in all stakeholders from the start of the project (i.e., conceptualisation and implementation). Training manuals and flyers were developed, and workshops run using a variety of methods (role playing, question-answer, small group sessions and information provision) with a curriculum adaptable to participant needs.
- The Khulumani Support Group (KSG), which concentrated on building the capacity of its own selected provincial branch members, used core ‘train the trainers’ (learning-action) workshops that focused on community narrative healing processes, human rights advocacy training and skills for public deliberation and dialogue. The methods adopted were multiple – standard instruction, films, conversations, practical exercises, discussion and team

building – while a range of materials were also provided. In turn, each participant then returned to their communities and replicated the workshops on a smaller scale.

- The Project for Conflict Resolution and Development (PCRD) concentrated on the internal organisational development of community-based advice offices (CBAOs) in small-town/rural areas of the Eastern Cape in order to enhance their work in protecting and advancing human rights and participatory democracy for the poor and marginalised communities they serve. The modality adopted included a first phase ‘induction’ workshop for all participant CBAOs centred on a needs/skills audit. Flowing from this self-identification of capacity gaps and ways to address them, workshops were held on various organisational skilling (e.g., writing, advocacy, finances) with relevant materials and resource packs produced and distributed. The main method adopted was an experiential learning process framed by simple instructions for literacy purposes, utilising small groups, practicals and the development of an advocacy campaign. In doing so the partner-provider made extensive use of professional external facilitators in each capacity-building area.
- The Labour Research Service (LRS), which concentrated on selected gender activists (all women) drawn from eight organisations in five provinces (including women farm workers, HIV-AIDS activists, community activists and trade union members), sought to increase capacity ‘to create knowledge and communicate their innovative change experiences through writing’; and through doing so, to positively change organisational culture and work. Initial workshops were held with each participant organisation to introduce the concept of the project, conduct basic organisational skills instruction, get buy-in and choose individual participants for the follow-on writing (residential) workshops. Workshop methods included focusing on personal development and expression (that included tai chi), peer learning and mentoring as well as linking this to broader areas of gender equality and organisational development. For the specific writing workshops, these were combined with free writing, brainstorming and a hands-on approach.
- The Centre for Conflict Resolution (CCR), which targeted the Du Noon community in the Western Cape because of xenophobic violence that had

occurred in the area, utilised the Du Noon Development Forum (which is comprised of religious, political, women, youth, refugee and community organisations) to roll out training – through workshops – in creative and constructive approaches to conflict, human rights and conflict management as well as basic mediation skills. The workshops centred on adult education participatory methods, incorporating a practical skills orientation, an emphasis on experiential learning through role-playing, case studies, and other group exercises. Three additional monitoring and evaluation workshops were also held throughout the duration of the project.

Following these capacity-building projects, the FHR then launched a pilot ‘Building Stronger Organisations’ project, working with organisations in one area of a province or in a sector. The overall goal of this project was for marginalised communities and sectors to have greater access to human rights. The aim was to strengthen organisations of the marginalised and other social justice organisations to work together systematically to deepen their rootedness or implantation in and accountability to the vulnerable and marginalised communities that they serve; and to consolidate and expand their leadership layers to help strengthen the human rights or social justice movement. The initial target group for the project was the current leadership, leading activists and programme staff of CSOs as the first target group for engagement in the exploratory meetings. Activities thereafter targeted emerging second layer leadership in the form of organising, programme staff and emerging activists; and included current leadership where relevant and appropriate. The two pilots were in the rural areas surrounding Pietermaritzburg and Limpopo Province (Turton, 2014: 4).

In Pietermaritzburg, participants from nine CSOs were exposed to training opportunities on project management, financial management, gender, youth training and skills for building activism between August 2013 and March 2014. In addition, exchange visits of between a few hours and five days enabled participants to acquire expertise on financial management, lobbying and advocacy, community mapping, and how to communicate with municipalities. Participation in the events of the targeted CSOs was another mechanism used, and this included participation in a gender-based violence (GBV) march, a hate crime forum, youth dialogues, gender

and sexuality forums (Turton, 2014: 11-12; Williams, 2014).

In the Limpopo pilot, participants from ten CSOs that focused on early childhood development and home-based care in the province were provided with training in computer skills, financial management, human rights, how to write proposals, women and leadership, HIV and AIDS (stigma and discrimination), how to use a camera and food gardening. The objective was to support greater rootedness or implantation of organisations in communities with campaigns and advocacy around human rights being led by the marginalised themselves, and to consolidate and expand wider layers of skilled and experienced leadership driving these campaigns and advocacy. The objectives included strengthening leadership skills, amongst women and young people in particular, building solidarity among participating organisations through shared experience of and reflection on each other's work and struggles, and improving the capacity of participating member organisations to strengthen their organisations (Turton, 2014: 12; Msunduzi Evaluation Consortium, 2014: 2-6).

Hendrickse draws attention to the capacity-building efforts of several international donor organisations active in South Africa:

...the European Union launched a programme to be implemented by Interfund to conduct capacity-building in the CSO sector in order to enhance the capability of organisations to become self-reliant. The Ford Foundation focused on building the infrastructure for a robust civil society. The Mott Foundation grant-making programme sought to strengthen the non-profit sector by building local resources for the sector. The W.K. Kellogg Foundation grant-making programme promoted partnering with community-based organisations and institutions, helping them link government and other service delivery institutions (Hendrickse, 2008: 20).

9.4. The positive and negative impact of civil society sector capacity-building mechanisms

A key starting point is to acknowledge that assessing “impact is a complicated process, especially when measuring the impact of intrinsically complex, intangible and often ill-defined processes such as organisational capacity-building” (Hailey, James & Wrigley, 2005: 3). Hailey, James and Wrigley (2005) offer a brief overview of current thinking and practice in relation to the impact assessment of organisational capacity-building interventions. Their study highlights some of the conceptual, methodological and practical challenges (issues of clarity, power and culture, among others), and then goes on to provide an overview of some of the practical approaches that have been adopted by CSOs to overcome these challenges (Hailey, James & Wrigley, 2005: 3). They contend that organisational capacity-building aims at “actual change in programme performance and, ultimately, in the lives of the” organisation’s beneficiaries. However, the challenge is the difficulty of demonstrating “a causal link between a particular organisational intervention and a wider process of change. For example, can a link be found between establishing staff performance appraisal procedures and the resulting improvements in the lives of the most vulnerable? (Hailey, James & Wrigley, 2005: 5).

Hailey et al. point to recent developments in measuring the impact of capacity-building mechanisms, and contend that integrated multi-dimensional frameworks are required for such assessments. One such framework is the Ripple Model, in which the capacity-building intervention is like a drop of rain or a pebble that lands in water – the ripples flow outwards to bring about changes at an individual level. The capacity-building inputs are seen to bring about changes in individuals in the organisation, which brings about changes in the organisation, which brings about changes in the quality of services delivered, which in turn brings about behavioural changes among beneficiaries. It is thus possible to determine impact by using the concept of plausible association to judge whether capacity-building inputs that bring about change at one level does indeed ripple out to bring about changes at a wider level (Hailey, James & Wrigley, 2005: 21).

Kutter & Trappmann conducted a study of capacity-building mechanisms applied to CSOs in former Eastern European (EU) countries after they joined the Union (Kutter & Trappmann, 2010: 58-9). They found that the CSOs funded, such as environmental groups and trade unions, had experienced enhanced capacities and increased promotion of their issues due to EU funding, EU social and environmental policies and the new opportunities for participation in transnational networks (Hicks, 2004: 221; Pleines, 2007). Direct funding of core activities and those related to EU policies allocated more resources, developed skills and thereby partially compensated for the lack of capacities of these CSOs. In particular, EU funding helped to build infrastructure for campaigning and awareness raising, for lobbying, networking and monitoring (Abele, 2006: 177). It is important to underscore that these funds should be sustainable but at the same time should not create dependency syndrome to a point that without them, the CSOs may be forced to close.

In the study of the impact of the work of FORUT, it was found that the resources spent on capacity-building were not adequate; capacity-building efforts were not aligned with FORUT's overall objectives; and a series of organisational practices in the CSOs counteracted the objectives of capacity-building (Baklien, Haug & Chamindra, 2005. Cited in Blagescu & Young, 2006: 26-7). Similarly, several challenges were found with the capacity-building mechanisms used at the six co-managed fisheries in Bangladesh. Overall, the capacity-building could not achieve expected full potential as fishers could not use the lessons learned during training afterwards. Communities raised several concerns about the type and effectiveness of the training provided, location of training venues, appropriate use of technologies and congruency across programmes. The types of training offered were mostly problematic because they often did not reflect the needs of the fishers that co-management programmes aimed to support. In addition, the funding system applied led to corruption because there was a lack of accountability and transparency pertaining to how the revolving funds were handled (Al Mamun, Brook & Dyck, 2016).

The study of capacity-building mechanisms applied to CSOs in former Eastern European (EU) countries after they joined the Union also found several negative consequences of funding for capacity development (Kutter & Trappmann, 2010: 58-9). These funds were short term and followed the priorities of the donor, rather than

the needs of the recipients (Fagan, 2004: 539. Cited in Kutter & Trappmann, 2010: 59). The shift in funding strategies from a grassroots enhancing approach to an approach that involved civil society organisations for recentralised top-down implementation in 1999 advantaged the already established actors who had the necessary skills and resources for fund-raising and for professional interaction with administrations (Raik, 2006. Cited in Kutter & Trappmann, 2010: 59). Although implementation-related capacity-building enhanced professionalism and elite proximity among the larger organisations, it weakened linkages with local communities (Fagan, 2004: 541. Cited in Kutter & Trappmann, 2010: 59). Finally, there was a mismatch between costs and effects, and an inappropriate selection of projects (Cooper & Johansen, 2003; EMS Consortium, 2004. Cited in Kutter & Trappmann, 2010: 59).

Ojiambo (2013: 12-14) draws attention to several studies that illustrate that externally driven interventions to improve the capacity of civil society organisations have limited impact. According to Ojiambo, most CSOs assisted by external funders collapsed soon after the withdrawal of the funding. This pattern suggests that external funding affects the sustainability of CSOs, which become reliant on such funding. In addition, several empirical studies suggest that external assistance is often not successful in improving the institutional capacity of CSOs but has the potential to interfere with their structure, processes and level of cooperation. For example, Molinas (1998. Cited in Ojiambo, 2013: 12) found that cooperation in CSOs increases with the increase in external assistance until an optimum following which it deteriorates. Casey, Glennerster and Miguel (2011. Cited in Ojiambo, 2013: 12) found that although external assistance improved CSOs' economic welfare, it was not effective in improving their norms or collective performance. This study confirms Gugerty and Kremer's (2008. Cited in Ojiambo, 2013: 12) conclusion that outside funding has very limited effects on the strength, internal activity and external outreach of CSOs.

External assistance can lead to changes in leadership, and scholars have found evidence that CSOs were more likely to change leadership by electing men and better educated women to leadership roles after securing external assistance (Gugerty & Kremer, 2008; Datta, 2007. Cited in Ojiambo, 2013: 13). The new leaders may lack the charisma to keep the group together, be motivated by the potential benefits

accruing from the external assistance, and may not have the willingness to continue devoting their time to group activities without compensation beyond the project period (Datta, 2007. Cited in Ojiambo. 2013: 13).

On the other hand, the literature indicates several benefits from capacity-building. Leaders of CSOs who have gone through capacity-building experiences have noted that these mechanisms increase confidence and self-belief, and that they can be a very motivating, inspiring experience. Other benefits for the individual include encouraging and developing creative thinking and problem-solving through reflection and discussion with an external person; increased management skills, such as better people skills and planning; helping individuals become aware of and responsible for their own actions; developing a better understanding of their role as CSO leaders; and enabling an individual to see the bigger picture and review their life and skills. These changes at the individual level had positive consequences for the organisation's styles of leadership, management and communication (Deans & Oakley with James & Wrigley, 2006: 18-20).

The capacity-building projects initiated by the Foundation for Human Rights in 2010 had varying impacts (McKinley, 2012). Nevertheless, according to an assessment of the projects, despite practical problems and a range of critical responses, almost all participating organisations and individuals warmly embraced and greatly appreciated the opportunity to be part of these capacity-building projects. In addition, all 16 capacity-building projects had a positive impact in one way or another (McKinley, 2012: 5). At a general level, significant impacts was seen in the way they increased access to information for the participants, and enhanced personal development in the form of providing participants with greater confidence, enhanced self-esteem and a deeper sense of empathy – i.e. the means to not only be better advocates, lobbyists and activists but also better human beings (McKinley, 2012: 6).

In the FHR's pilot project in Pietermaritzburg, the most significant outcome was that the participating organisations clearly saw value in working and learning in collaboration with other organisations, and their understanding of their communities deepened, their networks were expanded and their leadership was enhanced. The foundations for improvement in accountability to their communities and closer

collaboration between participating organisations around common interests were laid (Williams, 2014). There were also specific benefits derived. For instance, one exchange visit (5 days) resulted in one organisation learning about the principles of lobbying and advocacy, how to do lobbying and advocacy, community mapping, and how to communicate with municipalities. Another exchange visit of a week led to the development of skills in providing legal advice and how to take statements and help victims and secondary victims (Turton, 2014: 11-12).

In the pilot project initiated by the FHR in Limpopo Province, the impact of capacity-building was seen in the way in which participants' attitudes changed and the increase in personal awareness of human rights issues affecting their own lives; changes in the way the participating organisations approached and implemented their work at community level through awareness raising, education in human rights and addressing specific human rights issues; increased commitment to the principles of equality and power sharing amongst participating organisations; increased sharing of information and approaches amongst the organisations; the manner in which the organisations were able to embed their work in the communities they served and to relate the human rights approach to real-world aspects affecting their work with the most marginalised of communities; increasing gender awareness among participants; and increasing sharing of skills and information among participating organisations that promoted organisational capacity, including fundraising and leadership (Msunduzi Evaluation Consortium 2014). Participants gained skills in a wide range of areas, including identifying abused children, how to store information, send emails, typing, copying, photo-taking and printing, better ways to do record keeping, monitoring and managing finances, fundraising, financial reporting to the community – monthly, quarterly and annually – and advocacy of women and children's rights (Turton, 2014: 14).

However, several challenges were identified with the capacity-building programme in the first phase of the FHR's programme. Included here were the *physical location* of training interventions, specifically as related to long distances and necessary resources required to get to the venues where the training was provided; the types of materials used which did not take into account the literacy levels of participants; and the fact that several of the capacity-building projects were too ambitious/expansive in their conceptual scope (i.e. the capacity-building areas to be addressed and breadth of

participation) and the corresponding practical means (whether in respect of financial or human resources) to fulfil that scope (McKinley, 2012; Turton, 2014: 9). Similarly, the key challenges in the second phase of FHR projects were: the long distance to travel to training venues and the length of time spent on projects in the KwaZulu-Natal capacity-building programme; the inadequate funding for some of the projects in the Limpopo province; the inadequate time allocated to training in some of the Limpopo projects; the long distances and costs required to attend training in some of the Limpopo projects; and the failure to include some soft skills training such as computer skills, proposal- and report-writing, women's rights, office administration, and on AIDS, diabetes, cancer and Ebola in some of the Limpopo projects (Turton, 2014: 14).

9.5 Government involvement in capacity development

The role of government in building capacity development becomes significantly important in those developing countries that are democratic. On this point, Cairns, Harris and Young (2005:871) state that government involvement in capacity-building could be done through investment and funding aimed at capacity development. Eade (2007: 633) notes that although government intervention may be well intentioned, it is not always that straight forward. There are challenges such as resource misalignment, and potential conflict of interest can undermine the capacity-building programmes that government are undertaking and are involved in. Nevertheless, there is a clear need for government involvement in the form of sponsorships that can aid CSOs. CSOs in the global South in particular require more attention and government intervention for capacity development that is needed for them to continuously play a meaningful role in the democratic dispensation (Phlix, Dhaene, Molenaers, Nijs, Fonteneau, Bossuyt, Grega & De Potter, 2010: 36). If both government and civil society can diligently play their role, capacity development of CSOs can be a mutually beneficial relationship for both the between government and the CSOs.

9.6 Private sector involvement in capacity development

Much like government, the private sector also has an important role to play in building the capacity of CSOs. The significant increase of CSOs has been accompanied by

added pressure to enhance capacity and to source the enhancement of capacity from different avenues (Cooper, 2018: 15). In addition to providing much needed funds, the private sector is able to assist with capacity-building of CSOs by providing expertise where needed, such as in fund raising, which is a critical skill in the private sector that is important for CSOs (Thomas-Lake, 2006: 178). In its involvement in capacity development, the private sector can play a stronger role in ensuring that civil society is able to fulfil its role and in turn empower those who are underprivileged (CIVICUS, 2017: 20). Moreover, the World Economic Forum (2013: 5) argues that the private sector could play a significant role in taking on many of society's challenges by empowering CSOs. Therefore, private sector involvement in capacity-building of CSOs is beneficial for government, as well as the public sector. As Kotecha (2002: 137) notes, the public sector in South Africa has a stake in the growth of the private sector so that it is able to assist the public sector in meeting the needs of South Africans. To this end, there is an increase, for example, of private sector support for CSOs active in health care (Peltzer, Phaswana-Mafuya and Ramlagan, 2008: 118). The improvement of these relationships rests mostly on the interventions of CSOs who, with the right capacity and aid from the private sector, can foster such partnerships.

Capacity development is considered a priority internationally through the Paris Declaration of 2005 and Accra Agenda for action of 2008, whereby international donors have earmarked capacity development as one of the key priority areas. As noted in Bolger (2000: 5), one of the capacity development strategies is the utilisation of the private sector for capacity development of CSOs. Donor funding is the most common way in which the private sector seeks to assist CSOs, along with technical advice given to assist local CSOs with the development of the necessary technical skills (Morgan, 1998). Furthermore, Brinkerhoff and Morgan (2010: 4) write that private sector-led capacity development takes place at the individual level, and it characteristically involves the individuals in local organisations through training and filling of knowledge gaps. This is also seen in the work of Janssens-Bevernage (2002: 10) who writes that, within the SADC region, capacity development of CSOs included training and technical assistance in policy writing and formulation along with the training of senior executive management in focusing on budgeting, proposal-writing and performance monitoring. However, CSOs' capacity to derive support from the

private sector for capacity-building has been identified as a weakness by Janssens-Bevernage (2002).

12. EMPIRICAL ANALYSIS

Interviews were conducted with 6 Key Stakeholders (see Annexure 2 for the Interview Instrument) and the qualitative data arising therefrom analysed using content analysis. The analysis gave rise to several themes of significance for this study, and these themes and the related analysis are set out below.

10.1 Understanding of the meaning of the terms: capacities and capabilities

One key informant, Participant A, understood the terms capacities and capabilities to be broad terms, and stated that:

In terms of capacity, more so for us non-profit organisations, this is where we need more assistance from structures such as the NDA. This includes technical capacity, skills development and governance. There are so many things I could mention. It is broad for us, and we lack so much capacity, including manpower, and so on. So, there is so much we lack as Non-Profits, and it is broad.

Participant A explained further by pointing out that when speaking about capacity and capabilities, a lot of ideas and thoughts come to mind. Speaking on this, the respondent said:

For us, when we talk about capacity-building, we focus more on ... the use of technology. We have partnered with different technology companies where we administer their donated technologies. We work with Microsoft, Google, and so many others where we administer their solutions to Non-Profits, especially now during times of COVID-19 where most people are expected to work from home”

Participant B, on the other hand, said:

Capacity talks to all the necessary resources that are required for an organisation to run, and when I say resources, it would be skills and expertise to run and implement whatever programmes deemed necessary for your mandate and organisation: capacity in relation to human resources needed to execute whatever mandate that your organisation seeks to reach.

Speaking about capabilities, Participant B states that this has more to do with the ability of the organisation to meet its own targets. The participant further said:

The ability of that organisation to [meet] its expectations in terms of performance. For example, there are plenty of organisations who claim to be doing something in a particular field. However, you find that they are unable to live up to their own expectations.

Participant B further distinguishes between capacities and capabilities by stating that capacities focus more on the internal resources within the organisation, and capabilities focus on the organisation's ability to meet their own expectations in terms of performance.

Participant C confirms that capacity is about how much can be done, and capabilities is about skills sets. Participant D noted that capacity is the scope, dimension and potential, and capability is about skills, ability, and organisational aptitude.

Participant E stipulated that:

Capability is something that you have – you have the capability to do something, while capacity is something you can grow – something that you can develop. The capacity within the community-based organisations (CBOs) tends to be quite limited. You do have people who have the capability to do the work, but they

have not been capacitated, given the skills that they need. There is a lot of capacitation over the years in South Africa at the content level, for instance, if you are dealing with gender violence, training them to deal with that. But there has not been sufficient capacitation at the leadership level, at the organisational development level. There is a lot at the content level, but not sufficiently on organisational development and at the leadership level.

Participant F stated the following:

I understand capability to mean the intrinsic ability to fulfill required responsibilities. This would include financial, academic, knowledge, experience and human capabilities. Capacity refers to the sector or organisation's ability to bring on board and maintain people, projects and finances in order to fulfill its objectives.

10.2 The most important capacities and capabilities required in the civil society sector

Participant A mentioned that, firstly, for his organisation the most important capacity is around finance and governance. This participant stated that governance was not their area of specialisation, and added that:

Remember, my focus is not compliance. My focus is providing capacity to non-profits; training them. Every day I have webinars where I train them on how to use technology effectively. Some sessions are one-on-ones, and governance is just not my strong point. It is not my way of doing things.

Participant A also drew attention to the importance of having the necessary skills capacity, and in particular the need to appoint lawyers and chartered accountants in order to ensure that the organisation is operating within the correct framework and that the day-to-day running of the organisation is guided by legal expertise.

I had to approach a lawyer to sit on our board so that the lawyer can advise us on the legal implications of I mean we sign contracts, and without the legal background, we just sign: 'Hey, Microsoft is going to give us a million rands'. So, we sign, forgetting that there are terms and conditions. Having a lawyer on your side will help you understand the terms and conditions better instead of just rushing to put your signature.

Thirdly, Participant A mentioned the importance of human-power and capacity-building to round off the three most important capacities that are required in the civil society space. Participant B stated that capacities are broad and differ across organisations. However, this participant cited financial capacity as the most important requirement. In addition, human capacity, in terms of the required human-power and internal coordination, were the second most important capacity needs, whilst the participant acknowledged that finances play an influential role in determining the direction of an organisation. About the latter point, Participant B said:

We find ourselves as country, in a position where [having] financial resources influence the direction an organisation [takes]. Obviously, the ability to perform relies mostly on the financial resources available to keep it afloat. Most CBOs and organisations have several strategies which sometimes do not yield positive results, mostly as a result of financial constraints.

According to Participant E:

Most of the CSOs, there is a lot of capacity at the content level – they know the work and they are passionate about it. ... But they haven't invested a lot in the organisational design and organisational development. Which is why sustainability becomes such a huge issue. A lot of CSOs that have been around in the 1990s have actually cooled down. A high level of expertise, but civil

society had a tendency of expertise over issues of management rather than developing a strong organisation.

This participant added that:

In terms of [the three main capacities], at civil society level, definitely capacitation in terms of building a strong organisation, having all the proper organisational development mechanisms, from strategy to implementation, and monitoring that. Really, OD is a big issue. I think also investing in leadership. As someone who is leadership in an NGO, civil society attracts people who are passionate about what they want to do and highly motivated with doing something that is close to their heart. The downside of it is that the passions lead to contradictions, [and] the conflicts at the workplace can be very intense. To be able to develop emotional intelligence in the leadership to deal with those conflicts, and how to ensure that the organisational culture does not interfere with the strategy of the organisation, that is the biggest thing for me for CSOs. Whereas for the CBOs, it would be both that and content, because most of them are also lacking in the expertise of doing that work. The CBOs also, things like fund-raising, getting money for their work, being able to report properly, proper mechanisms for donor management and reporting are also quite a gap. A lot of people doing great work are unable to attract the funding that is needed. Whereas the CSOs that are very structured but are distant from CBOs are the ones that get the funding because they have the mechanisms to attract funding and report to donors.

Participant F listed the key capacities and capabilities required by CSOs as follows: knowledgeable and committed people who share common principles; resources to be able to achieve objectives aimed at programmes to achieve social justice; spaces for ongoing reflection on various manifestations of marginalisation; sectoral collaborations for mutual learning and solidarity; and engagement and intentional solidarity with

marginalized people to ensure that their voice is articulated by themselves and not silenced or diluted by CSOs.

In general, the participants in this study identified different priorities in terms of capacity and capability, but identified the most important capacities and capabilities in the civil society sector as follows:

1. Good governance
2. Enough funds
3. Capable and skilled human resources (leadership, financial management capacity, general management skills – operational efficiencies, people skills – administrative capacities, compliance (leadership, vision and mission and reporting), and co-ordination
4. Requisite technical and other material resources
5. Service delivery (ability to carry out mandate, communication with clients and other stakeholders)
6. Sustainability (resourcing, retaining skilled staff).

10.3 The key challenges currently experienced by the civil society sector

Participant B pointed out that, generally, the civil society space is challenging and requires a range of resources and skills capacities. In addition, this participant emphasised the importance of attracting people with the right skillset in the organisation in the following words: *“The ability to attract competent and skilled people who will be driving the organisation’s specific goals is proving to be a challenge.”*

Furthermore, Participant B drew attention to challenges around financing and technology, particularly in the context of the Fourth Industrial Revolution phase where technology becomes important for any organisation, and added:

The 4IR is taking over. You need to have the appropriate resourcing to keep afloat as an organisation. I think that is important, and we have seen over time that previously known organisations that used

to be respected from a humanitarian point of view who have ceased to exist. It is almost looking as if the focus is different.

Participant B identified another major challenge facing civil society organisations in South Africa to be contestation and competition within the civil society space. Elaborating on this point, this participant further stated:

Everyone is there for themselves; to push a particular agenda. Hence you find that most of these organisations end up getting swallowed by the bigger ones who are able to attract huge investment from donors, for example, and they forget why they were there in the first place.

Finally, Participant B stated that the politicisation and political involvement of CSOs is also a challenge that these organisations have to deal with.

Participant E identified COVID-19 as a major indication of challenges being brought to the fore in the civil society sector – the ability to manage change. A lot of stress, burn-out and exhaustion has become evident. The issue of emotional intelligence to deal with change management is critical. It also must deal with management and the capacity of management to deal with change. It has brought to the fore the difference between those organisations that have been able to deal with the change brought about by COVID-19 and those that are not. Management needs to have high levels of emotional intelligence themselves to deal with change. And, also the ability to be flexible – to think out of the box – to be able to deal with change. All of these have to do with change-management. Participant E drew attention to another challenge, however, adding that:

Almost every director [of a CSO] I talk to says, ‘my board, my board’. There is a crisis at the board level in our country. There is need for training. ... There is not sufficient.... I know there is a Board of Directors’ Association that we are also aligned to. But there is not sufficient training for board [members]. And those people can make even the most emotionally intelligent leaders [of CSOs] really

struggle. And a lot of capable people have left because they do not have that board.... The board is either completely distant and not engaged, or they are just micro-managing the people and too involved. ... I have seen a lot of capable, great organisations with good leaders being sabotaged because of the type of board members that are there. So, there is a lot of work, first of all, for directors to learn how to manage board members. But also for board members to [get to] really know how they can support organisations to become better without becoming a hindrance. ... When I talk about leadership in general, I am talking about the directors and the board members.

According to Participant F: *“Whilst CS is recognized as having a critical role to play in the transformation agenda, it has extremely limited financial muscle to take this work forward”*. In addition:

The brain drain remains a critical issue within the sector, as affordability draws experienced and knowledgeable people away from the sector. As a result, a number of capable and progressive CSOs, who have played a vital role in the transformation of society, have had to close down, leaving a big gap that is hard to close because of resource constraints.

In general, below are the key challenges that CSOs in South Africa are facing according to the participants in this study:

1. Poor leadership and management skills
2. Inability to attract the right people for the right job
3. Lack of people with finance and technological skills
4. Funding and resources
5. Lack of accountability (corruption and poor financial reporting)
6. Dearth of strategic planning capacity (developing implementation and business plans)
7. Competition and contestation

8. Incompetent or over-involved boards.

10.4 Specific skills required in the civil society sector to ensure that CSOs can execute their activities and achieve their goals

When speaking about skills that are required in the civil society sector, Participant A stated that this is a difficult question to answer because civil society organisations provide different services. Generally, all skills are important. However, Participant B stated that financial management skills and ability to attract funding are key. This participant noted that:

Your financial management skills. I mean, if you think about keeping the company afloat, that would include fund raising, attracting investment. A lot of these organisations lack that.

In addition, according to Participant B, communication skills are important, the ability to conduct the necessary awareness campaigns about the work that the organisation is doing. Finally, Participant B stated that skills transfer is an important skill that organisations need to have:

Being able to harness and nurture those skills, including people management, is probably important in the sense that you do not want people who come and go, you know. The ability to retain people who work for NPOs. They might not be for profit, but they should have people who are employed there on a full-time basis.

For Participant E, the main skills required by civil society organisations to achieve their objectives differ significantly:

CBOs lack resource-organisation skills, content-specific skills in the various fields of work that they operating in, and skills on how to run an organisation, generic organisational development from HR to financial management, all those basics of a functional organisation

that tend to be taken for granted. For bigger civil society organisations, it is basically issues of leadership. ... Some of them are looking at OD, and leadership, and managing change and having emotional intelligence to manage people and change.

Participant F listed the following key skill requirements of CSOs in South Africa: project management skills, financial management skills, fundraising and report writing skills, ongoing reflection and learning to improve organisational practice, monitoring and evaluation skills, and change management.

Below are the most important skills required by CSOs identified by the participants:

1. Financial management skills
2. Fundraising skills
3. Communication and stakeholder engagement skills
4. Mentoring and talent nurturing skills
5. Leadership
6. Project management skills
7. Strategy and planning skills
8. Legal skills
9. Organisational and administrative skills
10. Content-specific skills in the area of activity (e.g. human rights)
11. Research skills
12. Technological skills.

10.5 The role and responsibility of the government and business sector in building the capacity of the civil society sector

Participant A spoke about the importance of contextualizing each role based on the mandate of each role-player, whether government, business or the organisation itself. This participant said:

Ideally, for government and the private sector, the best thing would be to strengthen the capacity of an institution through partnership, it

does not have to be money only. It can be through capacity development. And it is broad. For example, I work with young people in this community who are involved in drugs. So, I am introducing new programmes to help get rid of drugs. If government comes on board, they can send these kids to like a TVET college, for example, where they can learn something, and they are doing something with their lives.

Participant A emphasised the importance of partnership, and not relying too much on financial resources from the various role-players to resolve all problems because not all challenges can be overcome with money. The channeling of human resources such as social workers by government can be useful, while giving access to government transport (e.g government fleets), would be a great contribution. This participant encouraged more partnerships between government and the private sector to assist the civil society sector. In addition, Participant A stated that it is not always easy to access state institutions:

Look, with government, I do not know much. With government, you do not know who to call at DSD or NDA, for example. [People] do not answer their calls. So, you just rely on good Samaritans in your area who may be able to assist.

Participant B acknowledged that government may have not done enough to build capacity in the civil society sector, and that government can do more. The participant put this sentiment in the following words:

In all honesty, I do not think that government has done much in terms of bringing civil society closer, even to establish sustainable partnerships with the civil society [sector]. We have seen it in many programmes that have failed due to lack of involvement and partnering with civil society. Hence, we go back to the drawing board and really look at developmental strategies that can ensure

that we broaden the space and take civil society organisations as our partners.

Participant B also stated that government needs to involve civil society organisation from the inception of projects, while adding that the presence of civil society in government processes are important, including the implementation of infrastructure projects. On this point, this participant said:

I think, as government we need to involve them from the very word go. For example, if you develop work in local government spaces to drive municipal development at the local level, you should have civil society sector playing an integral role in that particular process. Even when you are implementing your big capital infrastructure projects, make the role of civil society an integral part. They should be part of the entire value chain.

When speaking about the role of funders, Participant B noted that funders have a pre-determined programme to involve civil society. However, this participant stated that those programmes should be determined by the needs on the ground, rather than by pre-determined programmes that may not address the needs that matters. Participant B put this point across as follows:

It is through civil society organisations that we will get to know what are the priorities, in whatever area or sector that ought to be developed. Let them be capacitated in a way that will assist with bringing on board sustainable interventions, so that when the term of funding expires, those interventions can be sustained by the very same civil society organisations.

Participant C said that corporates must have a CSI budget dedicated to the funding of the civil society sector. In addition, every ministry of government must have a set of corresponding NGOs/CBOs to support. Funding must be extended to churches that plays critical roles in the society.

Participant D, on the other hand, said that Public-Private Partnerships (PPPs) must be extended to partnership with civil society as part of the social contract. Supporting NGOs, especially in view of the role they play in secondary job creation, must be part of the social contract. PPPs were working and encouraged through the Charters and tax incentives in the past. However, social compacts exist on paper only, and monitoring and evaluation of the PPPs is inadequate and needs to be restored. There is a need for a concerted and structured approach. There is also a need for a civil society mouthpiece like the Law Society to push back or put pressure to ensure that PPPs works.

Participant E noted that government plays a role in building capacity of CSOs in terms of registration of CSOs that participate in capacity-building interventions with the Department of Social Development. However, she adds that:

But it is not working very well. Government is very good at looking at compliance. I think the role of government is to be able to oversee, developing guidelines on what is expected from civil society, and some kinds of monitoring systems, and [determining] what is possible to capacitate. But the reality is that most of the CSOs that have succeeded beyond twenty years depend on external funding, outside South Africa. Not government, unfortunately. Actually, government becomes a burden when they are funding: they want all these detailed reports, without funding M&E systems or the kinds of management that is needed to respond to their complicated reporting.

This participant stipulated that the organisation she led was not ‘tapping into’ government funding for capacitation.

Participant E felt that the problem with the private sector is that:

CSI [corporate social investment], which gives very little money, are used more by these companies as public relations exercises rather

than social investment. And they also fund ... projects that could make them look good. So, organisations that deal with complicated stuff that could take a longer term are not being funded, basically. And there is a big divide between the private sector and the realities that we see on the ground. The way South Africa... We have been trying to talk to them about violence and they are like 'why should we invest in violence?'. The private sector is detached from the realities of what is really happening on the ground. Even when they fund education, we say to them 'it is not enough just to fund education, you need to understand if the teachers come with a high level of stress, you cannot just take them to workshops. You need to provide support and care for them'.

This participant E further said that the private sector should play a significant role in capacitation of CSOs but pointed out that their CSI budgets are constantly being cut because of the tough economic conditions.

It is the first budget that they cut. I think that we need to position ourselves; that we are strategic partners to help them do their work. Because if you have strong civil society that is functional, then you have a strong society that can thrive economically. But I don't think those links.... For them, it is like they are doing a favour, it is welfare. They don't see the critical role of civil society in contributing to a robust society that can really assist them to do their work. That being said, there are quite a few philanthropic initiatives that have been started in the last few years that are really encouraging. But we don't have a very strong philanthropic spirit in South Africa. And we need to see how we can build on that.

Participant E felt that the government, civil society organisations, donors and the private sector should all lead the process of capacity-building. When talking to donors Participant E said:

...if you are funding organisations in South Africa, you have to put an OD budget, have to put in a budget for leaders and managers. Donors have that responsibility for capacitation. Government has a lot of funding for training that it gives its employees. The least they can do – because most of us end up doing their work – is to try to integrate civil society in some of those training courses. And the private sector can do a lot in funding some of that training. Bigger civil society organisations – that are aware that they have an obligation towards the CBOs. There is a lot of conflict with being big brother. But they have to take that responsibility also of saying: ‘If I am successful, how can I support CBOs with also being successful?’

Participant F identified a role for both government and the private sector in capacity-building. In the participant view, the government should provide financial resources to enable CSOs to do their work and create an enabling policy framework for CSOs to succeed and remove red tape. The private sector, on the other hand, could provide financial support that also covers operational/administrative costs. This participant suggested that donors should do the same, while limiting financial reporting and accountability red tape that constrains organisations from achieving their goals. Donors should also provide ongoing capacity support to CSOs.

10.6 Processes that CSOs engage in to assess their organisational capacity in order to determine their capacity and skills challenges

When speaking about the processes undertaken by civil society to assess their organisational capacity, Participant A pointed out that they face difficulty in undertaking such processes and mostly rely on consultants. This Participant stated that:

We rely on consultancy to come and do that for us. However, consultancy needs money. So, instead of having a proper strategy

with the consultant, we will independently assess. We do not really do much of that because capacity [...]. I mean, I have to be honest. Unless the board is active and are able to send staff members to courses [...]. It is not really happening much in the sector because everything is dependent on money. And the consultants who are going to come, they are going to need money. As such, there is no money for such. That is not happening, I must say.

Participant B stated as government, they are involved in processes which seek to assess skills and capacity challenges facing CSOs. When speaking about such processes, Participant B spoke of the GGLN process that they have been involved in:

I am lucky enough to be engaged in quite a number of such processes. I think, one, the issue around peer review is important; when you have CSOs that are operating within a particular sector organising themselves in a network kind of collaboration. I can cite an example of such being the Good Governance Learning Network, which is a network of all the civil society organisations which are operating within local governance [and] covering a variety of issues and focus areas. They come together to reflect on their performance across the board.

Participant B also stated that the assessment of skills requirements is an important part of sponsors' financing agreements as well. This participant put this as follows:

The assessment of skills requirements is an integral part of the financing agreement. I mean, by virtue of you securing funding you ought to have indicated that you are fully capitated. And where you are not, you ought to provide a strategy of how you seek to build the capacity, or to even transfer the skills you would have gained.

Furthermore, Participant B drew attention to the importance of ensuring that skills transfer is beneficial to the community and members of CSOs such that there is a circulation of skills within the sector. Participant D said that there is a need for a

structure similar to the Law Society for the NGOs/civil society sector to be able to take on the government. This participant added that there should also be a Council for the civil society sector similar to the Council for Social Workers.

Participant E noted that CSOs, especially the bigger one, assess their organisational capacity and challenges when they develop their annual strategic plans or annual strategic reviews.

A few NGOs have invested in their M&E systems and they use those systems to evaluate where they are. Donors have played a really critical role, because most of the time when you get funding there are certain donors send a questionnaire to evaluate your capacity. And some of them come literally to view that. And some of them go beyond looking at your capacity but also give... I have been working with donors and have asked them to put aside an organisational development fund if they give us money because you cannot have a functioning organisation without that. And most CSOs do not do that. You get a lot of money for interventions, but if the organisation is not functioning the interventions get affected. I think strategic planning, PPPs and donor interventions [are the main aspects of capacity assessment].

Participant F agreed with much that Participant E stated, pointing out that:

...Internally, most CSOs have strategic planning sessions which do incorporate the assessment of their capacities, etc. However, these are possible in instances where there is funding available for competent consultants to facilitate these processes. I am personally aware of the work of ACT Ubumbano, an organisation that is committed to building solidarity amongst CSOs to support each other in the process of ongoing learning and reflection.

10.7 Funding for capacity-building of CSOs in South Africa

Participant A stated that the budget for CSOs was simply inadequate. This participant said:

There is no funding, Yes, there are organisations that are being funded by the NPO directorate; but it's selective. I mean, for example, we are in the middle of a pandemic [and] the President has not said anything about any relief for NPOs. I have watched all his addresses. But I have never heard anything. He has never mentioned a relief fund for Non-profits.

Participant A further stated that, due to the tough economic climate, it is becoming increasingly difficult for NPOs to source their own funding. The main source of funding is the National Lottery whenever it announces calls to apply for funding. But, even there, too, it is sector specific. Speaking on the latter point, this participant said: *“Funding is sector specific. If they say it's for youth and ECD, and you do not do that, you will not get any funding.”*

The funding seems to be constrained, and only a selected number of NPOs are able to source funding from the government in particular. Participant A further said that:

It is not enough. They need to expand, and they need to open up the calls to all NPOs. Because, when we register, we have criteria that we tick on. [The] funding is not enough. Even the lottery, they have specific organisations that they will fund, for example. Remember, there was so much funding for HIV/AIDS. I cannot now start doing AIDS-related work just because that is where the funding is. Right now, there is funding for food distribution and food parcels. I cannot now start doing that as well. When you do not go with the wind and stick to what you do, you do not get funding.

Participant A urged government to ensure that funding is available for all NPOs who are doing work with the community.

When asked about the availability of funds for the civil society sector, Participant B acknowledged that funding for NPOs is not enough by saying:

Certainly not. It is not sufficient. And we have seen that with each financial year that passes, it shrinks and shrinks. I think it also has to do with the change of focus in terms of where we are heading as a country. You can see that organisations are trying to adapt and be in line with the needs of the country as we develop.”

In addition, Participant B stated that CSI through private sector organisations could assist in increasing the pool of funding for NPOs, while acknowledging that government can do more. Participant C, on the other hand, said that donations must be self-sustainable. Participant D cautioned that 10-12% of funding to CSOs goes to administration (salaries, transport and rental).

Participant E felt strongly that there was insufficient funding for capacity-building of CSOs in South Africa and added that:

There are a lot of programmes that donors will do on generic capacitation, capacitation on human rights, on gender. But, first of all, there is very little capacitation for leaders – on how to be a leader, what leadership is, the kind of emotional intelligence that is needed for leaders in a context like South Africa will all the treating of traumas. Very little there. ... We literally pushed staff development where we targeted capacitation for staff members depending where the different gaps are. I have already talked about there being very little funds to strengthen organisational development, whether it is getting HR to help organisations to develop skills in strategic thinking. The challenge is that, in the 1990s when we had generous donors and we were getting a lot of money, we had generous donors who covered what we called core or running costs. They would say we like your work, and we will fund all your work. But over the years we have become more and more projectified.

According to this participant, the shift in focus to funding projects has meant that donors no longer fund the running costs of CSOs, providing very little or no funding for administration and none for organisational development and said:

Money to develop the organisation and make it strong. And I think this has really weakened civil society in South Africa. You had strong organisations that were there that have closed down because you need strong leadership and management to do their work.

Participant F noted that: “*Financial support aimed at building and strengthening CSOs’ capacity is extremely limited as most funders, including government funders, unfortunately do not consider this a priority*”.

10.8 International and regional capacity-building interventions that have been adapted for the civil society sector in South Africa.

Participant A indicated that he was not aware of any such interventions. Participant B stated that their focus is on capacity development and the interventions focus mostly on the local government space. However, this participant did draw attention to an example of capacity-building interventions occurring outside of South Africa:

If you look at the work that the European Union is doing in East African countries through the introduction of the development of different models and planning, this is something we could adopt here in South Africa in our own context.

Furthermore, Participant B stated that locally, local government as an institution could involve more stakeholders, including CSOs and private companies, and create an environment that enables CSOs to hold government accountable. This participant added that: “*In order for this to happen, there needs to be political will, and I am not sure to what extent is this available.*”

Participant D mentioned the Institute of Directors (IODs), Institute for Capacity Development (NGOs), Capacity training NGOs and SETAs as capacity interventions. According to Participant D, the SETA's skills levy should also support civil society. The government should be intentional about this.

Participant E stipulated that:

Some of them come from the Skills Development Levy that are being offered. We try to go to some of those. Some of the challenges with the courses being offered, sometimes even by business, is that they wouldn't speak to our contextual reality. They would give you a generic training for managers, to manage finances. But if I am dealing with issues of sexual abuse, vis-à-vis working with issues of human rights, you need to be able to integrate that. So, most of these courses [would be offered] by people who might be experts in their different areas but without understanding the complexities of dealing with civil society. I am not saying there is anything wrong with that. But there is not enough that speaks to our contextual reality. We even ended up being so frustrated that we would go for courses in management that are being offered by skills development that would be great for private companies, but we would ask, 'but what does this mean for civil society?'... There are not enough people who specialise in civil society. We ended up using an overseas organisation to offer us capacitation – they have people who have been executive directors in civil society and could therefore give the kind of support that is needed. I am not saying that it is not there. It needs to be aligned better.

This participant indicated that not all interventions from abroad are useful. But those that include people who have experience in working in CSOs have been the most effective. They can translate things like project management and financial management into 'NGO-speak'. Participant E further said:

We haven't yet succeeded in professionalising leadership and management within the CSO sector in South Africa. We take management training from the private sector. We've had people from a private organisation and they seek to teach us financial management. But they are not speaking to our realities and what it means to manage our finances when I have complicated donors checking my budgets.

According to this participant, there are quite a few international NGOs that provide direct capacitation for leadership and OD in South Africa.

10.9 Service providers of capacity-building

Participant A stated that capacity-building involves many NPOs that play a role in building the capacity of other CSOs in South Africa, including his own NPO that focuses mostly on technology. There are also consultants, who are usually in it for the money, and many other service providers in the country who render the same services. This participant stated that NPOs are best positioned to drive capacity development programmes due to their proximity to the communities serviced by CSOs. Participant A said:

Because NPOs work with communities, they are the best people for the job. For example, I know an NPO that is training unemployed youth on soft skills, using the computer, applying for a job, creating a CV and the interview process. Government cannot do that because government is government. But if I am sitting in my own township, I know these young people. Through my café, young people can come and use the resources. These organisations are able to do such because they have young people whom they are training and helping.

Participant B stated that capacity-building programmes should involve everyone, and not just one particular entity. When speaking about broader involvement, this participant said:

We have seen how capacity-building initiatives driven by government are captured. We have seen how private sector-driven initiatives tend to push a certain agenda. And we have seen as well how capacity-building initiatives driven by the civil society sector tend to be to the detriment and exclusion of smaller civil society organisations.

Participant B proposes that a structure comprising representatives of the civil society sector, government and the private sector should be created to ensure that there is capacity-building and vetting of service providers who are meant to render services related to capacity-building.

I think we need that coordination structure that is comprising of civil society, government and the private sector which will ensure that the service providers appointed would be agreed to by all. And I think we will be doing away with this fragmented and non-coordinated capacity-building initiatives.

According to Participant D, the capacity-building service providers are not organised.

Participant E identified the CSOs themselves as the main providers of capacity-building in South Africa. There are certain CSOs that specialise in providing certain kinds of training.

There is a lot of capacity-building and training that is being done. This is mainly at the content of the work level. The main ones for OD and leadership tend to be the SETA-related training. But that tends to be very generic and not applicable.

Participant F felt that: “CSOs themselves need to drive this process, as they are aware of what capacity needs they have. This should not be a process that is imposed on them by government or business”. She cited the following key service providers of capacity for CSOs in South Africa: “Organisations such as CMDS, Seriti Institute, NGO

Law and Act Ubumbano are rooted in the culture of the sector and are therefore better suited in facilitating capacity-building processes relevant to the needs of the sector”.

10.10 Accreditation and certification requirements of professional associations for CSO capacity-building service providers

Participant A stated that accreditation is the biggest challenge. Furthermore, there is a shortage of skills, and NPOs must outsource those skills and pay someone who is going to work on developing the manuals; that too will require money. This participant noted that:

The challenge is that the accreditation process is that when you start training, you will now have to charge money. In order to recoup the money you would have had to pay to the consultant. It is a long, complicated process. We have tried it, but we stumbled over the fact that we would need to pay the guy so much to develop the manuals.

Participant A also acknowledged the importance of accreditation of training courses provided by capacity-building service providers. However, Participant A added that the red tape and financial implications are too much to bear for most NPOs. In addition, this participant stated that service providers may have to charge participants for the training they would have otherwise provide for free due to the fact that the accreditation processes and developing of manuals become so expensive. Speaking about these challenges, Participant A said the following:

Accreditation is now like a business. Because if I spend R20 000 for training manuals that will be approved, we now have to train communities ... that do not have any money. Yes, it is a government model that they prefer. But I feel that it is misplaced because you now have to charge people who do not have money. And when you charge, for example a thousand rand, you're talking to organisations that do not have any money.

Participant B stated that the CSOs they work with do not necessarily have any accreditation but are required to register with the local government SETA. On this point, the respondent said:

If you are to be a civil society organisation that seeks to run capacity-building programmes for either municipal officials or other civil society organisations which are operating within local government, you have to be accredited by a local government Seta.

Participant D mentioned that some of the relevant CSOs are accredited and others are not; but added that there was a need for accredited programmes to enable the service providers to earn practice points.

According to Participant E, some CSOs that specialise in providing training to other CSOs are accredited, with many having SAQA (South African Qualifications Authority) accreditation. But the courses offered by these CSOs are largely generic. They are not SAQA accredited course in finance management for the civil society sector. In effect, CSOs that engage in capacitation focus on content training, instead if in the more important areas of management, leadership and organisational development in general. Those CSOs that do seek accreditation also have to engage costly consultants to develop the course material in order to achieve accreditation. Some that do not have money and time to pursue accreditation then offer non-SAQA accredited courses, which are often excellent despite this. In addition:

Those that do have the money and time to do the accreditation, don't have the understanding of the contextual nature of working in civil society, in CBOs.

10.11 The key mechanisms for capacity-building

Participant A states that all capacity-building mechanisms are important in different ways. Speaking about the importance of mentoring, this participant said:

In terms of skills transfer, this is where mentoring is important. And many corporates have such, whereby they can go volunteer to NPOs and help them with skills development. This is where they are most important.

Participant B stated that mechanisms for capacity-building are largely dependent on the particular field within the civil society sphere. According to this participant:

If you look at competency in an area, that would require a very good training skill set. But in my sector, depending on the audience and the level of comprehension of your people that you will be capacitating, you will find that workshops are the way to go.

In addition, Participant B stated that it is important to choose a mechanism that will suit people's strengths and needs at the time. On this point, the Participant stated: "*I do not think there is a mechanism that supersedes everyone. I think it depends on your audience. They are all effective in my view.*"

Participants C and D said that there is a mix of the capacity-building approaches: training courses, workshops, and partnerships with church-based organisations that offer such services. The view was that capacity-building must follow a blended approach.

Participant E is a product of mentorship and coaching and has also done both for others as a leader in the civil society sector in South Africa. In the Participant's view:

Mentorship is someone who is a content specialist, understands the work and has done the work. Really becomes your sounding board, and supports you and walks with you – exchanging that knowledge and expertise. Coaching helps you to deal with yourself. To deal with your own personality, your patterns and your emotional intelligence. For me, investing in those is very invaluable. ... The

other one that is very invaluable is learning exchanges, where you take someone from a CBO and take them to a successful, bigger CSO for a week and let them see how they run things. It is very different from just sitting there; and actually meeting people, and seeing how the organisation functions. I don't think we do enough learning exchanges in South Africa. That [is something] we need to focus on. The bigger training is in workshops – there might be some value, but I think mentorship, coaching and learning on the job [through learning exchanges] are the most critical.

10.12 Sustainable measures to ensure the sector retains and grows its own skills and capabilities

According to Participant A, internal capacity is important, and this could be applied through the Skills Development Levy:

We pay the Skills Development Levy. And this is where many of the organisations can retain skills. Because if you go for training and you come back, you can increase productivity in the organisation. So, I would say make use of the Skills Development Levy because most organisations will say they do not have money for such. But if they use the levy [...]. They can use the levy.

Participant B states that there are quite several measures that could be put in place to improve capacity and develop skills. This participant added:

I would say, investing in building the capacity of people who are working in these organisations, training and incentivizing people who are doing well [...]. It does not need to be monetary. There can be other ways in which you recognise and retain good people who are doing well and attract people with good skills required by your organisation.

Participant B stated that CSOs must be able to maintain their independence and not be used as a vehicle to critique government. In this regard, professionalization of the CSO is most important and ensures that it holds government accountable where needed.

Participant C said that the civil society sector should create financial models, for example, establishing of schools under a trust in such a way that all profits go to the trust. The NGO then becomes a beneficiary.

Participant D argued that, in order to retain skills in the civil society sector, there is a need for viable Providence Funds to ensure the staff earn a living wage with guaranteed job security. A conducive and competitive environment must also be created.

According to Participant E:

I have lost capable people. I remember complaining that we are like a university for the government. I don't know many financial managers have come in, get trained and do not last for two years. They are taken because of the amount of money that they are actually given. The issue of understanding that even NGOs need professionals and begin to align our salary compensation to the professional skills, and benchmarking and ensuring that we are actually competitive is something that is critical for us to invest in. And sometimes people stay not just because of money, but because of the organisational culture. If they feel that they are contributing to something, they are heard, they are supported, some of them really stay.

This participant added that another critical area required to retain skills was:

To build that leadership capacity. A lot of people that lead NGOs will tell you that it is about that leadership capacity. Because a lot of us who lead NGOs are passionate and come here because we love

the work. But we were never trained in leadership, and how to manage people. Again, investing in leadership will assist in solving some of the issues like retention, and being able to keep people.

In addition, there was:

...also need to professionalise our work and recruit professionals. We have struggled with that – for instance, we have not been able to get money from government to employ social workers. Because we would say, if we are going to work with people dealing with trauma, they are highly skilled and we need to put in competitive salaries. 95% of our funding comes from international donors because in South Africa they think NGOs are voluntary organisations. But the truth is that we are doing very difficult work in a very difficult society, and you need highly skilled and professional people. So, there has to be that mind-shift to begin to understand what is needed.

Participant F identified coaching and mentoring support as the “best suited mechanisms for capacity-building”. She added that peer learning and support was also important.

10.13 Ways to improve existing mechanisms for capacity-building

Participant A suggested a few mechanisms in the following words:

The NDA needs to be able to work with NGOs in the country, unlike working with a selected few that they have. ... Look, we do not work based on connections.... NDA must work on building capacity of all NPOs, not the select few, and not the connected ones because they know the CEO or someone in the office. Because I do not understand the reason why they cannot respond to an email

requesting a meeting with the CEO, no matter how busy she is. They need to start capacity-building internally.

This Participant A urges the NDA to be more responsive on their phone calls and emails, and not only focus on the politically connected. They must focus on everyone.

Participant B pointed out that coordination of capacity-building initiatives is important. Participant B said that there was need for:

A structure that will assist in terms of capacity-building. Because for me, they are so fragmented. There is no proper monitoring and tracking whether these organisations are doing what they say they are doing. And some of them are driven by ill-intentions and who are just in to eat the money. So, you need a structure that is going to support the smaller struggling organisations, whether through formal and informal training programmes or peer review programmes. But it just needs to be a coordinated effort.

Participant C suggested that a regulatory framework for CSOs that provide capacity-building should be developed, and government must set aside a specific budget for each CSOs/CBOs/NGOs/NPOs to enable them to be financial sustainable. Participant D stated that the government has lot of resources and should galvanize its huge potential to support the NGOs/NPOs. This participant also drew attention to the need to establish an office of an Ombudsman for civil society to handle complaints. This is long overdue.

According to Participant E:

There is not sufficient expertise from leaders within the sector that translates that knowledge and actually designs training courses. There are a few that are starting to emerge. But not that much. South Africa has a lot of people with expertise. Most of them – the ones that run financial management, HR and organisational stuff – what they need not to do is not to offer generic courses for private

organisations and NGOs, but know how to align. So, there is expertise, but it just needs to understand civil society more. When it comes to content knowledge, you have a sufficient pool. You have a lot of expertise in South Africa, a vibrant civil society that has been doing the work and really looking at capacitating of CBOs. It is not the lack of expertise but how you align it to needs on the ground.

13. CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS, BEST PRACTICES AND LEASONS LEARNERD

Several conclusions can be drawn from the theoretical and empirical analysis previously discussed. The first is that CSOs in the developing world have a wide range of capacity challenges, ranging from challenges at the level of individuals such as poor leadership and access to learning opportunities. At the organisation level, such challenges include inadequate funding, weak management and accountability systems, unskilled staff as well as over-reliance on international donors for funding and sustainability problems. There are also financial viability and sustainability issues. Other challenges range from lack of resources, a dearth of skilled leadership and staff in the society in general, to increasing demands placed on CSOs to perform tasks they lack the capacity to engage in. The government and business sector were found to be critical to support the civil society in a coherent and integrated manner through functional public private partnerships and this is a challenge at the moment.

While there are diversified approaches to capacity-building among donor organisations, with some focusing on funding, intellectual information and research support and providing support in the form of funding, exchanges, etc., others on providing training in short courses and seminars, supervision of graduate student thesis research, and in-service training and sponsoring or cosponsoring workshops and seminars, the capacity challenges of CSOs differ from organisation to organisation. Some may have capacity challenges in their leadership or staff, others in terms of the structure and programmes of the organisation, and still others in terms of the funding and environment or society in which they operate. There is thus no single approach to capacity-building that focuses only on a capacity challenge or limited set of capacity challenges.

There are also a wide-range of mechanisms for capacity-building, including mechanisms aimed at developing skills among the leadership and staff, such as mentoring and training courses, others aimed at transforming the organisation, such as introducing strategic planning and democratic internal decision-making processes, and still others aimed at establishing networks/partnership and improving the organisation's external relations. For instance, mechanisms that aim at upgrading the skills of the leadership and staff include mentoring, peer-learning, training courses, exchange visits, workshops, seminars, etc.

It is important to state that mechanisms to develop skills will differ from organisation to organisation. Some skills development efforts by donor organisations may just involve providing funding, while other organisations require co-managing and conflict resolution, and still others a variety of mechanisms to build skills such as workshops, seminars, exchange visits, university courses, mentoring, and peer learning. Thereafter, once the skills have been developed in the CSO, the organisation must identify appropriate ways to retain such skills and to sustain skills development capacity within the organisation. This must be followed by a similar exercise on the part of any donor organisation (where they exist), followed by a process that leads to mutual agreement between the CSO and the donor on the appropriate ways to retain such skills.

There is thus no single approach to building the skills of organisations that focuses only on a particular skill need or set of skills needs. The entire civil society sector is diversified and will require a multi-pronged approach to deal with capacities and capabilities of the CSOs.

The main challenges faced by South African CSOs are poor leadership and management skills, and inability to attract the right people for the right job, lack of staff with the requisite finance and technological skills, inadequate funding and resources, a lack of accountability (corruption and poor financial reporting), dearth of strategic planning capacity (developing implementation and business plans), competition and contestation, and incompetent or over-involved boards. The main capacity and capability requirements of CSOs in South Africa are in the following areas: good

governance, sufficient funds, capable and skilled human resources (leadership, financial management capacity, general management skills – operational efficiencies, people skills – administrative capacities, compliance (leadership, vision and mission and reporting), co-ordination, the requisite technical and other material resources, effective service delivery (ability to carry out mandate, communication with clients and other stakeholders), and sustainability (resourcing, retaining skilled staff).

The main skills needed by CSOs in South Africa are financial management, fundraising, communication and stakeholder engagement, mentoring and talent nurturing, leadership, project management, strategy and planning, legal, organisational and administrative, content-specific skills in the area of activity (e.g. human rights), conflict resolution, research, and technological skills.

While both government and the private sector in South Africa have not done enough to build the capacity of CSOs, they can both play a significant role by providing funds, partnering with CSOs, supporting them by providing critical public-sector human resources in support of their activities (e.g. social workers), including the staff of CSOs in government and private sector staff development programmes, including an organisational development component in their budgets for CSOs they fund, and building the monitoring and evaluation capacity of CSOs. Most CSOs in South Africa do not have the capacity or funds to engage in organisational capacity assessments, while some do assess their capacity in their strategic planning and review processes, are in networks that engage in capacity and performance assessment, or are required to provide a capacity assessment by donors when seeking funds. It is also becoming increasingly difficult for CSOs in South Africa to source funding, and in instances where funding is sourced it is insufficient for the needs of the CSOs and does not characteristically cover their running costs.

CSOs, especially those with significant understanding of the context and needs of the civil society sector in South Africa, are best placed to provide capacity-building interventions. The most appropriate mechanisms for capacity-building are dependent on the needs of the particular CSO, and may include skills transfers by the private sector and government, training courses, workshops, mentoring and coaching, and learning exchanges. Sustaining the capacity of CSOs is best achieved through

investing in training staff, providing incentives to staff, ensuring that staff earn a living wage with guaranteed job security, aligning staff compensation with their professional skills, and investing in leadership capacity with soft skills that ensures a healthy organisational culture and that sustains the passion of the staff for the work they do.

Based on the critical issues raised and drawn from theoretical and empirical analysis, the key recommendations arising from this study are divided in two parts:

Capacity and capabilities

- a) Government should develop a clearly articulated typology and mapping of CSOs as well as critical skills and services (if this does not exist), to inform the broad types of support different CSOs may require.
- b) Government and its entities should actively engage with CSO forums around capacity-building needs in order to enable CSO-led processes for driving capacity-building.
- c) Government should prioritise the active involvement of a wider base of smaller CSOs in shaping the direction of capacity-building in the civil society sector.
- d) Government should assist in the expansion of CSO-tailored training on topics related to leadership, financial management, conflict resolution, fund raising and reporting.
- e) Government should encourage mentoring and peer-learning-based models of capacity-building as well as learning exchanges across the civil society sector to enhance diversified skills set.
- f) Government should review the relevance of current capacity-building accreditation and general funding application processes to determine whether these are not creating unnecessary red tape and affecting the sustainability of CSOs.
- g) Government should work towards improving public officials' and the public's understanding of the positive role that many CSOs are playing in communities, and the need for highly skilled individuals (and associated resources) to sustain these activities.

- h) Government should develop a structured approach to Public-Private Partnerships (PPPs), and extend monitoring and evaluation mechanisms to partnerships with civil society as part of the social contract, including identifying areas where government can partner with CSOs on their capacity-building without necessarily providing funding.
- i) Government should develop a database of all CSOs and a functional monitoring and tracking system to ensure that they are operating optimally and taken care of.
- j) Government should consider establishing an Ombudsman for civil society to handle complaints and to assist with providing necessary interventions to build the capability and capacity of the civil society sector.

Financial sustainability and value propositions

- a) Government should develop a regulatory framework for CSOs that provides for capacity-building, and should set aside a specific budget for CSOs to enable them to be financially sustainable.
- b) Government should review how funding is allocated to CSOs, especially to what extent it supports 'core' operational activities (beyond projects), including annual assessments of skills needs, and whether this enables them to retain leaders and skilled staff.
- c) Government should promote the use of the skills levy to support capacity-building of the civil society sector.
- d) Government should find ways to encourage the Private Sector to have CSI budgets dedicated to the funding of the civil society sector, not for stakeholder relations, but for social investment.
- e) Government should ensure that every ministry has a set of corresponding CSOs to support.
- f) Government should find ways to encourage the development of a stronger philanthropic spirit in South Africa.

14. REFERENCES

- Abdullahi, M and Gana, A. 2017. Role of civil society organisations in promoting democracy and good governance in Nigeria. *International Journal of Administration and Development Studies*, 7 (1), pp. 11-10.
- Ahrne, G., 1996. Civil society and civil organizations. *Organization*, 3(1), pp.109-120.
- Al Mamun, A, Brook RK and Dyck, T. 2016. Multilevel governance and fisheries commons: Investigating performance and local capacities in rural Bangladesh. *International Journal of the Commons* 10(1): 45-70.
- Albareda, A., 2018. Connecting society and policymakers? Conceptualizing and measuring the capacity of Civil Society Organizations to act as transmission belts. *VOLUNTAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 29(6), pp.1216-1232.
- Alite, J, Guštářík, P, Miková, K and Paulíniová, Z. 2016. *CSOs Development, Sustainability & Inclusiveness in Participatory Processes*. Albania: PDCS and Partners Albania for Change and Development.
- Antlöv, H., Brinkerhoff, D.W. and Rapp, E., 2010. Civil society capacity-building for democratic reform: Experience and lessons from Indonesia. *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 21(3), pp.417-439.
- Antlöv, H., Ibrahim, R. and van Tuijl, P., 2006. NGO governance and accountability in Indonesia: Challenges in a newly democratizing country. *NGO accountability: Politics, principles and innovations*, pp.147-163.
- Asuelime, L.E., 2017. Civil society and the South African Developmental State: an appraisal. *Journal of Social Development in Africa*, 32(1), pp.45-68.
- Ayuk ET & Basil J. 2005. Building Institutional Capacity for Economic Policy Research in Africa: Myth or Reality? IDRC Paper for the International Conference of African Economic Research Institutions and Policy Development: Opportunities and Challenges, Dakar, 28-29 January 2005.

- Baklien B, Haug M & Chamindra W. 2005. Study of the Impact of the Work of FORUT in Sri Lanka: Building Civil Society. Oslo: Norwegian Institute for Urban and Regional Research, Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation.
- Banerjee, N., 2006. *A note on capabilities that contribute to the success of non-governmental organisations* (Vol. 57). Discussion Paper.
- Banks, N. and Hulme, D., 2012. The role of NGOs and civil society in development and poverty reduction. *Brooks World Poverty Institute Working Paper*, (171).
- Barati, A., Sharifi, M., Nemati, M.H. and Birgani, F.K., *The Role of Specialized Civil Society in Challenge Corruption with Glance to IRI. Journal of Public Administration and Governance*, 7 (3), pp. 174-189.
- Batti, R.C., 2014. Challenges facing local NGOs in resource mobilization. *Humanities and Social Sciences*, 2(3), pp.57-64.
- Bentley T, McCarthy H & Mean M. 2003. Executive Summary. In T Bentley, H McCarthy and M Mean (eds.) *Inside Out: Rethinking Inclusive Communities*. London: DEMOS.
- Blagescu M & Young J. 2006. Capacity Development for Policy Advocacy: Current thinking and approaches among agencies supporting Civil Society Organisations. Working Paper 260, London: Overseas Development Institute.
- Blagescu, M. and Young, J., 2006. *Capacity development for policy advocacy: current thinking and approaches among agencies supporting civil society organisations*. London: Overseas Development Institute.
- Blair, H., Dayao, L., Hasan, A. and Salomo, R., 2002. *Civil Society Strengthening Program Mid-term Evaluation*. Management Systems International: Washington DC.
- Bolger, J., 2000. Capacity development: why, what and how. *Capacity Development Occasional Series*, 1(1), pp.1-8.
- Botchway, T.P., 2018. Civil society and the consolidation of democracy in Ghana's fourth republic. *Cogent Social Sciences*, 4(1), pp. 1-17.
- Brinkerhoff, D.W. and Morgan, P.J., 2010. Capacity and capacity development: Coping with complexity. *Public Administration and Development: The International Journal of Management Research and Practice*, 30(1), pp.2-10.

- Brouwers, R., 2011. When 'civics' go 'governance': on the role and relevance of civic organisations in the policy arena in Sub-Saharan Africa. *The Power of Civil Society Working Paper Series*, 9(9).
- Brown, L.D. and Jagadananda, L., 2007. Civil society legitimacy and accountability: *Issues and challenges*. Centre for Youth & Social Development. [online]. Available at: < http://cpl.hks.harvard.edu/files/cpl/files/workingpaper_32.pdf > [Accessed 10 April 2020].
- Brown, L.D. and Kalegaonkar, A., 1999. *Addressing civil society's challenges: Support organizations as emerging institutions*. Boston: Institute for Development Research.
- Bruce, D., 2016. Control, discipline and punish? Addressing corruption in South Africa. *South African Crime Quarterly*, 48(1), pp.49-62.
- Cairns, B., Harris, M. and Young, P., 2005. Building the capacity of the voluntary nonprofit sector: Challenges of theory and practice. *Intl Journal of Public Administration*, 28(9-10), pp.869-885.
- Carolei, D., (2019) A study on the effectiveness of civil society self-regulation and on beneficiary accountability: The Case of Roman Civil Society and the "Mafia Capitale" Scandal. PhD thesis, University of Aberdeen.
- Carothers, T. and Brechenmacher, S., 2014. Accountability, transparency, participation, and inclusion: *A new development consensus?* Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.
- Casey, K, Glennerster, R. & Miguel E., 2011. *Reshaping institutions: Evidence on external aid and local collective action*. Accessed from http://www.theigc.org/sites/default/files/11_0266_policy_brief_sierra_leone_final3.pdf[Accessed April 2020].
- Chibamba FM. 2011. The role of Community-Based Organisations in response to HIV/AIDS in Botswana: The case of Gabane Community Home-Based Care Organisation. PhD thesis, University of South Africa.
- Chipkin, I. & Meny-Gibert, S. 2013. Understanding the Social Justice Sector in South Africa. A Report to the RAITH Foundation and Atlantic Philanthropies.

- CIVICUS, 2017. State of Civil Society report 2017 Civil Society and the Private Sector. [online]. Available at: < <https://www.civicus.org/index.php/state-of-civil-society-report-2017> > [Accessed 07 May 2020].
- Clayton, A., Oakley, P. and Taylor, J., 2000. *Civil society organizations and service provision* (pp. 1-23). United Nations Research Institute for Social Development.
- Cooper, C. and Johansen, M. 2003. An evaluation of completed twinning projects. A report presented to the National Contact Points Meeting; 30–31 January, Brussels, accessed at http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/pdf/financial_assistance/phare/phare_ex_post_twinning_en.pdf. [Accessed 15 April 2020].
- Cooper, R., 2018. *What is civil society? How is the term used and what is seen to be its role and value (internationally) in 2018?* K4D Helpdesk Report, Brighton, UK: Institute of Development Studies. Accessed June 19, p.2019.
- Cordery, C.J. & Sim, D. 2018. Dominant stakeholders, activity and accountability discharge in the CSO Sector. *Financial Accountability & Management*, 34(2).
- Crawford N. 2014. Engaging with Syrian CSOs: How can the international community engage better with Syrian civil society organisations during the civil war? Accessed April 2020, <https://civilsociety-centre.org/sites/default/files/resources/engaging-with-syrian-csos.pdf>. [Accessed April 2020].
- Crotty J. 2009. Making a Difference: NGOs and Civil Society Development in Russia. *Europe-Asia Studies* 61(1): 85-108.
- Daniel, A. and Neubert, D., 2019. Civil society and social movements: conceptual insights and challenges in African contexts. *Critical African Studies*, 11(2), pp.176-192.
- Datta D. 2007. Sustainability of community -based organisations of the rural poor: Learning from Concern's rural development projects, Bangladesh. *Community Development Journal* 42 (1): 47-62.
- De Feyter S. 2011. Impact of international donors' new policy agenda on project collaboration between community-based women organisations and NGOs in the Kibera slums of Nairobi, Kenya. *Afrika Focus* 24 (1): 33-50.

- Deans F & Oakley L with James R & Wrigley R. 2006. Coaching and Mentoring for Leadership Development in Civil Society. Praxis Paper No. 14, INTRAC.
- Duong, H.T., 2017. Fourth generation NGOs: Communication strategies in social campaigning and resource mobilization. *Journal of Nonprofit & Public Sector Marketing*, 29(2), pp.119-147.
- Eade D. 1997. *Capacity-building: An approach to people-centred development*. UK and Ireland: Oxfam.
- Eade, D., 2007. Capacity-building: who builds whose capacity?. *Development in practice*, 17(4-5), pp.630-639.
- Ekiyor, T., 2008. *The role of civil society in conflict prevention: West African experiences. The Complex Dynamics of Small Arms in West Africa*. Centre for Conflict Resolution: Cape Town.
- EMS Consortium. 2004. From pre-accession to accession – Thematic evaluation of second-generation twinning. European Commission, accessed at: http://ec.europa.eu.int/comm/enlargement/phare_evaluation_pdf/fv_zz_twi_03_057.pdf. [Accessed 15 April 2020].
- EUROSIS, 2012. *Capacity-building of Civil Society Organisations: A concept*. Online. Available at: <
https://www.shareweb.ch/site/DDLGN/Documents/SDC%20Mozambique-CB%20Concept_14.02.2016.pdf > [Accessed 06 May 2020].
- Evensen, J.V. and Stokke, K., 2010. United against HIV/AIDS? Politics of local governance in HIV/AIDS treatment in Lusikisiki, South Africa. *Journal of Southern African Studies*, 36(1), pp.151-167.
- Fagan A.2004.Taking stock of civil-society development in post-communist Europe: Evidence from the Czech Republic. *Democratisation* 12(4): 528–547.
- Fana, T., Mayekiso, T. and Gwandure, C., 2013. An assessment of community members' knowledge of drug-resistant tuberculosis and HIV and Aids in the Eastern Cape province, South Africa. *Africa Insight*, 43(2), pp.59-73.
- Fidelis, M.A., Youths and the Use of Social Media in the Peaceful Conduct of the 2015 General Elections in Nigeria. *Research on Humanities and Social Sciences*, 7 (2), pp. 65-72.

- Fioramonti, L. and Heinrich, V.F., 2007. *How civil society influences policy: A comparative analysis of the CIVICUS Civil Society Index in post-communist Europe*. Overseas Development Institute and CIVICUS: World Alliance for Citizen Participation, Report March.
- Fioramonti, L., 2005. Civil societies and democratization: assumptions, dilemmas and the South African experience. *Theoria*, 52(107), pp.65-88.
- Fleming, C. ed., 2001. *Building capacity in nonprofit organizations*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute.
- Fourie, D.J. and Kakumba, U., 2011. Assessing the role and capacity of civil society organisations in holding local government accountable in Uganda. *African Journal of Public Affairs*, 4 (2), pp. 55-66.
- Glaser, D., 1997. South Africa and the limits of civil society. *Journal of Southern African Studies*, 23(1), pp.5-25.
- Groenendijk, K., 2012. *Civil society capacity-building: an approach in Uganda*. Centro de Estudios de Cooperación al Desarrollo: Madrid.
- Gugerty, MK & Kremer M. 2008. Outside funding and the dynamics of participation. *American Journal of Political Science* 52 (3): 585-602.
- Gumede, W., 2018. How civil society has strengthened SA's democracy. [online] *Corruption Watch*. Available at: < <https://www.corruptionwatch.org.za/civil-society-strengthened-democracy-south-africa/> > [accessed 03 April 2020].
- Gumede, W., 2018. 25 years later, South African civil society still battling government in people's interests. [Online] CIVICUS. Available at : < <https://www.civicus.org/index.php/media-resources/news/civicus-at-25/3531-25-years-later-south-african-civil-society-still-battling-government-in-people-s-interests> > [Accessed 06 April 2020].
- Habib, A., 2005. State-civil society relations in post-apartheid South Africa. *Social Research*, 72 (3), pp.671-692.
- Hailey J, James R & Wrigley R. 2005. *Rising to the Challenges: Assessing the Impacts of Organisational Capacity-building*. Praxis Paper No. 2, Oxford: INTRACH
- Hendrickse, R.F. 2008. Governance and financial sustainability of NGOs in South Africa. PhD thesis, University of the Western Cape.
- Hilderbrand M & Grindle M. 1994. *Building sustainable capacity: Challenges for the public sector*. UNDP Report on Project INT/92/676.

- Hladchenko, L., 2016. *Government financial accountability and transparency in the digital world*. ICT in Education, Research and Industrial Applications. [online]. Available at: <
https://scholar.google.com/scholar?hl=en&as_sdt=0%2C5&q=Government+Financial+Accountability+and+Transparency+in+the+Digital+World&btnG= >
 [Accessed 11 April 2020].
- Hyden, G., 1996. The challenges of analysing and building civil society. *Africa Insight*, 26(2), pp.96-106.
- Iwilade, A., 2010. Democracy, civil society and the commodification of AIDS in Africa. *African Journal of Rhetoric*, 2(1), pp.133-158.
- James, R. and Malunga, C., 2006. Organisational challenges facing civil society networks in Malawi. *Knowledge Management for Development Journal*, 2(2), pp.48-63.
- Janssens-Bevernage, A., 2002. *Case Study on Capacity-Building for Private-Sector Development: The Southern African Enterprise Network (SAEN)*. [online]. Available at : <
<file:///C:/Users/nmchunu/Documents/NDA%20Lit%20Review/DP-38-Capacity-Building-for-Private-Sector-Development-SAEN-2002.pdf> > [Accessed 08 April 2020].
- Jelinek, E., 2006. *A study of NGO relations with government and communities in Afghanistan*. Agency Coordinating for Afghan Relief. [Online]. Available at: <
<https://www.alnap.org/system/files/content/resource/files/main/381c64cc0ebda2b7c1257704004609c5-full-report.pdf> > [Accessed 12 April 2020].
- Jensen, M.N., 2006. Concepts and conceptions of civil society. *Journal of Civil Society*, 2(1), pp.39-56.
- Kaplan, A., 2000. Capacity-building: shifting the paradigms of practice. *Development in practice*, 10(3-4), pp.517-526.
- Karant, B., 2015. Funds Management in NGOs – A Conceptual Framework. *AIJBSR (SPECIAL ISSUE)*. pp. 116-129.
- Kastrati, A., 2016. Civil Society from Historical to Contemporary Perspectives *European Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies*, 1 (1), pp. 61-65.
- Kastro A & Dullea K.2018.Community-based prevention of child trafficking in Southern Ethiopia. *International Social Work* 1-14.

- Katsios, S., 2016. Corruption as a Governance Challenge and the Role of Civil Society. *Ovidius University Annals, Economic Sciences Series*, 16(1), pp.192-197.
- Kingma, B.R., 1993. Portfolio theory and non-profit financial stability. *Non-profit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 22(2), pp.105-119.
- Kings, S., 2017. Court sets aside R1-trillion nuclear deals SA with Russia, US and South Korea. [online] *Mail and Guardian*. Available at: <
<https://mg.co.za/article/2017-04-26-sa-russia-nuclear-deal-set-aside-by-high-court/> > [Accessed 07 April 2020].
- Kohler-Koch, B. and Quittkat, C., 2009. What is civil society and who represents civil society in the EU?—Results of an online survey among civil society experts. *Policy and society*, 28(1), pp.11-22.
- Kotecha, P., 2002. Improving the quality of partnerships between the public and private sectors in South African higher education: Access and development: Debating process. *Perspectives in Education*, 20(1), pp.129-135.
- Kumi, E. and Hayman, R., 2019. *Analysing the relationship between domestic resource mobilisation and civic space: Results of a scoping study*. [online]. Available at: <
https://scholar.google.com/scholar?hl=en&as_sdt=0%2C5&q=Analysing+the+relationship+between+domestic+resource+mobilisation+and+civic+space%3A+Results+of+a+scoping+study&btnG=#d=gs_cit&u=%2Fscholar%3Fq%3Dinfo%3AB38ZuMsXrDAJ%3Ascholar.google.com%2F%26output%3Dcite%26script%3D0%26hl%3Den > [Accessed 11 April 2020].
- Kumi, E., 2017. Domestic resource mobilisation strategies of national non-governmental development organisations in Ghana. *Bath Papers in International Development and Wellbeing*, (52). pp. 1-28.
- Kuuter, A and Trappmann V. 2010. Civil society in Central and Eastern Europe: The ambivalent legacy of accession. *Acta Politica* 45(1/2): 41-69.
- Kwofie, S., Yankey, I.K. and Abledu, G.K., 2016. Financial Support for Civil Society Organisations in Ghana: A Study of Natural Resources and Environmental Governance. *International Journal of Business and Social Research*, 6(2), pp.48-57.

- Lange, S, Wallevik H and Kiondo, A. 2000. Civil society in Tanzania. Research Report No. 6, Chr. Michelsen Institute, *Development Studies and Human Rights*, Bergen, Norway.
- Larmer, M., 2010. Social movement struggles in Africa. *Review of African Political Economy*, 37 (125), pp. 251-262.
- Loubser, JJ. 1993. Capacity Development – A Conceptual Overview. In P Morgan & Carlan V (eds.) *Emerging Issues in Capacity Development: Proceedings of a Workshop*. Ottawa: Institute on Governance.
- Makwerere, D. 2017. Developing peacebuilding skills among civil society organisations in Zimbabwe. PhD thesis, Durban University of Technology.
- Malena, C., Forster, R. and Singh, J., 2004. *The Role of Civil Society in Holding Government Accountable: A Perspective from the World Bank on the Concept and Emerging Practice of "Social Accountability."*. World Bank.
- Marita, E., Oule, J., Mungai, M., Thiam, S. and Ilako, F., 2016. Capacity and readiness of civil society organisations to implement community case management of malaria in Kenya. *The Pan African Medical Journal*, 25(Suppl 2).
- Mavrikos-Adamou, T., 2010. Challenges to democracy building and the role of civil society. *Democratization*, 17(3), pp.514-533.
- McKinley, D. 2012. Post-training survey: Capacity-building for CSOs. Foundation for Human Rights.
- Minzner, A., Klerman, J.A., Markovitz, C.E. and Fink, B., 2014. The impact of capacity-building programs on nonprofits: A random assignment evaluation. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 43(3), pp.547-569.
- Molinas, JR. 1998. The impact of inequality, gender, external assistance and social capital on local-level cooperation. *World Development* 26(3): 413-431.
- Morgan, P., 1998. Capacity Development and Public Private Partnerships. [Online]. Available at: < <https://www.gdrc.org/uem/undp-capacity.html> > [Accessed 18 May 2020].
- Morgan, P. 1998. Capacity and Capacity Development: Some Strategies. CIDA Policy Branch.

- Moyo, B., 2011. *Governing the public sphere: Civil society regulation in Africa*. Johannesburg: Southern Africa Trust.
- Msunduzi Evaluation Consortium. 2014. Limpopo Pilot Project: Formative project evaluation. Foundation for Human Rights.
- Muhibbu-Din, M.O., 2019. Assessing the roles of NGOs in health care services in Nigeria. *Journal of Nation-building & Policy Studies*, 3(2), pp.163-183.
- Munene, J.W. and Thakhathi, D.R., 2017. An analysis of capacities of civil society organizations (CSOs) involved in promotion of community participation in governance in Kenya. *Journal of Public Affairs*, 17(4), p.e1668.
- Naidoo, K., 2004. The end of blind faith. In Civil society and the challenge of accountability, legitimacy and transparency. *Accountability Forum* , 2, pp. 14-22.
- Ndou, S.D., 2016. State and civil society relations perspectives for good governance: propositions for the Africa agenda 2063 aspirations. *Journal of Public Administration and Development Alternatives (JPADA)*, 1(1), pp.28-44.
- Nelson, P. 2001. Information, Location and Legitimacy: The Changing Bases of Civil Society Involvement in International Economic Policy. In Edwards & Gaventa (eds.) *Global Citizen Action*. London: Earthscan.
- Ngcobo, K. 2019. BREAKING: High court sets aside findings of Arms Deal Commission. [online] *IOL News*. Available at : < <https://www.iol.co.za/news/politics/breaking-high-court-sets-aside-findings-of-arms-deal-commission-31047904> > [Accessed 06 April 2020].
- Ngwakwe, C.C., 2012. Public sector financial accountability and service delivery. *Journal of Public Administration*, 47(Special issue 1), pp.311-329.
- Nilsson, M., 2018. Civil society actors in peace negotiations in Central America. *Journal of Civil Society*, 14(2), pp.135-152.
- Nomsenge, S.O., 2018. Education NGOs in Makhanda, South Africa: a zero sum of philanthropy and survival. *Africanus*, 48(2), pp.1-16.
- Norlund, I.2007.Filling the Gap: The Emerging Civil Society in Viet Nam.
- Nzewi, O., 2012. Participatory monitoring and evaluation of governance in Africa: lessons from the civil society African Peer Review Mechanism monitoring project (AMP) in South Africa. *Africa Insight*, 41(4), pp.36-52.

- Nzimakwe, T.I., 2008. The value of civil society participation in governance. *Journal of Public Administration*, 43(1), pp.44-58.
- Ojiambo, S. 2013. Factors influencing the cohesiveness of community-based organisations: The case of income generating community groups in Kibera informal settlements. Project Report submitted in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements for the Award of the Degree of Master of Arts in Project Planning and Management of the University of Nairobi.
- Orji, N., 2009. Civil society, democracy and good governance in Africa. *CEU Political Science Journal*, (01), pp.76-101.
- Pedahzur, A., 2002. *The Israeli response to Jewish extremism and violence: Defending democracy*. Manchester University Press. : Manchester.
- Peltzer, K., Ramlagan, S. and Phaswana-Mafuya, N., 2008. A baseline assessment of Department of Health partnerships with non-profit organisations. *Acta Academica*, 40(3), pp.115-141.
- Phago, K., 2013. Good governance and effective public administration in Africa. *Africa Insight*, 43(1), pp.105-117.
- Phlix, G., Dhaene, C., Molenaers, N., Nijs, L., Fonteneau, B., Bossuyt, J., Grega, P. and De Potter, L., 2010. *Evaluation of NGO partnerships aimed at capacity development*. Special Evaluation Office of International Cooperation: Brussels.
- Pond, A. 2015. *Supporting grantee capacity: Strengthening effectiveness together*. New York: GrantCraft.
- Raik, K. 2006. The ambivalent effect of accession on civil society: The case of Estonia. In A Kutter & V Trappmann (eds.) *Das Erbe des Beitritts. Europaisierung in Mittel- und Osteuropa*. Baden-Baden: Nomos.
- Ramkumar, V. and Krafchik, W., 2006. *The role of civil society organizations in auditing and public finance management*. [online]. Available at: <https://scholar.google.com/scholar?hl=en&as_sdt=0%2C5&q=The+Role+of+Civil+Society+Organizations+in+Auditing+and+Public+Finance+Management&btnG=#d=gs_cit&u=%2Fscholar%3Fq%3Dinfo%3AK2PesHTXlycJ%3Ascholar.google.com%2F%26output%3Dcite%26scirp%3D0%26hl%3Den> [Accessed 13 April 2020].

- Ratlabyana, L., Mkhonza, L. & Magongo B. 2016. South African government funding to non-profit organisations: what is the investment value? Johannesburg: National Development Agency.
- Salifu, A, Francesconi GN and Shashidhara, AK. 2010. *A review of collective action in rural Ghana*. (IFPRI Discussion Paper 00998). Ghana: International food Policy research institute (IFPRI).
- Shava, E., 2019. Accountability of non-governmental organisations in poverty alleviation programmes. *Africa Insight*, 49(1), pp.122-136.
- Sibanda, M.M., 2011. Civil society participation in government: re-examining the third sector in global perspective. *Journal of Public Administration*, 46(Special issue 1), pp.814-833.
- Squire, C. 2006. Building Organisational Capacity in Iranian Civil Society: Mapping the Progress of CSOs. INTRAC Praxis Paper No. 8.
- Sterland, B., 2006. *Civil society capacity-building in post-conflict societies: The experience of Bosnia and Herzegovina and Kosovo*. INTRAC. [Online] Available at: <
https://scholar.google.com/scholar?hl=en&as_sdt=0%2C5&q=Civil+Society+Capacity+Building+in+Post-Conflict+Societies%3A+The+Experience+of+Bosnia+and+Herzegovina+and+Kosovo&btnG=#d=gs_cit&u=%2Fscholar%3Fq%3Dinfo%3ACuOw2yFhMOsJ%3Ascholar.google.com%2F%26output%3Dcite%26scirp%3D0%26hl%3Den
 > [Accessed 05 April 2020].
- Teets, JC. 2009. Post-Earthquake Relief and Reconstruction Efforts: The Emergence of Civil Society in China? *The China Quarterly* 198: 330-347.
- Thomas-Lake, H., 2006. Private money for public health: a US perspective on the role of the private sector and its impact on African health service delivery. *African Renaissance*, 3(4), pp.173-180.
- Turton, J. 2014. Evaluation of the FHR capacity-building of Civil Society Organisations (2009 – 2014). Foundation for Human Rights.
- Van Leeuwen, M. and Verkoren, W., 2012. Complexities and challenges for civil society building in post-conflict settings. *Journal of Peacebuilding & Development*, 7(1), pp.81-94.

- Van Leeuwen, M. and Verkoren, W., 2012. Complexities and challenges for civil society building in post-conflict settings. *Journal of Peacebuilding & Development*, 7(1), pp.81-94.
- Villanueva, P.A.G., 2020. Why Civil Society Cannot Battle it All Alone: The Roles of Civil Society Environment, Transparent Laws and Quality of Public Administration in Political Corruption Mitigation. *International Journal of Public Administration*, 43(6), pp.552-561.
- Water Integrity Network, 2018. *Uganda – capacity-building for civil society organisations: reflections from watershed Uganda work package* [Online]. Available at: < <https://www.waterintegritynetwork.net/2018/08/31/june-2018-sector-round-up/> > [Accessed 15 April 2020].
- Williams, H. 2014. Evaluation Report: Capacity Development Pilot Project, KwaZulu-Natal Consortium. Foundation for Human Rights.
- Yachkaschi, S. 2008. Towards the development of an appropriate organisational development approach for optimising the capacity-building of community-based organisations (CBOs): A case study of 3 CBOs in the Western Cape. PhD thesis, University of Stellenbosch.

15. ANNEXURE 1 CATEGORISING CSOS

NAME	CATEGORY	TYPE	ROLE/ACTIVITIES
ABSA foundation	Donor / Trust	Corporate foundation	Funds NPOs and CBOs involved in education, job creation and health
Carl & Emily Fuchs Foundation	Donor / Trust	Private foundation	Funds CSOs involved in childcare and youth development; health; counselling services and frail care; poverty alleviation and community development; trauma management and services to people with disabilities; higher education and promotion of excellence, arts and research
Charles Mott Foundation	Donor / Trust	Private foundation	Funds NPOs that work to deepen democracy increase participation in decision-making, advance socio-economic and racial equality and promote justice and reconciliation
Citigroup SA Foundation	Donor / Trust	Corporate foundation	Funds low-income communities and NPOs
Coca-Cola Foundation	Donor / Trust	Corporate foundation	Funds Non-profit organisations, non-governmental organisations and community-based organisations involved in Primary Education, Health (HIV/AIDS), Environment (Water & Recycling), Youth and Job Creation
Community Chest	Donor / Trust	Non-governmental funding agency	Funds CSOs involved in health, youth, rehabilitation, welfare, handicapped, the aged and the homeless.
Eskom Development Foundation	Donor / Trust	Corporate foundation	Funds CSOs involved in economic development (SMMEs), social development, health, job creation, arts and culture
Jim Joel Education and Training Fund	Donor / Trust	Non-governmental funding agency	Funds CSOs involved in education and early childhood development
National Lottery Distribution Trust Fund	Donor / Trust	Non-governmental funding agency	Funds CSOs involved in reconstruction and development, charities, arts, culture and national heritage, sport and recreation
Nelson Mandela's Children's Fund	Donor / Trust	Non-governmental funding agency	Funds CSOs involved in work with children
Open Society Foundation/ Soros Foundation	Donor / Trust	Private foundation	Funds CSOs whose work is aimed at promoting accountability
Charities Aid Foundation Southern Africa	Classical charity / advocacy	NGO that focuses on increasing and facilitating giving, philanthropy, corporate social	Acts as a bridge between the corporate, private and individual sector and the NGO sector, and engages in advocacy.

		investment and volunteering	
Coordinating Body of Refugee Communities	Classical charity / Membership / Service Provider / Advocacy	Association of refugees and asylum seekers	Monitors treatment of beneficiaries, provides training and conducts advocacy
Diakonia Council of Churches	Classical charity / Service provider	An ecumenical, inter-church agency, working with churches and church organisations in the pursuit of a more just society.	Facilitate processes with church social action groups to bring about positive lasting change in communities
KwaZulu Regional Christian Council	Classical charity / membership	Provincial fellowship of churches and church-based organisations	Facilitating ecumenical relationships with Church leaders, member Churches and member organisations, drawing on the strengths of each grouping and helping to respond to new challenges
South African National Council for the Blind	Classical charity/ Membership / Service provider / Advocacy	National representative NPO for the blind constituted by nearly 80- member-organisations	Education and Rehabilitation, advocacy and support
SDASA	Classical charity/Membership service provider on pro bono	NPO Representative for students, professionals and business for spiritual and social-economic support	Providing professional services in various areas including more importantly, thought leadership, education and social development
South African Muslim Charitable Trust	Classical charity / Donor /Trust	Trust that acts as a conduit for the provision of funding assets, services and other resources to approved public benefit organisations	Providing aid / relief to deserving communities
Abahlali baseMjondolo	Classical charity	A movement that advocates for the protection of human rights.	A movement of the poor shack dwellers in Durban, Pinetown, Pietermaritzburg and other parts of the province and the Western Cape
Safer South Africa Foundation	Service Provider / Advocacy	Registered NPO	Deals with safety and crime prevention stats.
CALEB Development and Training Association	Service provider	National network of organisations (3 provinces)	Training and advice
Centre for the Study of Violence and Reconciliation	Service provider	Research Institute	Researches violence and conflict; informs public discourse, policy and practice

			related to violence and conflict; and engages directly with those affected by violence and conflict.
Charities Aid Foundation	Service provider	NGOC that facilitates financial and associated philanthropic support to CSOs	Builds relationships between corporates and CSOs and engages in advocacy
Community Advice Offices	Service provider	Community-based	Free legal services
Community Resource Centres	Service provider	Community-based	Pre-school teacher training
FAMSA Limpopo Families South Africa	Service provider	Provincial CSO	Counselling and training
Leamogetswe Safety Home	Service provider	NPO that services the needs of orphans	Provides residential care (housing), food, education, health care and a safe environment to orphans
Mvula Trust	Service provider	Water and Sanitation Development NGO	Water and Sanitation services
Restorative Justice Centre	Service provider	NPO that promotes restorative justice practices as a means to peacebuilding and the constructive resolution of conflict	Training and mediation
African Migrants Solidarity	Service provider / Advocacy	NPO that aims to influence Refugee Policy and assist in the peaceful re-integration of asylum seekers and refugees in South African society	Advocacy, community programmes for poor and needy persons, and education and training
Centre for Applied Legal Studies	Service provider / Advocacy	Human Rights organisation based at the Wits University School of Law	Research, advocacy and litigation on behalf of vulnerable people to advance social justice
Centre for the Study of Violence and Reconciliation	Service provider / Advocacy	NGO/Research Institute	Researches violence and conflict; informs public discourse, policy and practice related to violence and conflict; and engages directly with those affected by violence and conflict.
CBR Education and Training for Empowerment	Service provider / Advocacy	Provincial NPO	Training and advocacy
Ecumenical Services for Social Economic Transformation	Service provider / Advocacy	Ecumenical human rights NGO	Training through emancipatory learning, building solidarity networks, and advocacy
Freedom of Expression Institute	Service provider / Advocacy	Human Rights NGO	Education, legal services and litigation and advocacy.

Human Rights Institute of South Africa	Service provider / Advocacy	NGO which offers professional services towards the promotion of a human rights culture, peace and democracy	Training and education in human rights, dissemination of human rights information and conducting research and advocacy in South Africa and beyond
Johannesburg Society for the Blind	Service provider / Advocacy	Provincial NPO for the blind	Education and skills development, provider of residential care facilities and advocacy
Legal Resources Centre	Service provider / Advocacy	Non-profit public interest law clinic	provides legal services for the vulnerable and marginalised, advocates for law reform, and establishes partnerships and alliances
Masimanyane Women's Rights International	Service provider / Advocacy	Community-based	Advocacy and empowerment through education
Nisaa Institute for Women's Development	Service provider / Advocacy	NGO that focuses on the prevention of gender violence and the empowerment of women who have been abused	Counseling and shelter services, awareness and advocacy, training and developing partnerships
People opposing women abuse	Service provider / Advocacy		Provides shelter, counselling and legal advice and engages in advocacy
Women's Net	Service provider / Advocacy	NGO that strengthens women and girls movements for social change	Training and advocacy
AIDS Consortium	Membership / Service provider	Network of over 200 affiliated member organisations	Interventions in communities to address a multitude of developmental issues, including education on, and prevention of, HIV & TB, behaviour change communication and interventions relating to sexual risk, substance abuse, and human rights awareness raising.
Forum for the Empowerment of Women	Membership / Service provider	Ngo established by black lesbian women activists living in Johannesburg	Counseling and information, education and communication
Initiative for Participatory Development	Membership / Service provider	National network of organisations	Addresses socio-economic issues through community adult learning and education
Ntinga Ntaba Ka Ndoda	Membership / Service provider	Community-based	Mobilises for rights, democracy, land reform, and sustainable rural development I
ProBono.Org	Membership / Service provider	National association of pro bono lawyers, legal aid attorneys, law professors and	Connects attorneys to those most in need and creates legal tools to help individuals advocate for themselves

		students, courts and other legal advocates across the country	
Building Workers' Union	Membership	Trade union	Strives for the interests of its members
Food and Allied Workers Union	Membership	Trade union	Strives for the interests of its members
National Association Of Democratic Lawyers	Membership / Service provider	Professional formation of lawyers and activist lawyers.	Assists members in matters relating to and arising from their professions and render, and co-ordinate the rendering of, legal assistance to persons and organisations involved in matters affecting inter alia human rights
Nedbank Running Club	Membership	Sports Club	Provides certain benefits and sports facilities and opportunities for members
Khulumani Support Group	Membership / Advocacy	CSO with a membership of over 100,000 survivors and family members of victims of gross human rights violations	Advocacy
The Wanders Club	Membership	Sports Club	Provides certain benefits and sports facilities and opportunities for members
African Diaspora Forum	Membership / Service provider / Advocacy	NPO that us a federation of more than 30 organizations that protects and defends the rights of migrants	Information sharing, education and advocacy on policy affecting migrants
Consortium for Refugees and Migrants in South Africa	Membership / Service provider / Advocacy	Consortium of CSOs involved in refugee issues	Capacity-building, information and networking, and advocacy and lobbying.
Eastern Cape NGO Coalition	Membership / Service provider / Advocacy	Provincial collective of non-governmental, faith and community-based organizations	Advocacy and networking, training, information dissemination, mentoring, and research
Rural Women's Movement	Membership / Service provider / Advocacy	National network of 496 CBOs	Training, advice and advocacy on issues of land, gender and development at both local and national levels

16. ANNEXURE 2 INTERVIEW INSTRUMENT



CREATING CAPACITIES AND CAPABILITIES OF CIVIL SOCIETY SECTOR

Key Informant Interview (KII) Questions

Institution code (if relevant)	Date (dd/mm/yy)	Interview number

**To be completed by the
interviewer**

Interviewer details (Name and Surname)

1. Introduction

The Human Sciences Research Council (HSRC) is conducting a study on creating capacity and capability of the civil society sector commissioned by the National Development Agency. Given that you are a relevant stakeholder who is knowledgeable on this subject, you are deemed very relevant to this study. This interview aims to acquire your insights about capacity challenges of the civil society sector and interventions. I am therefore, kindly requesting you to participate in this study and would like to explain the purpose of the study and obtain consent from you on your willingness to respond to questions posed to you.

**PLEASE READ THE INFORMED CONSENT FORM TO THE RESPONDENT(S)
AND ASK THEM TO SIGN IT.**

1.1 What is your current job position?

1.2 Where do you work?

1.3 What do you understand the term capacities and capabilities?

1.4 How would you define / describe the three most important capacities and capabilities required in the civil society sector? Are the capacities and capabilities different for CSOs and CBOs, or other formations in CS?

1.5 What are the three key challenges currently experienced by the civil society sector? Why do you believe that the civil society sector is experiencing capacity and capability challenges?

1.6 What specific skills are required in the civil society sector to make sure that not for profit organisations are able to execute their activities and achieve their goals?

1.7 What do you think is the role and responsibility of the government and business sector in building the capacity of the civil society sector? What is the role and responsibility of funders/donors and CSOs themselves? What are they doing, or what should they do to support the building of capacity and increasing the capabilities of the civil society sector?

1.8 Are you aware of any processes that CSOs engage in to assess their organisational capacity in order to determine their capacity and skills challenges? How often should CSOs engage in such processes?

1.9 Is the funding or budget for capacitating not for profit organisations sufficient and if not, why not? What are the main sources of funding for capacity-building of CSOs in South Africa?

1.10 What capacity-building interventions you are aware of that have been drawn internationally and regionally to be adapted in the civil society sector in South Africa? What priority areas do such capacity-building exercises focus on?

1.11 Who are the main service providers of capacity-building? Do you think that South Africa has a pool of efficient service providers in this area? Who do you think should drive such capacity-building programme?

1.12 Do you know of any accreditation and certification requirements or professional associations for CSO capacity-building service providers and what are those and how effective are they?

1.13 What are the key mechanisms for capacity-building (e.g. training courses, workshops, seminars, coaching, mentoring, etc.)? Which mechanisms do you think are the most useful?

1.14 In what sustainable way could measures be put into effect to ensure the sector retains and grows its own skills and capabilities?

1.15 We are also asking you to share with us any material or records that you may have and found useful about creating capacities and capabilities of the civil society sector.

1.16 Generally, express your parting words about how would you suggest that mechanisms for capacity-building be improved or any issues you strongly felt important for this area of research?

Thank you for your participation!

17. ANNEXURE 3 CONSENT FORM

CONSENT FORM



18. INFORMATION SHEET AND CONSENT FORM

CREATING CAPACITIES AND CAPABILITIES OF CIVIL SOCIETY SECTOR

Key informant Interview Schedule

Who we are

Hello, I am I am a researcher at the Human Sciences Research Council (HSRC – www.hsrc.ac.za).

What we are doing

We are conducting research on Creating Capacities for Civil Society Sector commissioned by the National Development Agency (NDA). We are also interested to hear your views about capacities challenges and interventions in the civil society sector. In doing this, we aim to assist NDA to have a sense of measure of capacity situation in the civil society sector to be able to provide necessary interventions to redeem their complex situation and shift the landscape of the sector to the right direction.

Your participation

We are asking you whether you will allow us to conduct one interview with you about your knowledge and opinions capacity challenges and interventions. If you agree, we will ask you to participate in one interview for approximately one hour.

We are also asking you to share with us any material or records that you may have about capacities challenges and interventions in the civil society sector. If you agree, we will not include your name on these pieces of information. Please understand that **your participation is voluntary** and you are not being forced to take part in this study. The choice of whether to participate or not, is yours alone. If you choose not to take part, you will not be affected in any way whatsoever. If you agree to participate, you may stop participating in the research at any given time and tell me that you do not

want to continue. If you do this, there will be no penalties and you will not be prejudiced in any way.

Confidentiality

All identifying information will be kept in a locked file cabinet in a locked office at the Human Sciences Research Council buildings in Pretoria and will not be available to others and will be kept confidential to the extent possible by law. The records from your participation may be reviewed by people responsible for making sure that research is done properly, including members of the ethics committee at the Human Sciences Research Council. (All of these people are required to keep your identity confidential.) Otherwise, records that identify you will be available only to people working on the study, unless you give permission for other people to see the records.

We are asking you to give us permission to tape-record the interview so that we can accurately record what is said. Your answers will be stored electronically in a secure environment and used for research or academic purposes now or at a later date in ways that will not reveal who you are. All future users of the stored data are required to apply for further Research Ethics Committee review and approval for secondary use of the stored data.

We will not record your name anywhere and no one will be able to connect you to the answers you give. Your answers will be linked to a fictitious code number or a pseudonym (another name) and we will refer to you in this way in the data, any publication, report or other research output.

Risks/discomforts

At the present time, we do not foresee any harm or discomfort from the study that is traumatic. The study is all about the work that you do on daily basis with the municipalities.

Benefits

There are no immediate benefits to you from participating in this study. However, this study will be helpful to us in that we hope will be able to write a report on Creating Capacities for the Civil Sector that we have been commissioned by NDA.

Who to contact if you have been harmed or have any concerns

This research has been approved by the HSRC Research Ethics Committee (REC). If you have any complaints about ethical aspects of the research or feel that you have been harmed in any way by participating in this study, please call the HSRC's toll-free

ethics hotline 0800 212 123 (when phoned from a landline from within South Africa) or contact the Human Sciences Research Council REC Administrator, on Tel 012 302 2012 or

e-mail research.ethics@hsrc.ac.za .

If you have concerns or questions about the research you may call the project leader Professor Modimowabarwa Kanyane at bkanyane@hsrc.ac.za or 0660064969

CONSENT

I hereby agree to participate in research on creating capacities for the civil society and interventions in the civil society sector by NDA and conducted by the HSRC.

I understand that I am participating freely and without being forced in any way to do so. I also understand that I can stop participating at any point should I not want to continue and that this decision will not in any way affect me negatively. I understand that this is a research project whose purpose is not necessarily to benefit me personally in the immediate or short term. I understand that my participation will remain confidential.

.....

Signature of participant

Date:.....

CONSENT FOR TAPE RECORDING

I hereby agree to the tape-recording of my participation in the study.

.....

Signature of participant

Date:.....

I understand that the information that I provide will be stored electronically and will be used for research purposes now or at a later stage.

.....

Signature of participant

Date:.....