



Monitoring Capacity Development in GEF operations

A Framework to Monitor Capacity Development Initiatives



Capacity Development Initiative
Global Support Programme
National Capacity Self-Assessment

<http://nrsa.undp.org>

Contents

Introduction..... 3

Background 3

Capacity Development in the Global Environment Facility 5

What is Capacity? 6

Attributes of Capacity Development..... 9

A Framework to Measure Capacity Development Contributions 10

A Set of Capacity Development Indicators..... 12

Incorporating the capacity development Framework within GEF Operations..... 17

Capacity Development Monitoring Scorecard Table 18

Guidance Notes for Using the capacity development Monitoring Scorecard Table..... 23

References 25

Introduction

Capacity Development is a major concern and priority of the international community and it is now an officially declared key objective of international development. In recent years, the concept of capacity development also moved from a focus on building the capacity of individuals to support the capacity development of their respective organizations and the society within which these organizations are operating.

In line with the Global Environment Facility's (GEF) *Strategic Approach to Enhance Capacity Building* (2003) and their *Results-Based Management (RBM) Framework* (2007), this document proposes an approach to monitoring and evaluation in such a way that supports the integration of capacity development into programme and project design, as well as provides a framework for the use of capacity development indicators to establish baselines and monitor progress made. These indicators are intended to be flexible enough so that they can be tailored to specific programmes and projects.

The approach presented in this document contributes to the objective of the GEF RBM “*to design mechanisms to ensure the measurement of progress*” toward the specific goals of the GEF. In of itself, this framework provides also a tool to assess the existing capacities as well as to identify the capacity gaps within a programme or project.

As per the Paris Declaration, the partner countries will benefit from using this tool to strengthen their respective environmental monitoring system and improve the coordination of aid at the national level. Bearing in mind the need to operationalize capacity development indicators to help measure programme and project performance, this tool also captures the inherent process character of capacity development, being a ‘moving target’ influenced by many contextual factors.

This framework is based on a review of the most recent work on capacity and capacity development, from the GEF, its Implementing Agencies and from external research, mainly from work undertaken by Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development's Development Assistance Committee (OECD/DAC), United Nations Development Group (UNDG), United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), and the World Bank Institute.

Research and work on the development and testing of indicators to measure and assess capacities is ongoing. Empirical data from GEF-funded projects will help the further development and improvement of the indicators described below. For this reason, this study should be viewed as an incremental step to a more robust and resilient set of capacity development indicators.

Background

Following the Declaration adopted at the High-Level Forum on Harmonization in Rome (February 2003) and the core principles put forward at the Marrakech Roundtable on Managing for Development Results (February 2004), the OECD Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness (March 2005) committed to strengthen national capacities and national development strategies.

The Paris Declaration includes few partnership commitments, which are based on lessons of experience. They include:

- a) **Ownership:** Partner countries exercise effective leadership over their development policies, and strategies and co-ordinate development actions;
- b) **Alignment:** Donors base their overall support on partner countries' national development strategies, organizations and procedures;

- c) **Harmonization:** Donors' actions are more harmonized, transparent and collectively effective;
- d) **Managing For Results:** Managing resources and improving decision-making for results
- e) **Mutual Accountability:** Donors and partners are accountable for development results

As part of their commitment to align their support with other partners, the Paris Declaration recognizes that “*the capacity to plan, manage, implement, and account for results of policies and programmes, is critical for achieving development objectives — from analysis and dialogue through implementation, monitoring and evaluation*”. Furthermore, “*capacity development is the responsibility of partner countries with donors playing a support role. It needs not only to be based on sound technical analysis, but also to be responsive to the broader social, political and economic environment, including the need to strengthen human resources*”. (OECD 2005)

Within this context, the partner countries committed to integrate specific capacity strengthening objectives in national development strategies and pursue their implementation through country-led capacity development strategies where needed. The donors committed to align their analytic and financial support with partners' capacity development objectives and strategies, as well as to make effective use of existing capacities and harmonize support for capacity development accordingly.

A series of 12 progress indicators are included in the Paris Declaration that are to be measured nationally and monitored internationally. This list includes two specific indicators related to capacity development:

- a) **#4 Strengthen capacity by coordinated support:** Percent of donor-supported capacity development provided through coordinated programmes consistent with partners' national development strategies;
- b) **#6 Strengthen capacities by avoiding parallel implementation structures:** Number of parallel project implementation units (PIUs) per country¹.

Following the Paris Declaration, Member States have called for the United Nations (UN) system to enhance its efforts particularly at country level to support national capacity development; they view capacity development as a comparative advantage of the UN development system. A UNDG position paper, *Enhancing the UN's Contribution to National Capacity Development* (October 2006), laid out a new framework for the UN's work at the country level to enhance its contribution to national capacity development. The paper emphasizes that UN country teams “*will have to make capacity development the core of their work*” and to “*articulate capacity development and its underlying principles as the central thrust of the UN's role in the country, captured in the Common Country Assessment (CCA) and the UN Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF)*”.

The UNDG position paper suggests four key entry points to guide and position the UN country teams' work and to make it more effective in terms of country level capacity development:

- a) Articulate capacity development and its underlying principles as the central thrust of the UN's role in the country, captured in the CCA and the UNDAF;
- b) Situate the UN's work on capacity development within national policy and development plans;

¹ This indicator must be reconciled with the need for some minimum redundancy or overlap, necessary to build resiliency and ensure sustainability in complex dynamic social systems characterized by a relative high degree of uncertainty and unpredictability. Increasingly more countries are establishing Programme Coordination Units, under which multiple projects implementation units are managed, reducing overlap, creating economies of scale, as well as creating synergies and enhancing exchange of lessons learned and best practices.

- c) Assess the level of national and local capacity assets and respond to the identified capacity needs by drawing on, or feeding into, national or sector capacity assessments and capacity development strategies; and
- d) “Unpack” capacity development into tangible components.

In order to integrate a capacity development framework in UNDAFs and country programmes, the UNDG suggests that a series of five (5) steps is followed:

- a) Engage partners and build consensus
- b) Assess capacity assets and needs
- c) Formulate capacity development strategies
- d) Implement capacity development strategies
- e) Monitor and evaluate capacity development efforts

Capacity Development in the Global Environment Facility

Multilateral Environmental Agreements (MEAs) define capacity development as an integral part of their agenda. For example, Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (FCCC) decided to strengthen the monitoring of capacity development as part of FCCC implementation. Capacity development is also an integral element of the Convention Biological Diversity’s (CBD) Strategic Plan and 2010 target, particularly with regard to national implementation.

Guidance from the conventions to the GEF assigns growing importance to developing countries’ capacities. Guidance from the Conference of the Parties for the CBD and FCCC have requested the GEF to provide funding for country-driven capacity development activities by developing country parties, in particular, least developed countries and small island developing States. The FCCC has adopted a framework for capacity development in developing countries and requested the GEF and other organizations to support its implementation. The UN Convention to Combat Desertification and Drought (CCD), as well as the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants both highlighted the need to emphasize capacity development to assist countries to meet the objectives of their respective conventions.

During the late 1990s and early 2000s, the Capacity Development Initiative (CDI), a strategic partnership between the GEF Secretariat and UNDP, was a central part of the process to formulate and promote a conceptual framework for assessing and developing country capacities. The framework identified key capacity development dimensions at three levels – the *systemic*, *organizational*, and *individual* levels. The outcome of the CDI (2002) was to direct capacity development through the *GEF Strategic Approach to Enhance Capacity Building (2003)*. Under this strategic approach, the National Capacity Self-Assessment (NCSA) was made available to GEF programme countries to assess their own capacity needs and prepare an over-arching national capacity development action plan. Between 2002 and 2010 a total of 146 countries have taken advantage of the NCSA programme, with 120 having completed their NCSAs by January 2010.

As part of the CDI’s work in 2000, a review of the GEF portfolio concluded that 94% of all GEF-supported projects included at least one capacity development component, mainly aimed at strengthening capacities at the organization and system-wide levels. Subsequently, nearly all of the revised GEF focal area operational programmes explicitly state capacity development as part of their strategic objectives, programmatic strategies, or at least as a central element of the intended outcomes of the focal area activities.

The *Strategic Approach to Capacity Building* is built on the GEF's guiding principle and policy that the capacities necessary to provide global environmental objectives are closely related to and must be integrated with capacities to meet broader environmental goals at the national level. Capacity development is seen as essential to results and improving performance at the country level, and included as a key approach in the GEF business plan 2008-2010: "*New approaches and modalities will be developed to further operationalize the strategic approach to capacity building, support countries in implementing the Resource Allocation Framework², align on-going activities to ensure cost-effective management, and to demonstrate impact.*" These include supporting the development of client countries' cross-cutting capacities with the skills, knowledge and tools necessary to respond to emerging global environmental challenges.

In 2007, the GEF took a step closer towards a results-based-management approach (RBM)³, shifting from a culture of project review and approval to one focused on delivering project outcomes and impacts during implementation. The RBM framework incorporates monitoring and reporting at three levels: organizational; programmatic (focal area); and project level. The RBM framework includes a set of performance and outcome indicators for each focal area and their strategic programmes to help measure expected outcomes and long-term impacts.

While capacity development appears to be omnipresent and integrated into GEF's work through the focal areas, it remains at the same time an elusive concept with multiple definitions and interpretations. Another gap in the knowledge and tools for capacity development is the lack of concrete analytical frameworks that would allow for the monitoring as well as a quantification of the contribution that capacity development makes to achieve a specific development goal. A number of organizations are proceeding to elucidate and elaborate the concept and best practices to assess and develop capacities for the global environment and to achieve environmental sustainability.

One such exercise is UNDP's Energy and Environment Group (EEG) in the Bureau for Development Policy (BDP). Since 2009, UNDP/BDP/EEG has been undertaking a consultative and in-depth analysis of the capacity assessment and development process with a view to further elaborate a conceptual approach and practical guidance to the organization and its partners' practitioners. This *Practice Note on Capacity Development for Environmental Sustainability* is expected to be completed by mid-2010, and will provide practical tools that agents for environmental sustainability, be they UNDP staff, partner organizations, or practitioners in non-state organizations, can use at each stage of the capacity assessment and development process.

What is Capacity?

There is broad agreement that capacity in the context of development cooperation refers to "*the ability of people, organizations and society as a whole to manage their affairs successfully*" (OECD/DAC 2006). The OECD then defines capacity development as "*the process whereby people, organizations and society as a whole unleash, strengthen, create, adapt and maintain capacity over time.*" UNDP defines capacity in a rather similar way as "*the ability of individuals, institutions and societies to perform functions, solve problems and set and achieve objectives in a sustainable manner*" (UNDP, 2006a).

² The GEF established the Resource Allocation Framework in September 2005 to allocate resources based on a country's potential to generate global environmental benefits. This was replaced by the GEF's System for Transparent Allocation of Resources (STAR) in October 2009.

³ GEF (2007), *Results-Based Management Framework*, GEF Council June 12-15, 2007, Washington, D.C., GEF/C.31/11

In addition to defining what is capacity and capacity development, the CDI process conducted by UNDP and the GEF Secretariat identified key capacity development at three levels of intervention⁴:

- a) At the *individual* level, capacity development refers to the process of changing attitudes and behaviors, most frequently through imparting knowledge and developing skills through training. However it also involves learning by doing, participation, ownership, and processes associated with increasing performance through changes in management, motivation, morale, and improving accountability and responsibility.
- b) Capacity development at the *organizational* level focuses on overall performance and functioning capabilities, such as developing mandates, tools, guidelines and management information systems to facilitate and catalyze organizational change. At the organizational level, capacity development aims to develop a set of constituent individuals and groups, as well as to strengthen links with its environment.
- c) At the *systemic* level, capacity development is concerned with the “enabling environment”, i.e., the overall policy, economic, regulatory, and accountability frameworks within which organizations and individuals operate. Relationships and processes between organizations, both formal and informal, as well as their mandates, are important.

Common to these definitions is the clear attribution of capacity to a specific objective: Capacity is a means to achieve something, not an end in itself⁵. For the GEF, this objective must be in accordance to the GEF Instrument, where GEF funds are additional sources of funds to meet the incremental cost to provide global environmental benefits in its focal areas. Further bounding of this objective is guided by policy decisions from the Conference of the Parties of the global environmental conventions, and incorporated into GEF strategic programmes and objectives. Capacity in the GEF context is therefore those sets of capabilities needed to strengthen and sustain functional environmental management systems at the global level (recognizing that these systems must build upon national governance and management systems).

With a view to contribute to GEF goals, there are two modalities of capacity development interventions, with one complementing the other:

- a. Targeted capacity development interventions: These projects support the development of foundational capacities, including management structures that will allow for focal area programmes to gain a foothold and make a sustained contribution; and
- b. Regular focal area projects containing specific capacity development components: These projects take a more vertical integration approach to meeting focal area objectives, by building the set of foundational capacities up to the set of focal area activities.

Both approaches need to build on an agreed framework that outlines the main aims of capacity and capacity development, and establishes relevant operational indicators. Towards this end, the GEF in 2003⁶ identified an initial typology of 11 capacities as key building blocks to improve an environmental management governance framework:

- a. Awareness and knowledge;

⁴ Lusthaus, C., M.H. Adrien, and P. Morgan (2000), *Integrating Capacity Development into Project Design and Evaluation: Approach and Frameworks*, GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Working Paper No. 5, Washington, D.C., Global Environment Facility

⁵ Capacity development can be seen as both a means to an end as well as an end in of itself, depending on one’s perspective or approach. This is discussed in the European Centre for Development Policy Management’s *Study on Capacity, Change and Performance*, <http://www.ecdpm.org>.

⁶ GEF (2003), *Strategic Approach to Enhance Capacity Building*, GEF/C.22/8, GEF Council, November 19-21, 2003

- b. National policy, legal and regulatory frameworks;
- c. Organizational mandates, coordination, and processes for interaction and cooperation between all stakeholders;
- d. Information management, monitoring and observation;
- e. Mobilization of science in support of decision making;
- f. Financial resources and technology transfer;
- g. Incentive systems and market instruments;
- h. Negotiation skills;
- i. Cooperation and networking within regions;
- j. Organizational management and performance; and
- k. Individual skills and motivation in key organizations.

Reconciling the above typology with GEF's Capacity Development Approach that outlines the steps of the capacity development process⁷, interventions to achieve environmental sustainability should develop following types of measurable capacities:

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 to manage a global environmental issue.

2. 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 potential solutions.

3. 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.

4. Capacities for management and implementation:

- Capacities of individuals and organizations to enact environmental policies and/or regulatory decisions, and plan and execute relevant sustainable global environmental management actions and solutions.

5. Capacities to monitor and evaluate:

- Capacities in individuals and organizations to effectively monitor and evaluate project and/or programme achievements against expected results and to provide feedback for learning, adaptive management and suggesting adjustments to the course of action if necessary to conserve and preserve the global environment⁸.

⁷ UNDP (2009), *Supporting Capacity Development: The UNDP Approach*, Capacity Development Group, Bureau for Development Policy, UNDP, New York, January 2009.

⁸ Monitoring and Evaluation is necessary for capturing change and for quality control, and must influence management action. Monitoring provides descriptive information on where a project or programme is at a given time, relative to respective targets or outcomes. Evaluation addresses issues of causality and assesses why targets and outcomes were or were not achieved.

From the above, we see that capacity development activities are targeted to social actors, which are either individuals or organizations. The enabling environment, however, does not have its own particular type of social actor. Instead, the development of capacities at this level comes about by developing the environmental policy framework that builds on societal values and norms. Thus, by developing these five types of capacities in individuals and organizations, the systemic level of capacities is also being developed. This requires that certain important assumptions be made, e.g., that the strengthening of individuals and organizations *to plan and develop* effective environmental policy and legislation *will actually result* in effective environmental policy and legislation.

Attributes of Capacity Development

Another assumption that is being made is that the five strategic areas of capacity development support outlined above are directly correlated to an improved, more resilient and sustainable environmental framework. Converting these assumptions into critical success factors, capacity development for environmental sustainability must satisfy the following 11 criteria:

1. Capacity development requires ownership: To be equally valid to all relevant stakeholders, capacity development needs to be based on a joint vision. Important elements include the ability and mandate of participants to set goals and to formulate strategies; basic consensus on assumptions and the capacity development strategy; best entry points for interventions; and clarity on the sequence and timing of activities.
2. Capacity development requires collaborative agreements: Capacity development must address organizational and/or behavioral change. Changes to an existing structure or managerial arrangement can become important political issues, and therefore require collaborative agreements to clarify roles and responsibilities among the stakeholders involved, partner contributions, and the means to address such changes. These agreements may also help to “stay the course” in complex management environments.
3. Capacity development is a continuous process: Capacity development does not start at a certain point in time with the establishment of capacities needed for a particular task and stops when the task is accomplished. To sustain capacity development achievements, stakeholders need to create learning mechanisms that allow information to accumulate and knowledge to be shared.
4. Capacity development requires relevant and valid information for effective decision-making: Shared decision-making relies on a level of understanding of issues among stakeholders. Up-to-date, relevant, and accessible information is essential for informed decision-making.
5. Capacity development requires incentives and resources: Projects must have a set of built-in incentives and access to adequate levels of resources in order to catalyze capacity development actions.
6. Capacity development needs to be part of early project design: Capacity development should receive adequate attention from all stakeholders at the planning stage to ensure the development of a holistic vision and strategic direction that enjoys broad legitimacy.
7. Capacity development needs to build on existing structures and mechanisms: Capacity development initiatives should be based on countries’ national development policies, strategies, governance structures and mechanisms, as well as take into account societal values and norms.

Donor-supported programmes and projects should coincide with primary development processes and reinforce the existing policy framework and reform processes underway.

8. Capacity development needs a baseline: Capacity development targets a future state or desirable outcome. To monitor and measure changes, it is necessary to assess the state of capacities at the start of an intervention. An assessment of capacities during the project design phase is needed to facilitate a comparison of stages reached with a prior situation.
9. Capacity development needs benchmarks: Being a process, capacity development can be best measured in degrees and steps toward a desired outcome. This can be achieved by establishing benchmarks that provide a framework for the initial planning of capacity development processes and their monitoring.
10. Capacity development needs to be specific: To become measurable, capacity development interventions have to relate to a particular development outcome (capacity for what?). Specific recipients at individual, organizational or system-wide level (whose capacity?) should be targeted as much as possible, although capacity development interventions often reach across two or all three levels.
11. Capacity development needs to be attributable: Indicators can be established comparatively easily at a project activity level (X # of staff trained, Y % increase in training demand). It is also fairly easy to agree on high-level objectives or goals, e.g., increased biodiversity conservation or improved environmental sustainability, together with related indicators such as % increase in protected area surface or # of quotations of environmental sustainability in legislative frameworks. The key area for capacity development and capacity development measurement is the area in between, the mid-level outcomes. By clearly linking capacity development to intended project outcomes, it is possible to bridge, or at least narrow, the attribution gap between project activities and high-level development outcomes.

The above criteria to develop capacities for environmental sustainability point to a set of practices and approaches that are embodied within the innovative approach of adaptive collaborative management. Baseline indicators, benchmarks, and performance indicators are all a critical part of a monitoring and evaluation programme to catalyze the process of adaptive management. The methods used to assess capacities using measurable indicators should be institutionalized within monitoring and evaluation mechanisms and structures that are part of project implementation, and manage in such a way as to help set and re-calibrate project outputs in line with expected outcomes under changing circumstances. This approach legitimizes the adaptive management of project activities.

A Scorecard to Measure Capacity Development

Monitoring capacity development processes needs to be reconciled with output measures, taking into account that the GEF needs to monitor how programme and project outputs and outcomes contribute to delivering global environmental benefits. However, key project outputs (e.g., improved management information systems) that satisfy immediate project objectives are for the most part only available at the end of the project cycle, and measuring outcomes (e.g., reduced area of land degradation) requires longitudinal data. Therefore, process and performance indicators tend to be more commonly used as proxy to the measuring outputs and outcomes, and more attention needs to be paid to striking a better balance among the three types of indicators.

The following *scorecard* is a tool that attempts to meet this balance, serving to quantify a qualitative process of capacity change through the use of appropriate indicators and their corresponding ratings. The scorecards present descriptive sentences for each capacity development indicator with 4 numerical ratings (0 to 3). Although the framework presents a set of indicators, the tool is flexible enough to add indicators specific to each focal area. This flexibility is similar to the scorecards for assessing the effectiveness of protected areas management⁹ developed by IUCN, WWF, World Bank and others.

Using the Scorecard

The frequency to use this framework should be, at a minimum, at the beginning of a project, at its mid-point and at the end. If needed, this tool could also be used once a year to assess the progress of developing targeted capacities. This scorecard system allows for monitoring the capacity development process, and is equally applicable to use at both the programme and project levels of focal area strategies:

- While providing a standardized framework of capacity results, each cluster is flexible enough to accommodate specific programmes and projects operating at both national and regional levels;
- The staged capacity benchmarks under each of the five capacity results allow for the establishment of a capacity baseline. Through a rapid and participatory capacity assessment at the outset of project development, a reference point is to be determined;
- These benchmarks are compared against a baseline in order to assess progress made during a project's lifecycle;
- A rating system permits the quantification of change achieved and provides the information needed for reporting at the level of strategic programme;
- Aligned to the planning frame and outcomes of a project or focal area programme, the scorecard is designed to become an integral part of the delivery and monitoring mechanism itself, while responding to the GEF monitoring and evaluation policy's requirements; and
- Applied as an integral part of project design, the scorecard will support reporting on capacity development activities, also in quantifiable terms, to stakeholders such as the parties of the international conventions and the GEF Council Members.

Incorporating this capacity development framework into project design, implementation, and monitoring will provide a comprehensive monitoring framework aimed at assessing the range of needed capacities to achieving environmental outcomes and ensuring their sustainability, i.e., environmental sustainability. Achieving these outcomes should in turn lead to strengthened capacities to better manage the targeted global environmental issues at the most appropriate level of intervention. That is, environmental sustainability is characterized by a complex set of feedback loops operating in a dynamic social system.

⁹ See, for example, Leverington, F, M. Hockings, H. Pavese, K. Lemos Costa, and J. Courrau (2008), Management effectiveness evaluation in protected areas: A global study. Supplementary Report No. 1, Overview of approaches and methodologies, University of Queensland, Gatton, TNC, WWF, IUCN-WCPA, Australia.

Capacity Development Indicators

Considering the five (5) capacity results presented above, a set of indicators was identified to measure the contribution of capacity development activities toward the achievements of expected environmental outputs and outcomes. Using a scorecard approach these indicators are to be measured at the beginning of the projects to establish a baseline, then at the mid-point and and conclusion of each project. The institutional sustainability of the project calls for the scorecard to be mainstreamed with existing structures and mechanisms, and use as part of *post facto* project evaluations.

Capacity Result 1: Capacities for engagement

Relevant individuals and organizations (resource users, owners, consumers, community and political leaders, private and public sector managers and experts) engage proactively and constructively with one another in managing a global environmental issue.

Indicator 1.1 – Degree of legitimacy/mandate of lead environmental organizations: this indicator measures if the lead organizations are identified, if their respective responsibilities are clearly defined and if the authority of these organizations is recognized.

Scorecard Rating:

- 0 Organizational responsibilities for environmental management are not clearly defined
- 1 Organizational responsibilities for environmental management are identified
- 2 Authority and legitimacy of all lead organizations responsible for environmental management are partially recognized by stakeholders
- 3 Authority and legitimacy of all lead organizations responsible for environmental management recognized by stakeholders

Indicator 1.2 – Existence of operational co-management mechanisms: this indicator measures the existence of public and private co-management mechanisms and if these mechanisms are functional.

Scorecard Rating:

- 0 No co-management mechanisms are in place
- 1 Some co-management mechanisms are in place and operational
- 2 Some co-management mechanisms are formally established through agreements, MOUs, etc.
- 3 Comprehensive co-management mechanisms are formally established and are operational/functional

Indicator 1.3 – Existence of cooperation among stakeholder groups: this indicator measures the involvement of stakeholders, their identification, the establishment of stakeholder consultation processes and the active contribution of these stakeholders to decision-making.

Scorecard Rating:

- 0 Identification of stakeholders and their participation/involvement in management decision-making is poor
- 1 Stakeholders are identified but their participation in management decision-making is limited
- 2 Stakeholders are identified and regular consultations mechanisms are established
- 3 Stakeholders are identified and they actively contribute to established participative management decision-making processes

Capacity Result 2: Capacities to generate, access and use information and knowledge

Individuals and organizations have the skills and knowledge to research, acquire, communicate, educate and make use of pertinent information to be able to diagnose and understand global environmental problems and potential solutions.

Indicator 2.1 – Degree of environmental awareness of stakeholders: this indicator measures the level of awareness of stakeholders about global environmental issues and the solutions being implemented and their possibility to participate in the implementation of these solutions.

Scorecard Rating:

- 0 Stakeholders are not aware about global environmental issues and their related possible solutions (MEAs)
- 1 Stakeholders are aware about global environmental issues but not about the possible solutions (MEAs)
- 2 Stakeholders are aware about global environmental issues and the possible solutions but do not know how to participate
- 3 Stakeholders are aware about global environmental issues and are actively participating in the implementation of related solutions

Indicator 2.2 – Access and sharing of environmental information by stakeholders: this indicator measures the information needs, if they are identified, the adequacy of the information management infrastructure in place and the sharing of this information.

Scorecard Rating:

- 0 The environmental information needs are not identified and the information management infrastructure is inadequate
- 1 The environmental information needs are identified but the information management infrastructure is inadequate
- 2 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
- 3 Comprehensive environmental information is available and shared through an adequate information management infrastructure

Indicator 2.3 – Extent of inclusion/use of traditional knowledge in environmental decision-making: this indicator measures if the traditional knowledge is being explored, if the sources of traditional knowledge are identified, captured and shared among stakeholders for effective participative decision-making processes.

Scorecard Rating:

- 0 Traditional knowledge is ignored and not taken into account into relevant participative decision-making processes
- 1 Traditional knowledge is identified and recognized as important but is not collected and used in relevant participative decision-making processes
- 2 Traditional knowledge is collected but is not used systematically into relevant participative decision-making processes
- 3 Traditional knowledge is collected, used and shared for effective participative decision-making processes

Indicator 2.4 – Existence of environmental education programmes: this indicator measures both the formal and informal environmental education programmes in place to address global environmental issues.

Scorecard Rating:

- 0 No environmental education programmes are in place
- 1 Environmental education programmes are partially developed and partially delivered
- 2 Environmental education programmes are fully developed but partially delivered
- 3 Comprehensive environmental education programmes exist and are being delivered

Indicator 2.5 – Extent of the linkage between environmental research/science and policy development: this indicator measures the linkage between environmental policy and research; including the identification of research needs and research strategies and programmes; and the relevance of the research available to policy development.

Scorecard Rating:

- 0 No linkage exist between environmental policy development and science/research strategies and programmes
- 1 Research needs for environmental policy development are identified but are not translated into relevant research strategies and programmes
- 2 Relevant research strategies and programmes for environmental policy development exist but the research information is not responding fully to the policy research needs
- 3 Relevant research results are available for environmental policy development

Capacity Result 3: Capacities for strategy, policy and legislation development

Individuals and organizations have the ability to plan and develop effective environmental policy and legislation, related strategies and plans – based on informed decision-making processes for global environmental management.

Indicator 3.1 – Extent of the environmental planning and strategy development process: this indicator measures the quality of the planning and strategy development process; if the planning and strategy development process produces adequate plans and strategies related to environmental management; and if the resources and coordination mechanisms are in place for the implementation of these plans, programmes and projects.

Scorecard Rating:

- 0 The environmental planning and strategy development process is not coordinated and does not produce adequate environmental plans and strategies
- 1 The environmental planning and strategy development process does produce adequate environmental plans and strategies but there are not implemented /used
- 2 Adequate environmental plans and strategies are produced but there are only partially implemented because of funding constraints and/or other problems
- 3 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

Indicator 3.2 – Existence of an adequate environmental policy and regulatory frameworks: this indicator measures the completeness of the policy and regulatory frameworks, the existence and the adoption of relevant policies and laws and if the mechanisms for enacting, complying and enforcing these policies and laws are established.

Scorecard Rating:

- 0 The environmental policy and regulatory frameworks are insufficient; they do not provide an enabling environment
- 1 Some relevant environmental policies and laws exist but few are implemented and enforced
- 2 Adequate environmental policy and legislation frameworks exist but there are problems in implementing and enforcing them
- 3 Adequate policy and legislation frameworks are implemented and provide an adequate enabling environment; a compliance and enforcement mechanism is established and functions

Indicator 3.3 – Adequacy of the environmental information available for decision-making: this indicator measures the adequacy of the information available for decision-making; if the information is made available to decision-makers and if this information is updated and used by decision-makers.

Scorecard Rating:

- 0 The availability of environmental information for decision-making is lacking
- 1 Some environmental information exists but it is not sufficient to support environmental decision-making processes
- 2 Relevant environmental information is made available to environmental decision-makers but the process to update this information is not functioning properly
- 3 Political and administrative decision-makers obtain and use updated environmental information to make environmental decisions

Capacity Result 4: Capacities for management and implementation

Individuals and organizations have the plan-do-check-act skills and knowledge to enact environmental policies and/or regulation decisions, and to plan and execute relevant sustainable global environmental management actions/solutions.

Indicator 4.1 – Existence and mobilization of resources by the relevant organizations: this indicator measures the availability of resources within the relevant organizations, if the potential sources for resource funding are identified and if adequate resources are mobilized.

Scorecard Rating:

- 0 The environmental organizations don't have adequate resources for their programmes and projects and the requirements have not been assessed
- 1 The resource requirements are known but are not being addressed
- 2 The funding sources for these resource requirements are partially identified and the resource requirements are partially addressed
- 3 Adequate resources are mobilized and available for the functioning of the lead environmental organizations

Indicator 4.2 – Availability of required technical skills and technology transfer: this indicator measures the availability of skills and knowledge, if the technical needs and sources are identified and accessed by the programme or project and if there is a basis for an ongoing national-based upgrading of the skills and knowledge.

Scorecard Rating:

- 0 The necessary required skills and technology are not available and the needs are not identified
- 1 The required skills and technologies needs are identified as well as their sources
- 2 The required skills and technologies are obtained but their access depend on foreign sources
- 3 The required skills and technologies are available and there is a national-based mechanism for updating the required skills and for upgrading the technologies

Capacity Result 5: Capacities to monitor and evaluate

Individuals and organizations have the capacity to effectively monitor and evaluate project and/or programme achievements against expected results and to provide feedback for learning, adaptive management and suggesting adjustments to the course of action if necessary to conserve and preserve the global environment.

Indicator 5.1 – Adequacy of the project/programme monitoring process: this indicator measures the existence of a monitoring framework, if the monitoring involves stakeholders and if the monitoring results inform the implementation process.

Scorecard Rating:

- 0 Irregular project monitoring is being done without an adequate monitoring framework detailing what and how to monitor the particular project or programme
- 1 An adequate resourced monitoring framework is in place but project monitoring is irregularly conducted
- 2 Regular participative monitoring of results is being conducted but this information is only partially used by the project/programme implementation team
- 3 Monitoring information is produced timely and accurately and is used by the implementation team to learn and possibly to change the course of action

Indicator 5.2 – Adequacy of the project/programme evaluation process: this indicator measures the existence of an evaluation framework, if the adequate resources and access to information is available and if the evaluation results inform the planning process.

Scorecard Rating:

- 0 None or ineffective evaluations are being conducted without an adequate evaluation plan; including the necessary resources
- 1 An adequate evaluation plan is in place but evaluation activities are irregularly conducted
- 2 Evaluations are being conducted as per an adequate evaluation plan but the evaluation results are only partially used by the project/programme implementation team and other staff designing the next generation of projects
- 3 Effective evaluations are conducted timely and accurately and are used by the implementation team to correct the course of action if needed and to learn lessons for further project planning activities.

Incorporating the capacity development Framework within GEF Operations

The scorecard approach was designed to help implementation agency staff responsible for monitoring the progress and achievements of GEF capacity development interventions. This tool can also be applied at the level of GEF strategic programmes.

This scorecard system is complementary to other tools designed to monitor progress such as the METT (Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool) now used on all GEF funded protected areas projects. At the beginning of each project, an initial review should be undertaken to avoid possible duplication of some indicators across the monitoring tools (log-frame, METT, capacity development scorecard, etc.). However, this should not be confused with the need to have some redundancy among the set of indicators. In the latter case, a number of indicators would measure different activities and processes, and yet be indicative of the performance to deliver the same output. This redundancy strengthens the accuracy of the overall measurement of performance to develop needed capacities.

As mentioned above, this framework is based on the GEF's Results-Based Management Framework. The scorecard and its indicators are to be part of project log-frames, and more specifically part of the overall M&E plan for projects and programmes. An additional benefit of this tool is to provide a standardized monitoring framework for measuring the progress and the contributions to project achievements of capacity development initiatives.

In order to be integrated within GEF programme and project cycles, the capacity development monitoring framework should be:

1. Part of all GEF project designs (incorporated into the MSP and FSP templates); including the PPG phase;
2. Linked with the overall set of expected results identified at the design stage (log-frame);
3. Incorporated into the M&E plan at the design stage;
4. Integrated into the PIR (Project implementation review), the GEF annual project progress report process;
5. Part of the RBM framework being further elaborated this year for the GEF Council June 2008 meeting;
6. Integrated into the GEF monitoring and evaluation policy (2006) as a full part of the monitoring and evaluation process and part of the minimum requirements of this policy; and
7. Part of the evaluation methodologies used to evaluate GEF projects and programmes; including outcomes evaluations.

Capacity Development Scorecard

At the project level

Project/Programme Name:

Project/Programme Cycle Phase:

Date:

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	Organizational responsibilities for environmental management are not clearly defined	0				
	Organizational 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 decision-making processes	3				
.... 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				

Capacity Result / Indicator	Staged Indicators	Rating	Score	Comments	Next Steps	Contribution to which Outcome
	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 information management infrastructure	3				
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	Traditional knowledge is ignored and not taken into account into relevant participative decision-making	0				

Capacity Result / Indicator	Staged Indicators	Rating	Score	Comments	Next Steps	Contribution to which Outcome
knowledge in environmental decision-making	processes					
	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				
	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 them	2				
	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	1				

Capacity Result / Indicator	Staged Indicators	Rating	Score	Comments	Next Steps	Contribution to which Outcome
	processes					
	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 available for the functioning of the lead environmental organizations	3				
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	3				

Capacity Result / Indicator	Staged Indicators	Rating	Score	Comments	Next Steps	Contribution to which Outcome
	accurately and is used by the implementation team to learn and possibly to change the course of action					
Indicator 15 – Adequacy of the project/programme evaluation process	None or ineffective evaluations are being conducted without an adequate evaluation plan; including the necessary resources	0				
	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)						

Using the Capacity Development Scorecard

The scorecard is to be applied at the level of individual projects to assess that particular project's impact to developing a country's foundational capacities. However, the results of the scorecard need to be carefully used, as the contributions are being assessed against the project's baseline, which does not represent the overall sustainable development in a particular country. Furthermore, different projects will have the same baseline, and therefore aggregating the scorecard results may misrepresent the contributions to focal area objectives at the programme level.

The following steps are intended to serve as a guide to facilitate the use of the scorecard:

1. The overall M&E approach should be discussed with key stakeholders to agree on the final set of indicators to be used;
2. While the scorecard is designed to be as generic as possible, covering the key elements of capacity component in a management cycle, it should be adapted to best match your project circumstances;
3. Fill out the project/programme name, the project/programme cycle phase (start-up, mid-term, end, other critical stages) and the date of the assessment;
4. In the first column and the column "Staged Indicators", adjust the scorecard where needed to reflect project outcomes and circumstances; including editing the staged indicators and adding new indicators.
5. Assess capacity for each indicator – using the staged indicator sentences on a scale from 0-3 - and provide the results in column "Score".
6. Add comments in the corresponding column and the next steps to address a particular capacity area.
7. In column "Contribution to which Outcomes", list all Outcomes on which changes in a particular indicator will have an effect on the Outcome. This allows attribution of capacity changes to particular project outcomes.

When using the scorecard table in a spreadsheet (such as excel):

The five capacity result rows can automatically return average values per cluster. These should be interpreted with care. It is not recommended to further aggregate the capacity development data as this would contradict the complexity of capacity and capacity development processes.

Columns can be added after the 'Score' column to capture other assessments such as Start-up Score, Mid-term Score, End Score, among others. This allows the table to indicate the expected progression to develop these capacities and the eventual capacity gaps where attention would be needed.

At the programme level (Focal Area)

At the programme level, the scorecards for individual projects would be used to assess their contributions to meeting objectives of GEF Strategic Programmes. Data collected on the average changes of capacity results per project allow for various comparisons and assessments, for instance:

- Progress on capacity development at mid-term evaluations;
- Comparison of changes achieved between start-up phase and mid-term and final evaluations;
- Comparison of progress between different capacity results;
- The contribution of specific capacity results, e.g., information, knowledge and communication activities to achieve a focal area strategic programme;
- Further disaggregated data by particular capacity results;
- Other applications, such as comparisons within or between focal area strategic programmes;
- Provide a structured capacity assessment at project start-up and standard baseline information on existing capacities.

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

() The ratings used in the table above are fictional; there are only used to illustrate how this capacity development monitoring framework can be scaled up to the programme level.*

References

- European Center for Development Policy Management (2006), *Study on Capacity, Change and Performance* (www.ecdpm.org).
- Engel, Paul, Land, T., Keijzer, N., 2006: *A balanced approach to monitoring and evaluating capacity and performance*. ECDPM.
- Furtado, Jose I. dos R., 2003: *Capacity Development Indicators for GEF Projects: Practical Guidance on their Design and Use by Key Actors*. UNDP-GEF.
- GEF, 2003: *Strategic Approach to Enhance Capacity Building*. GEF.
- GEF Evaluation Office, 2006: *Evaluation of GEF Capacity Development Activities*. Approach Paper. GEF EO.
- GEF, 2007a: *Focal Area Strategies and Strategic Programming for GEF-4*. GEF Council Document.
- GEF, 2007b: *Results-based Management Framework*. GEF Council Document.
- GEF, 2007c: *GEF Business Plan FY08-10 and FY08 Corporate Budget*. GEF Council Document.
- GEF, 2006: *The GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy*. Evaluation Document No. 1. GEF Evaluation Office.
- Hunnam, Peter, Piest, U., 2007: *National Capacity Self-Assessment, 2006 Reports: Global Progress, Synthesis, Emerging Lessons*. UNDP/UNEP/GEF.
- Leverington, F, M. Hockings, H. Pavese, K. Lemos Costa, and J. Courrau (2008), Management effectiveness evaluation in protected areas: A global study. Supplementary Report No. 1, Overview of approaches and methodologies, University of Queensland, Gatton, TNC, WWF, IUCN-WCPA, Australia.
- Lusthaus, Charles, Adrien, M-H., Morgan, P., 2000: *Integrating Capacity Development into project Design and Evaluation*. Approach and Frameworks. GEF.
- Mizrahi, Yemile, 2004: *Capacity Enhancement Indicators*. Review of the Literature. WBI.
- Morgan, Peter, 1997: *The Design and Use of Capacity Development Indicators*. CIDA.
- OECD, 2005: *Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness*. OECD.
- OECD/DAC, 2006: *The Challenge of Capacity Development*. Working towards Good Practice. OECD.
- UNDG, 2006a: *Enhancing the UN's Contribution to National Capacity Development*. A UNDG Position Statement. UN.
- UNDG, 2006b: *Potential benchmarks in terms of assessing and achieving national capacity to reach the MDGs in a rights-based framework*. Working Draft for Comment. UN.
- UNDG, 2006c: *A Template of UN System Capacity Development Tools*. UN.
- UNDP, 2000: *Assessment of Capacity Development in the GEF Portfolio*. Capacity Development Initiative. UNDP-GEF.
- UNDP, 2003a: *Capacity Development Indicators*. UNDP/GEF Resource Kit No. 4. UNDP-GEF.
- UNDP, 2003b: *Workshop on Designing Capacity Development Indicators for Global Environment Facility Projects*. UNDP Workshop Report.
- UNDP, 2005: *Measuring Capacities: An Illustrative Catalogue to Benchmarks and Indicators*. UNDP-CDG.

UNDP, 2006a: *Capacity Assessment Practice Note*. UNDP-CDG.

UNDP, 2006b: *Capacity Development Practice Note*. UNDP-CDG.

Watson, David, 2006: *Monitoring and evaluation of capacity and capacity development*. ECDPM.