Global Environment Facility

GEF Council
April 22-25, 2008

SECOND PROGRESS REPORT ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE GEF STRATEGIC APPROACH TO CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT

Table of Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.   This report summarizes the key issues in the implementation of the GEF Strategic Approach to Enhance Capacity Building since the report to Council in October 2005. It is presented in response to the request received during the negotiations for the Fourth Replenishment that such a report should be submitted to the Council by May/June 2008.

2.   The Strategic Approach proposed four pathways for enhanced GEF support to capacity building: (i) National Capacity Self-Assessments (NCSA); (ii) enhanced attention to capacity building in regular GEF projects; (iii) targeted, free standing capacity building projects within focal areas (focal area specific) and across focal areas, and (iv) LDCs and SIDS cross-cutting capacity development programs and projects.

3.   The need for an analytical framework that would monitor and quantify the contribution that GEF capacity development support has provided toward achieving global environmental outcomes was identified as a critical step to operationalize the Strategic Approach. As a result, a Capacity Development M&E framework has been developed, including five Capacity Results and several Capacity Building Indicators, which would serve to measure capacity building processes and changes.

4.   For Pathway 1, the NCSAs have provided an opportunity for countries to assess the critical gaps in their capacities and have served as a logical follow-up to Enabling Activities under the Conventions. NCSAs have also provided inputs for the formulation of medium-sized projects (MSPs) and full-sized projects (FSPs) that aim to build capacity in specific areas.

5.   For Pathway 2, the Evaluation Office evaluated GEF capacity development activities. The results showed that GEF capacity development support has been relevant, in line with national policy priorities, and has enjoyed a good level of national ownership. It recommended that further work would be needed to analyze capacity development across the GEF portfolio.

6.   For Pathway 3, the GEF guidelines related to capacity building have been followed and sustained during GEF-4. Targeted, free standing capacity building projects are being supported for countries that have completed their NCSAs to develop corresponding action plans.

7.   For Pathway 4, interventions will focus both on targeted assistance to remove bottlenecks at the country level based on priorities identified in the NCSAs, as well as on developing common reporting to the conventions.

8.   Currently the GEF is financing cross-cutting capacity development projects within the framework and guidelines described in the GEF-3 Strategic Priority CB-2. Based on the results of this process and the feedback from countries, as well as guidance from the conventions, proposals on strengthening the Strategy may be presented to the Council as needed.

INTRODUCTION

1.   In November 2003, Council approved the *GEF Strategic Approach to Enhance Capacity Building* (GEF/C.22/8). The Strategic Approach was guided by the aim of providing adequate support for nationally determined and prioritized capacity building needs, consistent with the relevant conventions and the objectives of the GEF, in a cost effective manner, with clearly identified indicators of progress and achievement. The Strategic Approach was based on the conclusions from the Capacity Development Initiative, undertaken by the GEF Secretariat and UNDP in 2000, as a series of regional assessments of countries' capacity building needs and priorities in the focal areas of biodiversity, climate change, and land degradation, as well as within the broader sustainable development context. Later, in October 2005, a paper on *Progress on the Implementation of the GEF Strategic Approach to Capacity Development* (GEF/C.27/Inf.12) was presented to the Council.

2.   During the Negotiations on the Fourth Replenishment of the GEF Trust Fund in August 2006, the Secretariat was requested to report to Council by May/June 2008 on the implementation of the Strategic Approach and propose ways to further enhance the effectiveness and efficiency of GEF's capacity building efforts. This report summarizes the key issues in the implementation of the Strategic Approach since the report to Council in October 2005.

3.   The Strategic Approach outlined a set of operational principles to be adhered to by the GEF and itsAgencies in support of countries' capacity building efforts towards effective management of global environmental issues. It proposed four pathways for enhanced GEF support to capacity building: (i) National Capacity Self-Assessments (NCSAs); (ii) enhanced attention to capacity building in regular GEF projects; (iii) targeted, free standing capacity building projects within focal areas (focal area specific) and across focal areas, and (iv) LDCs and SIDS cross-cutting capacity development programs. Since October 2005, the evolution of the Strategic Approach has been focused on the NCSA Pathway, as summarized below. Additionally, the need to develop targets and indicators was also emphasized.

4.   One hundred and forty five countries have been preparing National Capacity Self-Assessments (NCSAs), which combine a country-driven assessment of critical capacity needs and a national capacity development strategy. As such, a few NCSAs are in the early stages, several are well underway, while the majority have finished. Responding to a demand from countries, the GEF Secretariat, UNEP and UNDP formed the Capacity Development Task Force to facilitate dialogue and collaboration among countries for planning their NCSAs.

5.   The Task Force work has led to the establishment of a Global Support Program (GSP), a three year GEF innovative partnership programme that started in August 2005. Its objective is to provide the countries undertaking NCSAs with methodological support and knowledge management mechanisms. Also, the GSP, managed jointly by UNDP and UNEP through the guidance received from the Capacity Development Task Force, has been providing substantive inputs for implementation of the Strategic Approach.

6.   The NCSAs have provided an opportunity for countries to assess the critical gaps in their capacity to sustain monitoring and reporting activities in the GEF focal areas. Similarly, NCSAs have served as a logical follow-up to Enabling Activities that assisted developing countries to

fulfill their commitments under the Conventions. NCSAs have also provided inputs for the formulation of MSPs and FSPs that, among other objectives, have aimed to build capacity in specific areas of global environment management. Countries that have been finalizing their needs assessments are considering their NCSAs to be a strategic tool in country programming on global environment issues.

ADVANCES ON CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT INDICATORS

7.   The need for an analytical framework that would monitor and quantify the contribution that GEF capacity development support has provided toward achieving global environmental outcomes was stated as a critical step to operationalize the Strategic Approach. Building on the preliminary work undertaken by the Capacity Development Task Force, early results and conclusions of NCSAs with regard to priority national capacity needs, as well as regional NCSA training workshops conducted by the GSP, a Capacity Development M&E framework has been developed.

8.   The draft M&E framework has been reviewed by the GEF Secretariat, the Evaluation Office, UNEP and UNDP. It was also presented to the Subsidiary Body for Implementation of the UNFCCC at a workshop in Antigua & Barbuda in 2007. The M&E framework will contribute to one of the objectives of the GEF Results Based Management (RBM): "to design mechanisms to ensure the measurement of progress" toward specific goals of the GEF. In itself, this M&E framework provides a tool to assess existing capacities and to identify capacity gaps, within a program or project context. The proposed M&E framework takes into account GEF Strategic Objectives and Programs as well as the evolving RBM Framework.

9.   The M&E Framework identifies five Capacity Results (CR) to form the basis for monitoring capacity development in the GEF: CR 1: capacities for engagement; CR2: capacities to generate, access and use information and knowledge; CR3: capacities for policy and legislation development; CR4: capacities for management and implementation; and CR5: capacities to monitor and evaluate (see full description in Annex 1). For each of the capacity results above, the M&E framework proposes a number of Capacity Building Indicators (CBI). These CR and CBI serve to measure capacity building processes and changes in a qualitative way. To measure these changes, a scorecard-approach has been proposed within the M&E framework (see Annex 2). The scorecard measures capacity change through the use of appropriate indicators and their corresponding ratings. The indicators should be tracked, at minimum, at the beginning of a project, at its mid-point and at the end.

10.   The application of the M&E framework has been used to "retrofit" a number of cross-cutting capacity building medium size projects (MSP) submitted to the GEF for review and approval (see Pathway 3 below). The initial experience with applying the M&E framework confirms that it is: (i) broad enough to capture the dimension/scope of project outputs and outcomes and to establish clear linkages between them; (ii) helpful to sharpen the focus of indicators in the project logical framework; (iii) an effective tool to identify and document capacity baselines at the onset of projects; and (iv) useful to quantify in budgetary terms what financial resources are directed to concrete capacity development activities. The next steps for furthering the use of the M&E framework are: to present it to the GEF focal areas' teams, to

integrate it into the RBM Framework and the GEF Operational Manual, to design tools to help integrate the CBI into the design of GEF projects and programs, and to test the M&E framework in focal areas projects and programs.

PROGRESS ON THE STRATEGIC APPROACH PATHWAYS

Pathway 1: NCSAs

11.   The first Pathway for enhanced GEF support to capacity building focuses on the development and use of NCSAs. As of early 2008 the status of NCSA implementation can be divided into three groups: (i) 23 countries (16%) are at the early stages in assessing their capacity needs; (ii) 59 countries (40%) are drafting their concluding reports and plans for submission this year; and (iii) 63 countries (44%) have completed the NCSA process. The GSP is conducting regular analyses and syntheses of NCSA results as they become available in order to understand how countries prioritize their needs and prepare their action plans to clarify the major areas of capacity needs that countries have identified. Furthermore, a number of policy-relevant impacts of NCSAs have been identified by the GSP, and are presented in Annex 3. To improve the quality of NCSA processes and products, countries are encouraged by the GSP to use a self-evaluation sheet that has been developed and improved through consultations with NCSA teams during regional training workshops (an example of a self-evaluation sheet is provided in Annex 4).

12.   The combined analysis of final NCSA reports and their corresponding action plans, plus the self-evaluation reports provide a range of lessons on the ways in which the NCSA capacity needs assessment and capacity action planning can be organized and implemented successfully. With regard to the NCSA process itself, it has emerged that the more successful NCSA outcomes followed a planned and systematic process that was well-led, coordinated, and supported with an integrated team and broader stakeholders working in concert.

13.   Political leadership, finding champions and good communications to adequately promote and position the NCSA are all factors that have contributed to the successful implementation of NCSAs. As such, high level government endorsement of the action plan is critical to get political commitment and to achieve sustainability. The broader lesson is to try to engage in a mutually beneficial way with relevant major events and the agendas of key stakeholders, such as national development plans, sectoral programming, decentralization planning, etc. The nature of the NCSA, which focuses on strengthening the enabling environment in a country, requires a process of development that works with the prevailing tide, rather than one that tries to "carry out the project" in isolation or regardless of the prevailing circumstances in the country.

Pathway 2: Enhancing capacity development within regular GEF projects

14.   Considering that Capacity Development remains a central element for all GEF projects, in November 2007 the Evaluation Office presented to the Council the *Progress Report of the Evaluation Director* (GEF/ME/C.32/1), in which the main results of GEF capacity development activities were summarized. The evaluation, based on country case studies of the Philippines and Vietnam, found that the results of capacity development activities have been generally positive

and in some areas significant. GEF capacity development support has been relevant, in line with national policy priorities, and has enjoyed a good level of national ownership. The effectiveness of capacity development activities has varied, but even in areas that did not produce immediate benefits, results have been known to develop in the longer term.

15.   The cost-effectiveness of capacity development activities was difficult to assess. Although there are many improvements to capacity at the individual, institutional and systemic levels, there are doubts about the sustainability. The case studies revealed a common underlying weakness in the training programs, namely the tendency to plan and execute training as a "one-shot" solution. Extensive stakeholder consultations showed the importance of progression and repetition in training. Progression is needed to allow successful trainees, who have made use of their new knowledge and skills, to undertake more advanced courses, to reach higher levels of expertise, thereby further strengthening institutional performance. Sustainability of training is necessary to deal with the attrition of trained personnel, which is a common problem in Government institutions.

16.   After reflecting on the issues identified by the country case studies, the Evaluation Office recommended that further work would be needed to analyze capacity development across the GEF portfolio. Therefore, the Council requested the Evaluation Office to incorporate an appropriate methodology in the upcoming focal area evaluations. In the meantime, it would be advisable for the projects that have Capacity Development components to present the activities based on a comprehensive capacity assessment of the target organization(s)/institution(s), by means of identifying: (i) a clear and specific set of capacity-building objectives; (ii) the human, institutional, and organizational capacity support that is necessary in order to achieve these objectives; and (iii) the capacity development indicators form the categories described above that could be used to measure not only performance but also success.

Pathway 3: Targeted free standing capacity building projects within focal areas (focal area specific) and across focal areas

a) Capacity development advances in focal areas

17.   In June 2007, the Council approved the *Focal Area Strategies and Strategic Programming for GEF-4* (GEF/C.31/10), which defines the strategic focus of the GEF during the fourth replenishment period. During its preparation, the Council reviewed working drafts and requested the Secretariat to continue its work to revise the focal area strategies in a way that could include "more harmonized and integrated approaches to *capacity building*, knowledge management and learning …" (pg. 1). Additionally, a cross-cutting goal for the GEF is to ensure that capacity is left behind in countries following project completion. This has and will be done by embedding *capacity building* elements in a coordinated manner in GEF projects. Therefore, *capacity building* remains a central element for all GEF focal areas.

18.   With regard to the Biodiversity focal area, in order to achieve its goal,[1] the Strategic Approach encompasses four complementary and mutually reinforcing objectives, three out of four of which are directly linked to capacity development: (i) improving the sustainability of protected area systems, recognizing the general need for *capacity building* at the national and local levels to support effective management of protected area systems; (ii) safeguarding biodiversity through *building country capacity* to implement the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety (CPB); and (iii) *capacity building* to support the implementation of the Bonn Guidelines on Access to Genetic Resources and Benefit-sharing. Underpinning these objectives, the GEF has been supporting *institutional capacity building* and the development of appropriate policy frameworks to ensure sustainable biodiversity conservation. In addition, some GEF Strategic Programs[2] within this focal area recognize capacity building as a requirement for the development of their initiatives.

19.   In the Climate Change focal area, the majority of projects during GEF-4 have provided a mixture of technical assistance, *capacity building*, and investment. Moreover, all projects presented to date in GEF-4 under the Strategic Pilot on Adaptation have combined technical assistance and *capacity building* with concrete actions.

20.   Regarding the International Waters focal area, the third independent Overall Performance Study of the GEF (OPS-3) in 2005 and internal reviews have documented success in use of GEF-recommended processes for achieving the first Strategic Objective[3] through special *capacity building* or foundational projects (equivalent to GEF enabling activities). Over the last 15 years, 123 different states have requested GEF help to work with their neighbors in GEF IW *foundational capacity building projects*. These projects have included almost one-half (14) of the planet's Large Marine Ecosystems (LMEs) that are shared by developing countries. At least 6 additional projects have been approved by Council in GEF-4 to complement this foundational capacity building work. Furthermore, targeted learning projects are being undertaken under the IW portfolio to enhance South-to-South experience sharing and learning, knowledge management (KM), and *capacity building* to replicate good practices.

21.   In the Land Degradation focal area, Strategic Objective 1[4] explains that countries are to be prioritized through an analysis of the drivers and impacts of land degradation, including existing patterns of degradation, land use, poverty and well-being, and vulnerability to climate change among others. Institutions with national and regional mandates in land resources management, including the provision of services such as training and research, have been receiving GEF support with the aim of enabling these institutions to fulfill their mandates by placing Sustainable Land and Forest Management in the main stream of public policy through *capacity building*.

---

[1] The goal of GEF's biodiversity program is the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity, the maintenance of the ecosystem goods and services that biodiversity provides to society, and the fair and equitable sharing of the benefits arising out of the utilization of genetic resources.

[2] Strategic Program 4: Strengthening the Policy and Regulatory Framework for Mainstreaming Biodiversity; Strategic Program 6: Building Capacity for the Implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety; Strategic Program 8: Building Capacity on Access and Benefit Sharing.

[3] Foster international multi-state cooperation on priority water concerns.

[4] Develop an enabling environment that will place sustainable land management in the mainstream of development policy and practices at regional, national and local levels.

22.   The Persistent Organic Pollutants focal area reaffirmed previous guidance and adopted the further guidance of the Conference of the Parties (COP) to the Stockholm Convention from its third meeting in May 2007. Much of this guidance related to alternative products, methods and strategies to address DDT for disease vector control, best available techniques, best environmental practices, and *capacity building* for the implementation of the global monitoring plan for effectiveness evaluation. The Stockholm COP also requested the GEF to give special consideration to those activities relevant to the sound management of chemicals identified as priorities in National Implementation Plans.[5] These guidelines have been followed and the activities have received support during GEF-4.

23.   As showed, during GEF-4, the guidelines related to capacity building have been followed and supported, and it is expected that results / outcomes are going to be closely monitored based on the indicators included within the RBM Framework of each project.

b) Targeted, cross-cutting capacity development projects to address capacity building needs identified in NCSAs

24.   The Strategic Approach envisaged support to countries with completed NCSAs to address their capacity building needs at the institutional and systemic levels in a cost-effective, cross-cutting way. This support builds on synergies among conventions and targets foundational work to create an enabling environment to address global environmental issues in the long term. Both the GEF-4 replenishment and the GEF Secretariat business plan have included conceptual and financial provisions to support this pathway. So far, 25 countries have prepared CB-2 MSPs to implement priority needs identified in the NCSAs. Each MSP entails less than $500,000 in GEF financing. These MSPs are currently being reviewed by the GEF Secretariat; three of them have already been approved by the CEO. Generally, MSPs have focused on one or two priority areas of support (see Table 1).

Table 1 - CB-2 MSPs registered in the GEF pipeline categorized by areas of CB needs identified by the countries as top priorities for phase II of the NCSA.

Area of Priority CB needs	Countries
Institutional coordination for MEA implementation	Ghana, Gambia, Philippines, Belize, Lithuania, Slovak, Jordan, Nicaragua, Romania
Policy mainstreaming	Seychelles, Lithuania, Namibia, Bulgaria, Jordan
Information and data management and monitoring	Cambodia, Kenya, Croatia, Armenia
Environment policy and law enforcement	Lao PDR, Nicaragua
Local level environmental governance	Bhutan, Gambia, Bulgaria, Ghana
EIA and other tools and methodologies	Jamaica, Kenya, Croatia
Scientific and technical	Jordan
Environmental education/public awareness	Tajikistan
Stakeholder empowerment and involvement	Seychelles, Lao PDR, Tajikistan, Philippines
Institutional management and implementation	Bhutan, Romania, Uzbekistan, Slovak, Belize,

---

[5] Specifically, the COP invited "the GEF to incorporate activities related to the GMP and *capacity-building* in developing countries, SIDS, and CEITs, as priorities for providing financial support"

	Armenia
Fund and/or human resource management	Uzbekistan, Namibia

Pathway 4: LDC/SIDS cross-cutting capacity development programs

25.   The recently CEO-endorsed project titled *West Africa Regional Biosafety* (Benin, Burkina Faso, Mali, Senegal, Togo), fits appropriately in Pathway 4. Its objective is to establish and implement a regional biosafety regulatory framework that will enable the West African Economic and Monetary Union (WAEMU) member countries to meet their obligations under the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety and other international standards. Obligations will be met through the establishment and implementation of an institutional, legal and regulatory regional biosafety framework for the regulation of Living Modified Organisms (LMOs). In harmony with Pathway 4, this project also responds to Article 22 of the Cartagena Protocol with regard to supporting developing country Parties' needs on capacity-building for biosafety, in particular the least developed and small island developing States needs for financial resources and access to and transfer of technology and know-how.

26.   Another project that also suits Pathway 4 is the *Targeted Portfolio Project on Capacity Building and Mainstreaming of Sustainable Land Management (SLM) for Least Developing Countries (LDCs) and Small Island Developing Countries (SIDS)*, currently in execution. The project will assist 47 LDCs and SIDS countries to develop individual, institutional and systemic capacity for sustainable land management in a cost-effective manner.[6] The eligible countries may access an expedited Medium-Sized Project (MSP) under the programmatic approach from the GEF. At the end of the project, each participating country will have: (i) begun a process of capacity development and mainstreaming; (ii) elaborated their National Action Programmes (NAPs); and (iii) produced a Medium-Term National Investment Plan for SLM (including a Resource Mobilization Plan with projects identified for investment by specific Implementing and Executing Agencies and interested donors).

27.   Capacity building programs for LDCs and SIDS remain a priority, and GEF Secretariat will continue implementing Pathway 4 during the second half of GEF-4 and beyond. Interventions will focus on targeted assistance to remove bottlenecks at the country level, based on priorities identified in the NCSAs, including:

(a)   Assisting countries to develop a comprehensive and multi-focal approach that will result in each country having an integrated team of experts who can both address all needs without having to compartmentalize their work and produce a single national report that can comply with their obligations under all the relevant Conventions.

(b)   Adopting alternative scenarios through improved opportunities for strengthening the enabling environment and general cross-cutting support.

(c)   Supporting initiatives that cover not only the GEF focal area Strategic Priorities, but also additional cross-cutting initiatives, namely capacity enhancement,

---

[6] For more information, see http://www.gsu.co.za

enabling activities and support for relevant activities undertaken by both civil society and the private sector.

(d)   Assisting countries to establish the foundation for policies and strategies and to develop action plans, frameworks and priorities, primarily through enabling activities, when the foundation and priorities have been established.

NEXT STEPS

28.   The NCSAs Pathway has advanced as described above. Currently the GEF is financing cross-cutting capacity development projects that address national priority needs in response to the decisions of the relevant Conventions, within the framework and guidelines described in the GEF-3 Strategic Priority CB-2. All cross-cutting projects are using the GEF Medium-sized project cycle and have been designed to address the priority capacity constraints identified in the NCSAs results. These projects will contribute to the implementation of Pathway 3 (b)(targeted, cross-cutting capacity development projects). Three projects have been approved, while others are currently being presented for approval. It is expected that all these projects will be implemented over the next 24 months. As stated in document, *GEF Strategic Approach to Enhance Capacity Building* (GEF/C.22/8), given the enabling nature of capacity building activities, many such activities will be funded on an agreed full-cost basis, since the baseline cost to be met from other resources may be zero. GEF Secretariat will continue receiving, reviewing and when appropriate, approving projects.

29.   The experience with capacity building at the GEF has been positively evaluated, and is considered to be a cost-effective investment, however not as easily quantifiable as other interventions, and should continue to permeate GEF projects, as well as be the focus of dedicated projects. Some focal areas are now emerging as priorities for capacity building, in particular supporting the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety, and supporting the implementation of the Bonn Guidelines on Access to Genetic Resources and Benefit Sharing. Furthermore, the programming of GEF-4 resources in Natural Resources Management continues to make reference to capacity development activities embedded in focal area objectives, specifically in Biodiversity, International Waters and Land Degradation. Based on the results of this process and the feedback from countries, as well as guidance from the conventions, proposals on strengthening the Strategic Approach will continue to be prioritized in GEF's overall portfolio.

ANNEX 1: CAPACITY RESULTS TO FORM THE BASIS FOR MONITORING CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT IN THE GEF

CR 1: Capacities for engagement: capacities of relevant individuals and organizations (resource users, owners, consumers, community and political leaders, private and public sector managers and experts) to engage proactively and constructively with one another in managing a global environmental issue.

CR2: Capacities to generate, access and use information and knowledge: capacities of individuals and organizations to research, acquire, communicate, educate and make use of pertinent information to be able to diagnose and understand global environmental problems and identify potential solutions.

CR3: Capacities for policy and legislation development: capacities of individuals and organizations to plan and develop effective environmental policy and legislation, related strategies and plans – based on informed decision-making processes for global environmental management.

CR4: Capacities for management and implementation: capacities of individuals and organizations to enact environmental policies and/or regulation decisions, and to plan and execute relevant sustainable global environmental management actions/solutions.

CR5: Capacities to monitor and evaluate: capacities in individuals and organizations to effectively monitor and evaluate project and/or program achievements against expected results and to provide feedback for learning, adaptive management and to suggest adjustments to the course of action if necessary to conserve and preserve the global environment.

ANNEX 2: SCORECARD FOR MEASURING CAPACITY RESULTS

Capacity Result / Indicator	Staged Indicators	Rating	Score	Comments	Next Steps	Contribution to which Outcome
CR 1: Capacities for engagement						
Indicator 1 – Degree of legitimacy/mandate of lead environmental organizations	Institutional responsibilities for environmental management are not clearly defined	0				
	Institutional responsibilities for environmental management are identified	1				
	Authority and legitimacy of all lead organizations responsible for environmental management are partially recognized by stakeholders	2				
	Authority and legitimacy of all lead organizations responsible for environmental management recognized by stakeholders	3				
Indicator 2 – Existence of operational co-management mechanisms	No co-management mechanisms are in place	0				
	Some co-management mechanisms are in place and operational	1				
	Some co-management mechanisms are formally established through agreements, MOUs, etc.	2				
	Comprehensive co-management mechanisms are formally established and are operational/functional	3				
Indicator 3 – Existence of cooperation with stakeholder groups	Identification of stakeholders and their participation/involvement in decision-making is poor	0				
	Stakeholders are identified but their participation in decision-making is limited	1				
	Stakeholders are identified and regular consultations mechanisms are established	2				
	Stakeholders are identified and they actively contribute to established participative	3				

Capacity Result / Indicator	Staged Indicators	Rating	Score	Comments	Next Steps	Contribution to which Outcome
	decision-making processes					
.... Add your own indicator(s)						
CR 2: Capacities to generate, access and use information and knowledge						
Indicator 4 – Degree of environmental awareness of stakeholders	Stakeholders are not aware about global environmental issues and their related possible solutions (MEAs)	0				
	Stakeholders are aware about global environmental issues but not about the possible solutions (MEAs)	1				
	Stakeholders are aware about global environmental issues and the possible solutions but do not know how to participate	2				
	Stakeholders are aware about global environmental issues and are actively participating in the implementation of related solutions	3				
Indicator 5 – Access and sharing of environmental information by stakeholders	The environmental information needs are not identified and the information management infrastructure is inadequate	0				
	The environmental information needs are identified but the information management infrastructure is inadequate	1				
	The environmental information is partially available and shared among stakeholders but is not covering all focal areas and/or the information management infrastructure to manage and give information access to the public is limited	2				
	Comprehensive environmental information is available and shared through an adequate	3				

Capacity Result / Indicator	Staged Indicators	Rating	Score	Comments	Next Steps	Contribution to which Outcome
	information management infrastructure					
Indicator 6 – Existence of environmental education programmes	No environmental education programmes are in place	0				
	Environmental education programmes are partially developed and partially delivered	1				
	Environmental education programmes are fully developed but partially delivered	2				
	Comprehensive environmental education programmes exist and are being delivered	3				
Indicator 7 – Extend of the linkage between environmental research/science and policy development	No linkage exist between environmental policy development and science/research strategies and programmes	0				
	Research needs for environmental policy development are identified but are not translated into relevant research strategies and programmes	1				
	Relevant research strategies and programmes for environmental policy development exist but the research information is not responding fully to the policy research needs	2				
	Relevant research results are available for environmental policy development	3				
Indicator 8 – Extend of inclusion/use of traditional knowledge in environmental decision-making	Traditional knowledge is ignored and not taken into account into relevant participative decision-making processes	0				
	Traditional knowledge is identified and recognized as important but is not collected and used in relevant participative decision-making processes	1				
	Traditional knowledge is collected but is not used systematically into relevant participative decision-making processes	2				

Capacity Result / Indicator	Staged Indicators	Rating	Score	Comments	Next Steps	Contribution to which Outcome
	Traditional knowledge is collected, used and shared for effective participative decision-making processes	3				
.... Add your own indicator(s)						
CR 3: Capacities for strategy, policy and legislation development						
Indicator 9 – Extend of the environmental planning and strategy development process	The environmental planning and strategy development process is not coordinated and does not produce adequate environmental plans and strategies	0				
	The environmental planning and strategy development process does produce adequate environmental plans and strategies but there are not implemented/used	1				
	Adequate environmental plans and strategies are produced but there are only partially implemented because of funding constraints and/or other problems	2				
	The environmental planning and strategy development process is well coordinated by the lead environmental organizations and produces the required environmental plans and strategies; which are being implemented	3				
Indicator 10 – Existence of an adequate environmental policy and regulatory frameworks	The environmental policy and regulatory frameworks are insufficient; they do not provide an enabling environment	0				
	Some relevant environmental policies and laws exist but few are implemented and enforced	1				
	Adequate environmental policy and legislation frameworks exist but there are problems in implementing and enforcing	2				

Capacity Result / Indicator	Staged Indicators	Rating	Score	Comments	Next Steps	Contribution to which Outcome
	them					
	Adequate policy and legislation frameworks are implemented and provide an adequate enabling environment; a compliance and enforcement mechanism is established and functions	3				
Indicator 11 – Adequacy of the environmental information available for decision-making	The availability of environmental information for decision-making is lacking	0				
	Some environmental information exists but it is not sufficient to support environmental decision-making processes	1				
	Relevant environmental information is made available to environmental decision-makers but the process to update this information is not functioning properly	2				
	Political and administrative decision-makers obtain and use updated environmental information to make environmental decisions	3				
.… Add your own indicator(s)						
CR 4: Capacities for management and implementation						
Indicator 12 – Existence and mobilization of resources	The environmental organizations don't have adequate resources for their programmes and projects and the requirements have not been assessed	0				
	The resource requirements are known but are not being addressed	1				
	The funding sources for these resource requirements are partially identified and the resource requirements are partially addressed	2				
	Adequate resources are mobilized and	3				

Capacity Result / Indicator	Staged Indicators	Rating	Score	Comments	Next Steps	Contribution to which Outcome
	available for the functioning of the lead environmental organizations					
Indicator 13 – Availability of required technical skills and technology transfer	The necessary required skills and technology are not available and the needs are not identified	0				
	The required skills and technologies needs are identified as well as their sources	1				
	The required skills and technologies are obtained but their access depend on foreign sources	2				
	The required skills and technologies are available and there is a national-based mechanism for updating the required skills and for upgrading the technologies	3				
.... Add your own indicator(s)						
CR 5: Capacities to monitor and evaluate						
Indicator 14 – Adequacy of the project/programme monitoring process	Irregular project monitoring is being done without an adequate monitoring framework detailing what and how to monitor the particular project or programme	0				
	An adequate resourced monitoring framework is in place but project monitoring is irregularly conducted	1				
	Regular participative monitoring of results in being conducted but this information is only partially used by the project/programme implementation team	2				
	Monitoring information is produced timely and accurately and is used by the implementation team to learn and possibly to change the course of action	3				
Indicator 15 – Adequacy	None or ineffective evaluations are being	0				

Capacity Result / Indicator	Staged Indicators	Rating	Score	Comments	Next Steps	Contribution to which Outcome
of the project/programme evaluation process	conducted without an adequate evaluation plan; including the necessary resources					
	An adequate evaluation plan is in place but evaluation activities are irregularly conducted	1				
	Evaluations are being conducted as per an adequate evaluation plan but the evaluation results are only partially used by the project/programme implementation team	2				
	Effective evaluations are conducted timely and accurately and are used by the implementation team and the Agencies and GEF Staff to correct the course of action if needed and to learn for further planning activities	3				
.... Add your own indicator(s)						

Capacity Results	Contributing to which Strategic Objectives	Start	Project 1 Mid-term	End	Start	Project n Mid-term	End	Average change at mid-term	Average change at end	Average change overall
CR1 Capacity for engagement	a, b, c, ..	0	1	3	1	1	2	0.5	1.5	2
CR2 Capacity to generate, access and use information and knowledge	B, c, ..	1	2	2	2	2	2	0.5	0	0.5
CR3 Capacity for strategy, policy and legislation development	a, c,	2	1	2	2	2	3	-0.5	1	0.5
CR4 Capacity for management and implementation	d	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	1	2
CR5 Capacity to monitor and evaluate	C, d, ..	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0

Examples of Institutional Engagement and Coordination:

- The NCSA from Jamaica was led by the National Environmental and Planning Agency (NEPA), with a Project Management Unit within the agency's Policies and Projects Division and a Project Steering Committee of 18 institutions (key government ministries, academic institutions, NGOs and CBOs). The Natural Resources Sub-Committee of Cabinet had political oversight of the NCSA, and was provided with periodic briefing notes.

- The NCSA from Namibia process was co-ordinated by the Directorate of Environmental Affairs (DEA) within the Ministry of Environment and Tourism, led by a co-ordinator and supervised by a multi-disciplinary National Steering Committee. Administrative and technical support, including report-writing, was provided by a consulting company and two academic institutes were commissioned to conduct the capacity assessments. The final RAP is to be reviewed by a meeting of Permanent Secretaries.

- The NCSA from Seychelles was implemented by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources through its Division of Policy Planning and Services and its International Conventions Unit Project Officer. Oversight was by the 40 member steering committee for the country's Environmental Management Plan, and an NCSA Review Committee, which included the Rio Convention Focal Points and the Permanent Secretary from the Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources. Work was undertaken by three thematic expert teams drawn from key government agencies and NGOs.

- The NCSA project from The Gambia was managed by the National Environment Agency with technical guidance from its Agriculture and Natural Resources Working Group. High-level progress review, procedural oversight and policy guidance were provided by a coordination committee comprising representatives from the Departments of Finance, Natural Resources and the Environment, Office of the President, Personnel Management and the MEA focal point secretariats. Three Thematic Assessment Teams were established for the NCSA, headed by the relevant convention Focal Point and with members drawn from the existing focal area Task Forces. Interestingly, for CC only government officials were involved, whereas BD and LD teams included government, NGOs and institutes. Local District coordinating committees and workshops drew participants from all strata of civil society, including traditional rulers, women groups, youth groups, NGOs and local government agencies. The use of existing bodies and mechanisms, including a well-established participatory planning process, helped ensure continuity, efficacy, and strong connections between the NCSA, the range of Enabling Activities and their action plans, and the country's overall Environment Action Plan.

Examples of Stakeholder Engagement and Consultation

- Deliberate efforts were made for local stakeholder participation in the NCSA process from Namibia, with strong recognition that decentralisation is the focus of all recent natural resource management policy and legislation. A helpful stakeholder analysis was used to engage a wide range of stakeholders, who were selected for their authority and role on specific issues. A thorough consultation process was organised at both local/ regional and national levels, each with a range of selected stakeholders. The process was professionally facilitated and, for local consultations, used a questionnaire and checklist to interview development practitioners, natural resource users, local government officers and traditional leaders in three selected regions, followed by a verification workshop in each region.

- Extensive consultation was carried out with 10 ministries, 15 statutory bodies, 5 private sector organizations, research institutions, academics and NGO stakeholders throughout Mauritius. Workshops and individual interviews were used. The participatory process is recorded in the final report.

- In Georgia good levels of public participation achieved, despite lack of history in this area. Process centered on series of national workshops, plus 3 quite large multi-stakeholder thematic advisory groups - biodiversity group 24 members, climate change 23, land degradation 27 – composed of senior members of ministries, academics and national and international NGOs.

- Throughout the NCSA from Egypt process, the team made sure that appropriate and important stakeholders were invited to participate, including the National Focal Points for the conventions and other experts. Senior academics were used as authors of the stocktaking reports, with the result that they are well written, clear, and relatively concise. Another essential stakeholder was the GEF Steering Committee who was invited to become the Technical Advisory Group (TAG) for the NCSA project. The combined efforts of the NCSA team and their TAG were instrumental in ensuring the high quality of the NCSA process and its outputs, with the NCSA team later also becoming invaluable to the GEF Secretariat by playing a pivotal role in many national GEF activities.

Examples of Information Management & Public Awareness

- A bi-lingual project website for the Georgia NCSA project ensures the project is accessible to all stakeholders with internet access. It implemented a targeted public awareness campaign, which included producing a book on global environmental protection, a short documentary film on the country's natural resources, publicity at national environment events and a competition among local NGOs.

- The NCSA from Seychelles included a communications strategy that was actively implemented over the life of the project (web-site development; public media events; national press releases; printed brochures summarizing findings).

- The NCSA team from Egypt obtained and disseminated information through a variety of mechanisms including: Networking/ media events; briefings to stakeholders; a schools outreach programme; working groups for experts; and steering committee meetings every 3-4 months.

- Good, informative resource materials were produced through the NCSA project from The Philippines, including an explanation is included of how climate change, biodiversity and land degradation interact to affect poverty, and a paper on background detail.

- The final reports from Mauritius include a useful discussion of scientific and technical linkages between biodiversity protection, mitigation of climate change, preventing land degradation and sustainable management of forests.

Examples of Analysis of Priority Environmental Issues

- The NCSA process from Kazakhstan has been exemplary in terms of the 'stocktake' on environmental conditions and the review of conventions, with a great diversity of national documents, strategies, and projects taken into consideration. Each of the thematic reviews is highly detailed and informative, beginning with a clear explanation and analysis of the thematic environmental context, producing a chapter titled 'national profile' for each thematic area and containing explanations of what is of national and global environmental significance. The reviews are lengthy; fortunately 25-28 page Executive Summaries have been produced, with 'key conclusions' at the end of each section. The Thematic Reviews for CC and CD have broadly similar chapter headings and content, demonstrating good co-ordination between the groups and making cross-comparison easy. The Thematic Review for BD differs, including additional valuable material, for example, a useful section on financing.

- The NCSA from Mauritius is strongly linked to the country's environmental priorities. Data on key national environmental indicators are presented at the outset. For biodiversity and land degradation, the thematic reviews present a clear picture of prevailing substantive issues; whereas the section on CC identifies capacity needs rather than substantive issues. The final NCSA report provides an excellent summary of these BD and LD issues and CC capacity needs, and presents a very useful NCSA Priorities Matrix specifying high priorities, potential outcomes and performance indicators.

- The NCSA project from Nicaragua was extended at the Ministry's instigation, to cover all 6 of the MEAs ratified by the country and strengthen synergies between them. The analysis for cross-linkages among MEAs was performed with a very thorough methodological approach.

- In the Final Report from Vietnam, capacity needs are discussed in detail by conventions before being synthesized into a list of needs of relevance to all focal areas. Part of the discussion of capacity needs by convention is a description of capacity already in place,

which is very helpful in gauging the relevance and urgency of the respective capacity needs.

- The Action Plan from Zimbabwe presents very clear, good, extensive details on the capacity constraints within each thematic area, with explanations on why there is a lack of capacity and what the precise needs are. The text is based on the excellent stocktaking process, the workshops undertaken and the assessment-based questionnaires, the results of which have been presented graphically. The NCSA team is to be commended for focusing on completing the NCSA process in line with guidance given, when it would have been tempting to focus only on the huge cross-cutting capacity constraints arising from the political-economic situation.

Mainstreaming and Linkages to other National Environmental Policies

- The NCSA from Slovakia initiated and facilitated the development of a National Action Plan to combat desertification. The NAP suggested under the UNCCD had not been prepared and so could not be used as the basis for the NCSA thematic assessment on land degradation. Instead, the thematic assessment was extended to provide the solid basis for a NAP, and the thematic working group continued to develop the document beyond the NCSA.

- The NCSA process and Action Plan from Seychelles were integrated with the development and implementation of the country's overarching policy instrument, the Environmental Management Plan (for 2000-2010), with the same vision, guiding principles and timeframe for implementation, monitoring and review. This exemplified the principles proposed for the NCSA by the GEF, of multi-stakeholder participation and use of existing structures and mechanisms.

- The NCSA from Liberia includes a detailed review of the existing policy environment and proposes that the NCSA outputs should be linked to the basic policy and legal framework for environmental management that is in place. It is proposed that the NCSA Action Plan should be integrated with the National Environment Action Plan / NRDP.

- The Strategy from Antigua & Barbuda is closely linked with the country's National Environmental Management Strategy & Action Plan (NEMS). It is intended to outline the capacity needs for the effective implementation of the NEMS.

- There was no separate "NCSA Capacity Action Plan" from Bahamas: the NCSA process led to a (draft) National Environmental Management & Action Plan and Policy (NEMAP), which proposes broad/ high level policy, legislation and organizational reform.

- In developing Swaziland's NCSA, comprehensive review was made of all existing policies, plans and programmes related to sustainable development and the work of 12

national Ministries. The intention was to use the NCSA process to link poverty alleviation, food security, climate change, land productivity, and environmental degradation. Two key documents provided the main framework: the National Development Strategy outlines the policy framework for issues of poverty alleviation, food security and the need for environmental sustainability; and the Environment Action Plan outlines environmental issues and actions relating to the country's sustainable development.

- As well as taking into account nationally agreed documents, the NCSA from Egypt has integrated itself with the national institutional framework for sustainable development, and was specifically charged by the MSEA to help build the capacity of the newly established National Sustainable Development Committee during the NCSA.

- The Action Plan from Eritrea is well structured and, with its detailed project proposals, readily usable once the necessary implementation structure and budget have been put in place. The plan breaks its analysis of capacity needs down by (administrative) regions, which provides a detailed picture of the situation in the country.

- The cross-cutting analysis and recommendations are integrated with the National Long-Term Development Strategy and the National Sustainable Development Strategy from Lithuania, as well as with other strategies relevant to the subject area of the capacity actions proposed (e.g. Public Environmental Education Strategy). Stakeholders were presented with the National Report on the Implementation of the National Strategy for Sustainable Development alongside the Cross-Cutting Report in order to clearly demonstrate the linkages. The integration within the ongoing national processes is the key strength of this NCSA document.

ANNEX 4: NCSA SELF-EVALUATION - CRITERIA & INDICATORS

Self Evaluation Questions	Possible Indicators
NCSA PROJECT PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT	
1. Was an NCSA project plan prepared, with clear goals and objectives, expected results and performance indicators?	NCSA project logical framework
2. Did the project produce periodic progress reports, to the Steering Committee and/ or IA office?	Regular series of reports produced
3. Were any major changes made to the project design, timeline or budget during its life? If so, what were the main reasons for the adjustments?	Revised logical framework
4. What has been the total expenditure on the NCSA project? Were there sufficient funds for each part of the work?	Financial report
NCSA INCEPTION	
5. Were all significant stakeholders identified?	Stakeholder analysis report
6. Was the project able to get all significant stakeholders to engage effectively and appropriately in the NCSA process?	All significant stakeholders were included in Steering Committee and/or working groups
7. Did the most appropriate national institution have responsibility for the NCSA process and provide good leadership?	Government directive issued to appropriate national institution.
8. Did the NCSA attract sufficient interest and support from key political and administration leaders?	Summary progress reports were given to key leaders
9. Has the NCSA project itself been used to start to address capacity needs - of NCSA managers, key stakeholders, committee members, or the responsible national agency?	Capacity was built during the life of the project

NCSA STOCKTAKING	
10. Did the Stocktaking identify past and current Enabling Activities and other programmes and projects relevant to natural resources, environmental management, conservation, sustainable development or capacity building in the country?	˷ Categorised list of other EAs and related activities.
NCSA THEMATIC AND CROSS-CUTTING ASSESSMENTS	
11. Did the NCSA identify and re-validate the country's priority environmental issues and objectives?	˷ List of country priority environmental issues and objectives relevant to each thematic/ focal area.
12. Did the NCSA identify the country's priority environmental issues or objectives that cut across more than one focal area or MEA theme?	˷ List of country priority environmental issues or objectives that cut across themes/ focal areas.
13. Did the NCSA identify critical areas of capacity needed to address the priority thematic and cross-cutting environmental issues?	˷ List of critical capacity needs for priority cross-cutting environmental objectives.
NCSA CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT ACTION PLANNING	
14. Has a plan been prepared for a programme of capacity building actions, to support the priority environmental objectives identified (cross-cutting and thematic)?	˷ Strategic action plan of capacity building actions to address priority environmental objectives.
15. Have detailed plans for implementation of some of the capacity building actions been prepared?	˷ Detailed plans prepared for some CD actions.
NCSA FOLLOW-UP	
16. Does an appropriate institution have the mandate and capacity to manage the implementation and up-dating of the Capacity Development Action Plan?	˷ Government directive to manage implementation, monitoring and review of the CD Action Plan issued to appropriate national institution.
17. Have key stakeholders endorsed the CD Action Plan, signed on as partners and committed resources to its implementation?	˷ Key country stakeholders signed-on to a formal coordination mechanism for capacity development. ˷ Partnership agreements signed between key stakeholder groups.
18. Have NCSA project funds been used to start implementation of the Action Plan?	˷ Specific capacity built to manage the follow-up CD programme.
19. Has the CD Action Plan been integrated with	˷ References to the CD Plan in national

relevant national development plans?	development plans and programs.
Other evaluation comments LESSONS learned Examples of good practices observed	