Experiences with Capacity Building
Two ways: Traditional and Non-traditional

Traditional capacity building

Through working with national authorities, established structures and communities in a formal way.
• **Suspicion of the external agencies**: Issues related to explosives, mines and ERWs associated to militaries and national security resulting in little willingness to share information with the international organisations.

• **National technical capacity**: Governments have limited technical ability and hence involves working from the bottom and gradually building up. It requires time and resources.

• **Willingness of the governments**: Sometimes, lack of motivation amongst the responsible authorities and understanding of the obligations and the consequences of not being compliant to conventions
DDG’s Mine Action Capacity Building

- **Lack of resources**: within the government/national authorities to continue once the Donor funding has run out.

- **Integration of international conventions into national legislations**: Investment in setting up legislations is often limited.

- **Disconnect between government officials and the technical people who hold the actual “hardware” (military, police etc)**: Military and Police that are directly involved are oftentimes unaware of the international treaties signed by their governments/authorities, and hence unaware of their commitment to compliance with these treaties.
Non Traditional capacity building:
DDG’s work in Somalia

• Building capacity of local communities to adopt safe practices with ERWs, and remove other explosive devices from homes
• Through advocacy with local Leaders, mobilisation of community representatives, and other community stakeholders
• Use of community safety committees to encourage people to give up ERWs, mines and other explosive devices, collection by the DDG employed demolition teams to destroy these.
• Effective in reducing risks at lower level, ownership by the people that actually posses the hardware, grass roots level mobilisation
• Works well in places where a traditional government authorities are not well established (eg. Somalia)
The good examples and recommendations for way forward

Holistic engagement: Consisting of increased technical capacity, setting up structures, procedures, skills, and legislations. Ensuring involvement of government as well as the community level stakeholders (both top down and bottom up).

Responsibility to the national governments/authorities: Procedural and organisational responsibility for conducting activities for compliance left to the governments/national authorities. Technical training, skills development, quality control, and information management can be done by external agency.

Ensuring participation of all in-country stakeholders: Buy in, involvement and continuous engagement of “stakeholders holding physical hardware” (militaries, police and others)
The good examples and recommendations for way forward

Setting up well balanced functional national structure (sustainability) that has representation and functional responsibility to the people with hardware, and those whose capacity will be built will be crucial for sustainability.

Financial accountability and control: Financial capacity building including rigorous financial procedures and accountability is established.

Addressing the willingness of the national governments: by addressing the reasons, benefits and compliance factor of the capacity building work.

Longer term engagement from the International agencies and Donors: Needed for sustainability and quality of the capacity in place.