



Global Environment Facility Evaluation Office

Evaluation of GEF Capacity Development Activities

APPROACH PAPER

November 2, 2006

Contents:

| | | |
|------|---|----|
| I | INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| II | FOCUSING THE EVALUATION: EVOLVING DEFINITIONS AND UNDERSTANDING OF CAPACITY BUILDING AND DEVELOPMENT | 1 |
| III | CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES AND THE GEF | 2 |
| IV | PROPOSED APPROACH AND SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION | 6 |
| V | KEY ISSUES AND QUESTIONS | 8 |
| VI | EVALUATION DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY: OUTLINE..... | 9 |
| VII | OUTPUTS | 11 |
| VIII | KEY AUDIENCES | 12 |
| IX | RESOURCES AND WORK PLAN | 12 |
| X | RESOURCES REQUIREMENTS | 13 |
| | END NOTES | 13 |

Contacts:

David Todd, Senior Evaluation Officer, GEF Evaluation Office, dtodd@thegef.org

Anna Viggh, Extended Term Consultant, GEF Evaluation Office, aviggh@thegef.org

I. INTRODUCTION

1. The GEF is the financial mechanism, or a financial mechanism, for a number of international environmental conventions, as well as for activities in the area of International Waters, which is not governed by any overarching convention. It provides new and additional funding to meet the agreed incremental costs of securing global environmental benefits. The GEF works in partnership with a set of Implementing Agencies (IAs) (UNEP, UNDP and the World Bank), seven Executing Agencies (ExAs), national governments and civil society.

II. FOCUSING THE EVALUATION: EVOLVING DEFINITIONS AND UNDERSTANDING OF CAPACITY BUILDING AND DEVELOPMENT

Definitions

2. In international development thinking and practice there has been a gradual shift of terminology away from the term ‘capacity building’ towards ‘capacity development.’ The term ‘capacity building’ has come to be seen as connoting starting from zero and erecting new structures or transferring new knowledge, processes which are now perceived to be largely externally driven and to lack national ownership. ‘Capacity development’ is seen to include national ownership, the identification of capacity needs, building on what is already available and the development of policies, which allow for synergies between local and external efforts and knowledge.

3. Usage in GEF documents reflects the shift in thinking outlined above, with early activities couched in terms of ‘capacity building’ and later ones largely defined as ‘capacity development.’ However, due to time lags in project approval processes and in awareness of the changed perspective, there are also relatively late activities, which are still described in earlier terminology. For the sake of simplicity, this approach paper will adopt the current perspective and use ‘capacity development’ consistently, except when quoting directly from project titles or other documents, in which ‘capacity building’ was used.

Capacity Development and Evaluation

4. Definitions of capacity development reflect particular characteristics:

- Capacity development can only be defined in relation to a specific goal – it does not exist for its own sake. Project documents should therefore clearly establish what the goals are and how the capacity development activities relate to them.
- Capacity development is a process and ‘moving target’ in terms of variations at temporal scales. The impact of capacity building efforts will rarely materialize in the short term, because it will always inter-play with many contextual factors (e.g., systems of governance; historical and cultural matters, socio-politics; actions of other donors) which will have considerable influence on the outcomes of the initiative.
- Capacity development is multidimensional in terms of actions at policy, institutional and individual levels. This encourages any overall evaluation of capacity development to

think in terms of complex systems, in which linkages between scales are critical to understanding outcomes/impacts on performance.

- In the case of the GEF, capacity development is required to improve individual, institutional and/or enabling environment performance to promote progress towards global environmental gains. The particular characteristics of capacity development in this complex context require careful consideration of issues of attribution of achievements to the GEF.

Levels of Capacity Development

5. It is widely acknowledged¹ that there are three analytical levels at which capacity development may be pursued and evaluated:

- Individual: enabling individuals to embark on a continuous process of learning – building on existing knowledge and skills and extending these in new directions as opportunities appear.
- Organizational or institutional: building on existing capacities – but can involve constructing new institutions depending on the country context.²
- Enabling environment, systemic or societal:³ improving existing or developing new policies and legal systems to influence institutions and individuals through the incentives it creates. This could be at the national level or still higher, given that many environmental threats are sub-regional or regional in nature.

6. Depending on the goals and the context in which capacity development activities are implemented, the three levels may or may not be addressed independently of one another. Many large-scale investment projects include elements of capacity development linked across all three scales.⁴ Any evaluation, therefore must seek to define the scale(s) [or analytical subject] of analysis as related to project(s) or program(s). So, for example, an evaluation of individual capacity building for small business development and/or alternative livelihoods would require somewhat different evaluation design and methods from an evaluation of the enabling environment level. In the case of the GEF, the multitude of capacity development activities presents opportunities to assess achievements at particular levels or to conduct a more comprehensive and integrated assessment.

III. CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES AND THE GEF

7. This section outlines briefly the capacity activities/modalities supported by the GEF as well as the status of evaluation related to the various activities/modalities. As noted above, in its early years, the GEF used the term ‘capacity building,’ but by the time of the National Capacity Self Assessments, it had largely moved towards a process of country-driven ‘capacity development,’ in which countries were intended to take the lead in identifying the types of activities that could be supported by the GEF and other donors.

8. Capacity development⁵ is a major priority within the global environmental conventions⁶ and the GEF.⁷ The GEF approach in this area is articulated in the Operational Strategy (1995) as a process to “produce and ensure the sustainability of global environmental benefits”⁸ and this

has been reaffirmed in the strategic priorities of focal areas.⁹ Following the Capacity Development Initiative launched by the GEF Secretariat and UNDP in 2000, the GEF Secretariat presented (in 2003) a “Strategic Approach to Enhance Capacity Building” to the GEF Council. The approach recognized the fundamental role of capacity building activities as an integral part of projects and recommended continued emphasis on projects as a “preferred pathway” for capacity development to stimulate and sustain global environmental gains.¹⁰

9. In line with the broader international community,¹¹ the GEF¹² has recognized that most of its developing country recipients lack many relevant policies and have insufficient institutional and individual capacities to meet and sustain national and global environmental obligations. Furthermore, within the broader context, donors and developing countries recognize lack of capacity as a key barrier to achievement of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs).¹³ The OECD (2006) notes that:

“Capacity development is a major challenge. Technical cooperation and various forms of capacity building have absorbed substantial funds over many decades. While a few countries have done well, donor efforts in many countries have produced little to show in terms of sustainable country capacity.”¹⁴

10. The GEF funds capacity development through six types of activity:

National Focal Point Capacity Enhancement

11. The objective of this program is to:

- Increase the awareness of GEF strategic priorities, policies and programs;
- Creation of enhanced institutional memory of GEF activities within National Government Ministries;
- Support the creation of GEF coordination and resource units within National Government Ministries to increase coordination among national agencies and improve country ownership and a cohesive approach to global environmental issues;
- Promote mainstreaming of global environment issues into national sustainable development agendas;
- Strengthen stakeholder involvement in global environmental programs.

12. The program has been under implementation since 1999 and was revised following recommendations by OPS2 and GEF Secretariat evaluation (GEF, 2004).¹⁵ It entered a second four-year funding phase in 2005. The total cost of the program is US\$6.8 million. The analytical scale of the program is primarily focused on building individual capacities of National Operational and Political Focal Points and creating GEF specific ‘coordination units’ within National Government institutional structures (see Table 1). The second phase intends to link this activity to support provided to other capacity building activities in projects and NCSAs.

Enabling Activities (EAs) for Conventions

13. The objective of these programs in the focal areas of Biodiversity,¹⁶ Climate Change¹⁷ and Persistent Organic Pollutants is to:

- Prepare and guide effective response measures (e.g. investment priorities); produce plans, strategies and encourage integration of Convention objectives into national development efforts and sectors; in doing so strengthen individual, institutional and national capacity that will contribute towards the achievement of Convention objectives.

14. In the case of biodiversity, at the end of 2005 approximately 140 countries had completed initial reports, 118 countries submitted second national reports, and 29 third national reports to the CBD. Similarly, 129 countries had submitted their initial reports, three had submitted second reports to the UNFCCC. EAs for Persistent Organic Pollutants have only recently been initiated. Biodiversity EAs were evaluated in 1999 and Climate Change EAs were evaluated in 2000.¹⁸

15. It is worth noting that (a) countries receive equivalent EAs for the UNCCD to prepare National Reports and National Action Programmes, but not funded by the GEF; and (b) that these are linked to the GEF-funded "Capacity Building for Sustainable Land Management portfolio" project.

16. The Global Support Programme for National Capacity Self-Assessment (see below) (a) has prepared and distributed a broad introductory guide covering each of these EAs and equivalent assessment and planning exercises; and (b) is currently preparing guidance for countries on how to "make best use of" the NCSA in conjunction with the range of other EAs prepared in each country.

National Adaptation Plans of Action (NAPA)¹⁹

17. The NAPAs are aimed at identifying the most vulnerable areas and sectors and at prioritizing urgent adaptation investment and capacity development measures to be implemented by Least Developed Countries (LDCs).

18. In 2001, the GEF was requested to by the UNFCCC²⁰ to provide funding to assist with capacity development in LDCs for the production of NAPAs. As of March 2006, 44 countries have begun NAPA preparation, and three have completed. Capacity development in NAPAs is primarily associated with supporting individual and institutional scales to identify future country-driven climate change investment needs, including capacity development (see Table 1). Therefore, NAPAs are primarily a 'tool' for identification of needs similar to NCSAs. Given the short period of NAPA's operations no evaluation has yet been undertaken.

National Capacity Self-Assessment (NCSA)²¹

19. The objective of NCSA is to assist countries in preparing self-assessment of their capacity development needs and priorities to manage global environmental issues. Once countries identify capacity gaps, they are encouraged to develop a plan of action for overcoming them. NCSAs are intended to be entirely country-driven exercises.

20. The NCSAs cover capacity development priorities for all the Conventions. They are primarily a 'tool' for identifying capacity development needs that could produce and sustain global environmental gains and are not specifically designed to build capacity and improve

performance by themselves. The NCSAs are designed to use existing national structures and coordination mechanisms. At the end of 2005 ten countries have completed NCSAs, while another 40-50 countries are scheduled to complete in 2006. UNDP has a process of on-going evaluation and 'lessons-learning' of the NCSA through the Global Support Programme.

FSP/MSP Capacity Development Components

21. Most GEF projects contain substantial capacity development objectives aimed at augmenting individual (e.g., training; skills and knowledge transfer; awareness-raising), institutional (e.g., organization development of existing governmental and non-governmental institutions) and enabling environmental (e.g., policy and legislative development and harmonization) capacities critical to the achievement of global environmental goals. However, in most of these projects, capacity development is not the principle objective, but a means to a broader global environmental goal. This has been the principle pathway for addressing country capacity development needs and GEF strategic priorities. Data on total GEF funding in capacity development through FSPs/MSPs is not available. However, the Capacity Development Initiative (in 2000) concluded that nearly all projects have included at least some objectives or activities related to capacity development. Evaluation of capacity building/development components in FSPs/MSPs has been covered as part of the Focal Area Program Studies, Local Benefits Study and the Studies of GEF's Overall Performance (OPS1, 2 and 3) as well as by internal UNDP studies. A substantial amount of capacity development is delivered through regional programs, particularly in the International Waters focal area, and the inter-relationship between regional and national approaches presents a major area to be addressed by the study.

Small Grants Programme (SGP)

22. The SGP is primarily active at local individual and institutional capacity development scales (see Table 1) in its activities to develop and implement technologies, building partnerships and share knowledge to address environmental problems. A strong emphasis is placed on replication of local activities over time through capacity development activities. The SGP has been evaluated three times, most recently in 2003. The GEF Evaluation Office (GEF EO) has been requested to manage the fourth evaluation of the SGP. It is anticipated that capacity development activities will be assessed as part of that separate evaluation.

23. In sum, the focus of the various GEF support modalities and the degree to which the various modalities have been evaluated are presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Analytical classification and current status of Evaluation of GEF Capacity Development/Building Activities²²

| | Individual | Institutional | Enabling/systemic | Evaluation |
|--|---|---|---|--|
| Support to Enhance Capacities of Focal Points | Primary focus | Primary focus | No | Yes |
| Enabling Activities for Conventions | Primary focus | Primary focus | No | Yes, interim |
| National Adaptation Plans of Action | No | Primary focus | Primary focus | No, (too new). |
| National Capacity Self-Assessments | Tool for capacity building needs identification | Tool for capacity building needs identification | Tool for capacity building needs identification | NCSA Evaluation system in operation by the GSP |
| FSP/MSP Capacity Building components | Dependent on project | Dependent on project | Dependent on project | Only at project level |
| Small Grants Programme | Primary focus | Primary focus | No | Several evaluations by UNDP. One new evaluation planned by GEF EO. |

IV. PROPOSED APPROACH AND SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION

Approach

24. The OECD/DAC stated that in 2004 – 05 multilateral and bilateral donors spent more than US\$20 billion on ‘technical assistance’ or capacity development activities.²³ Yet there is little coherent evidence available regarding the impact of these activities at individual, institutional and systemic levels.²⁴ Similarly, in the GEF context the evaluation of capacity building has been piecemeal [confined to parts of other evaluation studies²⁵] and a focused evaluation of results of capacity building on global environmental benefits is not available. Yet there is a clear need for the drawing and distillation of findings and lessons to inform the evolving GEF strategic approach. The Global Support Programme (GSP) has a mandate “to inform the evolving GEF strategic approach,” and the GEF EO study team will liaise with the GSP team to benefit from its approaches and findings.

25. The most recent Overall Performance Evaluation (OPS3) asserted:

“OPS3 considers knowledge and partnership development as resources that the GEF can use to create catalytic effects, and individual and institutional capacity building as a condition that the GEF can foster to create catalytic effects ...these mechanisms can be explored in more depth by OPS4.”

In recognition of the OPS3 call for capacity development to be examined in more depth, to inform the GEF Secretariat’s and Implementing Agencies’ continuing efforts to refine their strategic approach, the GEF Evaluation Office proposed to conduct a capacity development evaluation as part of the four-year work program.²⁶ This evaluation will make a systematic contribution toward OPS4. The GEF Council accepted and supported the Evaluation Office proposal for this evaluation in 2004.²⁷

26. A Draft Approach Paper, Revision 3 was discussed with the GEF Biodiversity team and widely circulated for comments and suggestions. In the light of responses received and further reflection, the study team proposes to adopt a different approach to that earlier suggested. The revised approach rejects the concept of evaluating the capacity development activities of MSPs and FSPs as discrete interventions. Rather it moves the unit of analysis to a higher level; that of countries, viewed within their regional context, a perspective, which is in line with the approach of both the NCSA and the Global Support Programme. This takes note of the fact that coherence, consistency and complementarity are important dimensions of the efficiency, effectiveness and sustainability of GEF support to capacity development. In many cases, targeted environmental issues are addressed at a regional or sub-regional level, for example by International Waters projects or regional projects in other focal areas. Furthermore, there is a need to assess the extent to which capacity has been raised in a coherent and connected manner across focal areas in the same geographical context.

Scope

27. Under this new approach, the evaluation will study the results of all GEF capacity development support, from Enabling Activities and Small Grant Programme support, through to the national results of regional projects, in two countries, which share one or more common environmental challenges of global importance. These challenges could be related to international water bodies, or, for example, common threats to biodiversity or land degradation. The study will examine in each country the nature and results of the national and regional interventions and relate these to policy, institutional and individually-focused capacity development targets.

28. The focus of the evaluation will be twofold. Firstly, it will conduct a sub-regional case study in two countries of capacity building/development activities across all GEF project and program modalities to assess their global environmental results, relevance, effectiveness, sustainability and efficiency. One of these cases will be coordinated with the GEF EO Country Portfolio Evaluation and will provide it with an additional in-depth body of data, particularly concerning the contribution of regional programs to national capacity. The second country will be unique to this study and will provide a comparative perspective on how capacity development has been pursued and with what results in a country, which shares some environmental issues and GEF-supported programs with the first country.

29. Secondly, this evaluation will play a vital role in developing a comprehensive understanding of how capacity development is conceived and implemented, nationally and regionally, how different approaches to the issue relate to one another and what are the key factors contributing to the generation of intended results. By reflecting on the key results and how they were achieved, the evaluation will be able to develop methodologies for rapid assessment of capacity development initiatives, including a set of protocols, which will enable forthcoming Annual Performance Reports, Country Portfolio Evaluations and OPS4 to evaluate the achievements of such activities on a broader scale. This broad based assessment is not possible without first developing the necessary understanding of the how capacity development interventions produce results over time and space. The country studies will be a substantial product; but the understanding, which they will bring of the long-term processes of capacity

development and which will be used to develop concise approaches to the measurement of achievement in this area, for the use of a range of subsequent GEF EO studies will be the most significant evaluation gain. Since the NCSA is conducted along similar lines to this study plan and the GSP is monitoring and evaluating the performance of each of the NCSA projects, currently in 152 countries, the GEF EO study will be able to coordinate with these processes and draw on their data, whilst retaining its independent perspective and assessments.

V. KEY ISSUES AND QUESTIONS

30. The **key issues** of this evaluation are:

- 1) Country ownership and involvement of national institutions/stakeholders in identification of capacity gaps to be alleviated through GEF projects, including at the regional level.
- 2) Relevance of GEF projects to country policies and needs, including the integration of GEF projects into national policies and plans and the development of regional capacity to address environmental issues, which cross national boundaries.
- 3) The results achieved in developing required environmental management capacities.
- 4) The effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of GEF-supported efforts for capacity development.

31. **Key questions** for the study will include:

Relevance

- To what extent have GEF funded capacity activities been relevant to country needs and priorities?
- How have country capacity development activities been identified and assessed?
- To what extent have the design and implementation of capacity development activities involved country stakeholders and been country-driven?
- To what extent have the design and implementation of capacity development activities adopted holistic approaches?
- How have capacity development activities been integrated into wider national sustainable development sectoral plans and activities?
- To what extent have design and implementation of capacity development activities promoted partnerships and coordination? (e.g., between civil society and government, countries, donors, private sector partners)?
- To what extent has the GEF explored and implemented alternative approaches to project delivery of capacity development? (e.g., programmatic / regional / product-based)?

Efficiency

- To what extent have GEF capacity development activities been cost-efficient?
- What level (individual; institutional; systemic) of GEF capacity development activity provides the most cost-efficient global environmental benefits?
- What factors influence capacity development funding decisions?

Results and Sustainability

- What results have individual capacity development activities delivered to assist countries to secure and sustain global environmental benefits?
- What results have institutional capacity development activities delivered to assist countries to secure and sustain global environmental benefits?
- What results have systemic capacity development activities delivered to assist countries to secure and sustain global environmental benefits?
- Are there examples of significant capacity gains, and if yes, what elements of good practice do they reflect?
- Are there examples of significant capacity stagnation / losses, and if yes, what elements of bad practice do they reflect?

Effectiveness

- What are the factors that determine the effectiveness of GEF capacity development activities?

VI. EVALUATION DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY: OUTLINE

Design

32. The evaluation will begin by identifying a sub-region, which has experience of a broad range of GEF-supported capacity development activities, from regional to SGP projects. Two countries in the sub-region will be selected to provide a comparative perspective of achievements in similar environmental situations. If possible, the countries will be coordinated with the GEF EO Country Portfolio Evaluation or the Small Grants Programme Evaluation, which will enable sharing of local consultants and possibly supervision missions in one of the two, to reduce costs and maximize the utility of the evaluation outputs.

33. Once the sub-region and its two participating countries have been selected, a detailed review will be undertaken of all completed evaluation reports in their portfolios, to assess the intended and reported achievements with regard to capacity development. Other documents to be consulted will include NCSAs and reports on support to Focal Points and Enabling Activities, as well as on SGP activities. An overview report will be prepared on each country, specifying the results reported in existing documents and defining the specific key questions to be evaluated by field study.

34. Fieldwork will then be undertaken in the two countries. This will begin with discussions with Government and other national stakeholders, as well as with Implementing (and/or Executing) Agencies and officials of any regional bodies associated with GEF activities. An overview will be obtained of country perspectives on what has been attempted and achieved with GEF support. A group of projects will be selected on the basis of these discussions, for field study. This will include projects which targeted government or non-government officers as well as some which intended to raise the capacity of communities to improve their environmental

management practices. The results and issues raised by fieldwork study will provide the basis for a second round of discussions with Government and other national-level stakeholders.

35. The findings from the country studies will be drawn together in a draft report, which will be circulated and discussed with a broad range of institutional stakeholders in the headquarters of the Implementing and Executing Agencies and the GEFSEC. This will report on the specific findings for the two countries covered and raise broader issues of capacity development evaluation, including how to incorporate the lessons and approaches from the study into other Evaluation Office activities and products, including Country Portfolio Evaluations and the Annual Performance Report, to enable a broader evaluation process of capacity development to begin.

Methods

36. The evaluation methodology will include both qualitative and quantitative approaches, including:

- Literature review(s) of GEF capacity building/development strategies and programs, Convention guidance and experiences as provided in evaluations and reports. It will also review non-GEF capacity building experiences in environment and other sectors. These reviews would provide important internal and external contexts on which to base and compare field data.
- Review of project/program documents for the evaluation countries – including such project documents as supervision, implementation completion/terminal evaluation reports (including IEG and GEF EO evaluation reviews); institutional and individual in-country records.
- Semi-structured interviews with GEF Secretariat, Implementing and Executing Agencies, and in-country stakeholders and beneficiaries. These interviews will be important in providing overview of capacity development strategies and modalities, and also on specific case studies to ascertain insights into capacity development effectiveness and relevance to individuals and institutions.
- Sub-regional field studies: Review of projects in the three focal areas of Biodiversity, Climate Change and International Waters (and others present) in the selected countries in the sub-region. Local consultants, supervised by GEF EO staff, will mostly carry out the data collection. Group and individual interviews will be used during field case studies to solicit information from in-country stakeholders (e.g., Government staff/trainers/policy-makers) and from beneficiaries (Government staff/groups of individuals). Participatory approaches (e.g., stakeholder and policy mapping; self-assessments)/life histories will be useful to examine the individual and institutional perceptions of effectiveness of capacity building.

- Quantitative approaches may also include questionnaire surveys (e.g., survey monkey) for a range of stakeholders, depending on and customized on the results of the desk reviews.

Challenges and Limitations

37. The evaluation is likely to face several methodological challenges: Firstly, capacity development is never static and therefore it is difficult to measure within and between analytical scales – project monitoring may capture one capacity building scale better than others. Secondly, capacity development and performance are influenced by numerous contextual factors external to project-based interventions, that need to be taken into account, but the relative importance of the various factors may not be known. A predefined set of indicators runs the risk of constituting a “reductionist” view of complex development problems and a wide variation of solutions. For this reason the evaluation may both underestimate the interconnectedness of factors in organizational systems and may further mistakenly attribute performance changes to the GEF, when other factors could be equally important.²⁸ Thirdly, there is paucity of baseline information and project monitoring of capacity development (as already reported in previous GEF evaluations).

38. Tackling the challenges will not be easy. However, it will require the combination of qualitative and quantitative approaches; addressing all three analytical scales and a number of contextual factors concurrently to capture and comprehend the relationships at work. The evaluation will include self-assessment components in combination with different external methods to effectively triangulate data sources.²⁹

39. The evaluation has a number of limitations which result from the need to develop an intensive understanding of how capacity development is targeted and achieved across the broad variety of GEF national and regional activities in any country. Early work developing the approach showed clearly that there was no possibility of conducting a cost effective global evaluation of capacity development at this stage. The methodological development to be achieved by this evaluation will pave the way for the issue to be addressed effectively and more extensively in a broad range of future evaluations. It is therefore clearly stated that this evaluation will not be able to generalize its findings to higher levels and that the countries studied and the projects and programs, in which they have participated, will not be regarded as representing any broader cross-section of the GEF portfolio.

VII. OUTPUTS

40. The evaluation will produce a set of inter-related outputs. The first of these will be a Report on the context of GEF capacity development interventions. This will review relevant policies, strategies and guidelines within the GEF and its Implementing Agencies and, where relevant, Executing Agencies. It will relate these to guidance received from Conventions. Non-GEF capacity development experience in the environmental field will also be reviewed, to develop an understanding of the GEF’s specific “added value.”

41. The second output will be two country background studies, covering all available documentary material on capacity development in the two countries selected. These studies will be a critical input into fieldwork methodology preparation.

42. The final and main output will be a synthesis report, which brings together the policy and country background material and results of country fieldwork studies. This will assess the capacity development results of GEF activities in the countries and sub-region and provide an analysis of the most effective means of evaluating capacity development on a broader basis across the GEF portfolio, by means of outline protocols of key questions for use by other GEF EO evaluations, notably country evaluations, program studies, and OPS4.

VIII. KEY AUDIENCES

43. The key **audiences** of the evaluation report are:

- The GEF Council – the evaluation is envisaged to serve as a basis for further decision-making in this area.
- The GEF Secretariat and Implementing and Executing Agencies – the evaluation will inform strategic approaches and provide recommendations on focus of work and composition of programs.
- Project proponents (Country Governments and NGOs) and especially the GEF Focal Points – the evaluation will provide lessons on planning and implementation
- The broader environmental conservation community.

IX. PROCESS AND WORK PLAN

44. It is expected that the evaluation will commence after the finalization of the approach paper and terms of reference in August 2006. The exact timetable for the evaluation will be dependent on countries selected by the Evaluation Office. It is expected that the evaluation will be completed for GEF Council in November 2007. A tentative work plan is provided below.

Table 2: Tentative Work Program and Timetable

| Time | Task |
|------------------------------|---|
| September 11th 2006 | Revised Approach Paper Circulated to GEFSEC and Implementing Agencies |
| November 20th 2006 | Final Approach Paper and Terms of Reference |
| November - December 2006 | Literature Reviews |
| December - January 2006 | Interviews with Implementing/Executing Agency Staff |
| November 2006 – January 2007 | Desk Review of GEF Projects in selected countries |
| February 2007 – May 2007 | Country Studies |
| June - August 2007 | Analyses, Workshop and write-up |
| September 2007 | Draft Evaluation Report circulated to GEFSEC and Implementing and Executing Agencies for comments |
| October 2007 | Completion of evaluation report, Management Response |
| November 2007 | Evaluation Report Submitted to GEF Council |

X. RESOURCE REQUIREMENTS

Table 3: Indicative Budget

| Input | Cost |
|---|------------------|
| 1: GEF EO support staff and consultants for desk review of GEF policies, strategies and approaches to capacity development: | \$15,000 |
| 2: GEF EO support staff and consultants for desk review of activities in two countries of one sub-region | \$15,000 |
| 3: Travel by GEF EO staff to set up and supervise fieldwork in two countries | \$30,000 |
| 4: Fieldwork management time of GEF ETC/STC | \$31,000 |
| 4: National consultants in two countries | \$60,000 |
| 5: Workshop costs, printing, dissemination | \$15,000 |
| | |
| Total | \$166,000 |

END NOTES

¹ See UNDP (2002) Capacity for Development: New Solutions Old Problems. Earthscan. London; OECD (2006) The Challenges of Capacity Development: Working Towards Good Practice. DAC Network on Governance. OECD. Paris.

² For example, post conflict/war reconstruction may involve the development of new institutional structures and concomitant legal structuring structures (e.g., international experience in Afghanistan and Iraq).

³ These terms are often used inter-changeably. Although systemic is also used to refer to interaction between the three levels (see OECD, 2006: 10).

⁴ Ibid.

⁵ Described in many documents under the earlier label of capacity building.

⁶ See CBD/UNFCCC/UNCCD/Stockholm Convention – COP summaries have emphasized the need for country-driven capacity building activities.

⁷ See the GEF (1995) Operational Strategy. Global Environment Facility. Washington DC; GEF (2002) Second Assembly. Global Environment Facility. Washington DC; GEF (2003) Policy Recommendations of the 3rd Replenishment. Global Environment Facility. Washington DC.

⁸ GEF (1995:3).

⁹ For example see GEF Strategic Priorities: Biodiversity 2, 3 & 4; Climate Change 1; International Waters 2; Persistent Organic Pollutants 1.

¹⁰ GEF/C.22/8. See also the GEF Business Plan FY04-06 which recognized capacity building as cross-cutting strategic priority for all focal areas.

¹¹ 2002 WSSD recommended that GEF support capacity building needs for training, technical-know how and institutional development.

¹² See GEF/C.22/8 (November 2003) Strategic Approach to Enhancing Capacity Building.

¹³ See G8 Gleneagles Summit Statement; 2005 Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness www.oecd.org

¹⁴ OECD (2006) The Challenges of Capacity Development: Working Towards Good Practice. DAC Network on Governance. OECD. Paris: Pages 6-7.

¹⁵ GEF/C.23/Inf.12.

¹⁶ CBD COP2/3 requested the GEF to fund Enabling Activities for Articles 6 and 8 for the 1st National Communications. Guidance for the 2nd National Communications was given at COP4 (in 2000).

¹⁷ UNFCCC COP4 requested that the GEF provide support for preparing initial and subsequent national communications to the Convention by maintaining and enhancing relevant capacity.

¹⁸ GEF (1999) Interim Assessment of Biodiversity Enabling Activities. Global Environment Facility Monitoring and Evaluation Unit. Washington DC; And GEF (2000) Review of Climate Change Enabling Activity Projects. Evaluation Report #2-00. Global Environment Facility Monitoring and Evaluation Unit. Washington DC.

¹⁹ NAPA is also an Enabling Activity.

²⁰ UNFCCC COP7/Decision 6.

²¹ The NCSA is also an Enabling Activity.

²² A more detailed annotated table and description of each GEF capacity building activity/modality will be part of the literature review.

²³ See Nelson (2006) Does Training Work? Re-Examining Donor Sponsored Training Programs in Developing Countries. World Bank Institute. Washington DC: Pages 1-2.

²⁴ See for example, World Bank (2005) Capacity Building in Africa: An OED Evaluation of World Bank Support. Operations Evaluation Department. Washington DC.

²⁵ Capacity building has been covered as part of the GEF focal area Program Studies; Overall Performance Studies (see OPS2 and OPS3); and more recently Bio-Safety and Local Benefits Study. Of these studies only the Local Benefits Study has collected substantive field-based data on capacity building. Also the Capacity Development Initiative by UNDP produced a significant amount of literature on GEF capacity building needs.

²⁶ GEF/ME/C.24/5 (November 2004).

²⁷ GEF.C24 (November 2004) Joint Summary of the Chairs.

²⁸ See for example David Watson: "Monitoring and Evaluation of Capacity and Capacity Development". ECDPM Study on Capacity Change and Performance.

²⁹ See LaFond, A (2003) A Guide to Monitoring and Evaluation of Capacity Building Interventions in the Health Sector in Developing Countries. Measure Evaluation and USAID.