



UNITED
NATIONS



**Framework Convention
on Climate Change**

Distr.
GENERAL

FCCC/SBI/2004/9
14 May 2004

Original: ENGLISH

SUBSIDIARY BODY FOR IMPLEMENTATION

Twentieth session

Bonn, 16–25 June 2004

Item 7 of the provisional agenda

Capacity-building

**Range and effectiveness of capacity-building activities
in developing countries aimed at implementing decision 2/CP.7**

Note by the secretariat*

Summary

This note contains analyses and findings of capacity-building activities in developing countries, based on information provided by Parties in their submissions; documents produced by the secretariat; the capacity-building technical paper; and reports by the Global Environment Facility and by bilateral and multilateral agencies. It also outlines lessons learned in implementing capacity-building activities and programmes, and key issues that Parties may wish to consider in relation to the comprehensive review of the implementation of decision 2/CP.7.

* This document is being submitted after the official deadline due to the need for extensive consultations.

CONTENTS

	<i>Paragraphs</i>	<i>Page</i>
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1–4	3
A. Mandate.....	1	3
B. Scope of the note.....	2–3	3
C. Possible action by the Subsidiary Body for Implementation..	4	3
II. RANGE AND EFFECTIVENESS OF CAPACITY-BUILDING PROJECTS AND PROGRAMMES	5–36	3
A. Background	5	3
B. Capacity-building needs and priorities	6–10	4
C. Description of capacity-building programmes and activities..	11–14	5
D. Key results and impacts of capacity-building activities	15–18	6
E. Availability, accessibility and efficiency of resource use.....	19–23	7
F. Sustainability of capacity-building activities.....	24–32	8
G. Indicators for capacity-building.....	33–36	9
III. MATTERS FOR CONSIDERATION BY THE SUBSIDIARY BODY FOR IMPLEMENTATION.....	37	10
<u>Annexes</u>		
I. Climate change capacity-building levels of analysis and the capacity-building framework.....		11
II. Summary of capacity-building needs and priorities.....		12
III. Types of capacity-building indicators relating to the strategic areas of support in the UNDP/GEF resource kit and the needs presented in the capacity-building framework.....		13

I. Introduction

A. Mandate

1. The Conference of Parties (COP), by its decision 9/CP.9, decided to complete the comprehensive review of the implementation of the framework for capacity-building in developing countries at its tenth session. It requested the secretariat to prepare a paper with technical appendices on the range and effectiveness of capacity-building activities in developing countries aimed at implementing decision 2/CP.7, for consideration by the Subsidiary Body for Implementation (SBI) at its twentieth session, this paper and its technical appendices to be based on the terms of reference contained in annex III of the report of the SBI on its eighteenth session (FCCC/SBI/2003/8).

B. Scope of the note

2. This note outlines the analyses, key issues and lessons learned in implementing capacity-building activities and programmes, based on information from the capacity-building documents produced by the secretariat, on information provided by the Global Environment Facility (GEF), bilateral and multilateral agencies and other international organizations, on additional information submitted by Parties (FCCC/SBI/2004/MISC.1), and on the technical paper on the range and effectiveness of capacity-building in developing countries (FCCC/TP/2004/1). Parties may wish to refer to the aforementioned documents to supplement the information contained in this note.

3. The secretariat prepared the document “Analysis of the implementation of the framework for capacity-building in developing countries” (FCCC/SBI/2003/14) at SBI 19 to assist Parties in the review of the implementation of decision 2/CP.7. Among the limitations identified in document FCCC/SBI/2003/14 are the lack of information on topics such as impacts of project implementation and the extent of stakeholder participation in capacity-building activities. In order to fill the information gap, the technical paper employed the following methodologies: interviews and a survey involving key delegates and international organizations; and review and analyses of capacity-building documents prepared by the secretariat, national communications of Parties not included in Annex I to the Convention (non-Annex I Parties) and Parties included in Annex II to the Convention (Annex II Parties), national poverty reduction strategy papers (PRSP) and national sustainable development strategies, and capacity-building activities of the secretariat relating to training and workshops.

C. Possible action by the Subsidiary Body for Implementation

4. The SBI may wish to take note of the findings of this note and consider the key issues identified in drafting conclusions and a decision relating to the comprehensive review of the implementation of decision 2/CP.7 for adoption by the COP at its tenth session. Parties may also wish to consider lessons learned, as outlined in this note, in implementing capacity-building activities.

II. Range and effectiveness of capacity-building projects and programmes

A. Background

5. To simplify and organize the analysis of capacity-building activities, three levels of intervention were used: systemic, institutional and individual.¹ The **systemic level** “emphasises the overall policy framework in which individuals and organizations operate and interact with the external environment, as

¹ These are categories used by the GEF (in its guidelines for preparing the national capacity self-assessments), the United Nations Development Programme (*Capacity Development Indicators, UNDP/GEF Resource Kit (No. 4)*), and the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (*Methodological and Technological Issues in Technology Transfer*).

well as the formal and informal relationships of institutions.” At the **institutional level**, “capacity-building focuses on overall organizational performance and functioning capabilities, as well as the ability of the organization to adapt to change.” Capacity-building at the **individual level** “refers to the process of changing attitudes and behaviours—imparting knowledge and developing skills while maximizing the benefits of participation, knowledge exchange and ownership.”² In annex I, the needs identified in the framework annexed to decision 2/CP.7 are loosely grouped into the above categories.

B. Capacity-building needs and priorities

6. Capacity-building needs have been identified by developing countries in their country submissions, such as national communications and other national reports. The scope of needs identified in the framework for capacity-building in developing countries (hereinafter referred to as the CB framework) is still pertinent and in line with the needs expressed by the developing countries through different assessments. As capacity-building is a slow, complex and resource-intensive process, needs are normally addressed over many years. The process is further complicated depending on the way the individual Party defines and addresses capacity-building in the context of climate change. Although these needs are being addressed as reported in the submissions of Parties (FCCC/SBI/2003/MISC.5 and FCCC/SBI/2004/MISC.1) and by the GEF and its implementing agencies (FCCC/SBI/2003/MISC.2), they continue to be the priority needs of non-Annex I Parties.

7. The needs and priorities identified in the submissions of developing countries and other literature were related to the preparation of national communications (e.g. greenhouse gas (GHG) inventories, emission database management, and systems for collecting, managing and utilizing activity data and emission factors); institutional capacity-building, including the strengthening or establishment, as appropriate, of national climate change secretariats or national focal points; vulnerability and adaptation assessment; and capacity-building for implementation of adaptation measures. Annex II of this document summarizes the capacity-building needs and priorities based on information from national communications, submissions by Parties and sources of information identified in the technical paper.

8. Some of the developing countries surveyed for the technical paper identified the need for more support from the secretariat in disseminating information relating to lessons learned from the experiences of countries that are more advanced in the UNFCCC processes. They also identified the need for the GEF secretariat to provide more information on new funding opportunities to be able to effectively access resources.

9. Results of the national capacity self assessment (NCSA) and the national adaptation programmes of action (NAPA) processes, which will be made available starting in 2004, will shed more light on specific-country needs. These initiatives are under way and their results may be considered in further developing the scope of needs addressed by the CB framework.

10. Although the CB framework is still largely in line with the present priorities of non-Annex I Parties, a thorough country-driven assessment of the existing and required capacities of these countries in view of the implementation of the UNFCCC will be instrumental in clarifying further their specific needs and relevant priority actions. Furthermore, understanding the potential linkages among national reports such as national communications, NAPAs, PRSPs, national environmental strategies and others will also illustrate the extent to which capacity-building in the context of climate change has been internalized at the country level.

² These definitions are taken from the United Nations Institute for Training and Research/GEF's *Guide for Self-assessment of Country Capacity Needs for Global Environmental Management* (September 2001), pages 32–34.

C. Description of capacity-building programmes and activities

11. Multilateral and bilateral agencies have addressed the priority issues identified in the CB framework, and those expressed by developing countries as their main needs and priorities. Developing countries in general regard enabling activities, supported by donors, as very useful. Important gaps, however, remain to be filled as discussed below:

- (a) **Institutional capacity-building.** Both non-Annex I and Annex II Parties have given priority to activities addressing institutional capacity issues that help countries meet their obligations under the Convention, and empower developing countries to continue to address their national priorities. For example, this has been done by creating national coordination bodies for climate change activities (such as national climate change committees and secretariats), establishing or revamping research centres, improving information management capacity, and providing equipment and institutional support for data collection and analysis. However, given the increasing number of climate change activities in developing countries, institutional capacity remains a priority need in order to ensure long-term sustainable capacity-building programmes (FCCC/SBI/2003/14).
- (b) **Education, training and public awareness.** Many Annex II Parties include education, training and the exchange of information in their capacity-building and technology transfer activities. Specific efforts with regard to education and training include the establishment of environmental education networks, the development of international courses and training programmes, and the provision of financial assistance to students and representatives from developing countries to either pursue education or participate in international meetings on climate change (FCCC/SBI/2003/INF.9). In line with COP decisions relating to Article 6 of the Convention, national communications show that all Parties have conducted and plan to continue developing and implementing activities relating to education, training and public awareness, involving various types of actors from the private sector, government, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), resource users and schools.
- (c) **Vulnerability and adaptation assessment.** In submissions from Annex II Parties on actions to implement decisions 2/CP.7 and 3/CP.7 on adaptation and vulnerability (FCCC/SBI/2003/MISC.5), the capacity-building activities supported by those Parties range from disaster-preparedness projects, including weather forecasting, modelling and loss-reduction practices, to the exchange of expertise and training on building disaster-resistant communities. Assistance also included coastal zone management programmes aimed at enhancing adaptation capabilities, and projects looking at the assessment of impacts of climate on agriculture and the costs of damage and adaptation. Further assistance is needed in upgrading skills and research, improving data collection and analysis pertaining to vulnerability and adaptation measures, and capacity-building to assess and respond to the impacts of climate change. Many Parties emphasized the need to improve the capacity to project temperature and precipitation changes, as well as sea-level rise, so as to reduce uncertainties about their impacts (FCCC/SBI/2003/14).

12. The technical paper pointed out that a good dialogue between host countries and donors during proposal preparation ensured that the capacity-building activities were in line with country priorities. For instance, the project on Adapting to Climate Change in the Caribbean (ACCC) funded by the Canada Climate Change Development Fund (CCCDF) was considered to be very much in line with the Caribbean countries' priorities in capacity-building for adaptation.

13. There are also instances where the project development process is largely donor driven due to lack of either national capacity or a country-driven process during the project/programme negotiations. A country-driven capacity needs assessment and development of local experts will address this concern.

14. The technical paper identified two types of outstanding capacity-building activities. First are capacity-building activities that have been partially addressed but that still require further attention. These relate to capacities built under the national communications but which need further strengthening, such as for data collection and analysis, and other capacities such as country management and decision-making capacity to deal with the prospects of implementing activities relating to the clean development mechanism (CDM). The second type relates to needs that have been addressed only peripherally, such as networking between institutions, improved decision-making, and implementation of adaptation measures.

D. Key results and impacts of capacity-building activities

15. Although results from the activities implemented under or relating to decision 2/CP.7 are starting to appear, and in some cases are evident and measurable, it will take some time to produce meaningful results. Countries may wish to consider assessing capacity built through various interventions in order to guide the design of future work on capacity-building.

16. The GEF reports, national communications of non-Annex I and Annex II Parties and submissions of Parties (FCCC/SBI/MISC.1) indicated that **relevant institutions** dedicated to the achievement of the UNFCCC objective are being put in place, the quantity and quality of information created and disseminated relating to general and technical aspects of climate change have been increased, and the **capacity of various stakeholders** to tackle a wide range of climate change issues has improved. Developing countries, however, expressed the need for further assistance in strengthening their existing institutions (FCCC/SBI/2003/14). At the **individual level** specific areas needing improvement are training in negotiation skills and technical training in, for example, measuring climate change variability.

17. Lessons learned about the effectiveness of capacity-building initiatives include the following:

- (a) Tools for assessing the effectiveness of capacity-building projects and programmes may assist in improving the implementation of these activities. These tools should be flexible enough to respond to differing national circumstances;
- (b) Ensuring that a thorough self-assessment of needs has been conducted and that proper consideration is given to the systemic, institutional and individual levels is crucial to the effectiveness of capacity-building activities;
- (c) Long-term learning-by-doing approaches that favour the development of partnership and networks and that integrate capacity-building in wider sustainable development efforts have more chances of success;
- (d) Ensuring national ownership and leadership as well as multi-stakeholder consultations and involvement at all stages of implementation creates a favourable environment for the achievement of results;
- (e) The practice of **adaptive management**³ and consideration for the dynamic nature of capacity-building considerably increases the likelihood of an initiative achieving its intended results.

³ Adaptive management is a management approach that encourages flexibility to account for and adapt to changing circumstances within which a project is situated and executed.

18. Tools to conduct thorough country capacity needs assessments should be made readily available to proponents of capacity-building activities. More urgently, their thorough application should be actively promoted within the context of the on-going NCSA and NAPA processes.

E. Availability, accessibility and efficiency of resource use

19. Developing countries have various funding opportunities available to support the implementation of capacity-building activities. They, however, require further assistance in developing project proposals relating to climate change in order to improve access to available financial resources. As the financial mechanism of the Convention, the GEF has been funding climate change capacity-building projects and programmes. By March 2004, it had invested more than USD 2 billion in a wide range of climate change activities. Annex II countries, through their bilateral agencies and support provided to multilateral agencies, have also contributed extensively to capacity-building activities in the CDM and Joint Implementation (JI) such as the World Bank's National Joint Implementation/Clean Development Mechanism (JI/CDM) Strategy Studies Programme (NSS Programme); adaptation and vulnerability assessment such as the project on Providing Regional Climates for Impacts Studies (PRECIS) of the United Kingdom; education, public awareness and information exchange such as annual climate change seminars of Japan; and technology transfer such as the Technology Cooperation Pilot Project (TCAPP) of the United States.

20. Other multilateral agencies involved in implementing climate change capacity-building activities through their own resources and/or funds from the GEF include the United Nations Development Programme, the United Nations Environment Programme, the World Bank, the United Nations Industrial Development Organization, the United Nations Institute for Training and Research and the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development. Capacity-building activities of these organizations may be grouped into the following:

- (a) Capacity-building for improving the UNFCCC/Kyoto Protocol processes such as the preparation of national communications or NAPAs; training review teams; and improving the negotiating capacity of delegates;
- (b) Capacity-building for climate change policies and strategies that need to be implemented by governments and other sectors of society, such as energy and transport policies (for mitigation), or disaster preparedness and emergency response (for adaptation);
- (c) Capacity-building for sustainable development as a whole, which will have a bearing on climate change and its impacts (e.g., a resilient and sustainable agricultural policy will have included climate change impacts, and so will be less vulnerable to climate change impacts), and on climate change policies themselves (e.g., in a sustainable city there would be fewer vehicles, thus less emissions, thus lower concentrations of greenhouse gases).

21. In general, capacity-building relating to the preparations of non-Annex I Party national communications, for example, developing or strengthening the capacity to conduct GHG inventories or to develop vulnerability, adaptation and mitigation assessments, has been given more attention. However, developing countries identified the need for further support, in particular for development/strengthening national climate change programmes, improving decision-making, further strengthening of existing institutions, training in negotiation skills, capacity for implementation of CDM projects, and training in measuring climate change variability.

22. Implementation of capacity-building activities could be further improved through enhanced dissemination of information, South-South cooperation and facilitation of the exchange of success

stories, lessons learned, and knowledge (in addition to increased use of local rather than international human resources).

23. Publications on best practices and current efforts in capacity-building by Annex II countries and non-Annex I countries should be encouraged. Such publications could be posted on or linked to the UNFCCC web site.

F. Sustainability of capacity-building activities

24. Although Parties agree on the factors affecting sustainability, in practice, project implementation does not always take into account all of these factors. At the country level, a few examples of good practices in capacity-building relating to climate change are starting to emerge and prove the point that it is of crucial importance to adequately take into account the enabling environment in designing and implementing capacity-building strategies and actions. Without systematic acknowledgement of the presence or absence of the enabling environment and of the need to address it adequately from the outset, capacity-building projects and programmes will continue to be a challenge.

25. At the institutional level, the national communications reviewed contained lists of large numbers of national organizations, programmes and committees that have been created to address climate change issues at the national level and to comply with obligations under the UNFCCC. One positive aspect of these institutional arrangements in terms of sustainability is that some countries have been able to maintain their climate change secretariats and focal points for many years.

26. When reviewing the development of individual level capacity, within and across institutions, capacity-building initiatives have been successful in training large numbers of individuals from different sectors, in particular during the preparation of initial national communications. However, the tendency so far when building individual capacity is to focus on training without giving due attention to performance reinforcing factors (e.g. clearly defined jobs, skills, responsibilities and access to information) and other key incentives, such as career development, that are crucial in ensuring the sustainability of human resource development efforts; this tendency limits the potential to retain that capacity.

27. Addressing sustainability requires an integrated approach that integrates capacity-building interventions at the systemic, institutional and individual levels. Sustainability at these levels includes the development of enabling environments, strengthening the institutional arrangements, and addressing human resource issues. Many countries, however, still require much assistance to address capacity-building needs in an integrated manner.

28. Stakeholder participation is also key in addressing sustainability. In general, governments have involved different stakeholders such as NGOs, academic institutions, and in some cases the private sector, in implementing capacity-building activities, especially with regard to the preparation of national communications. With few exceptions, other groups, such as indigenous peoples, who may be directly affected by climate change, do not seem to be participants in the preparation and implementation of climate change activities or plans to the extent they could be.

29. The following are some of the lessons learned when considering the sustainability of capacity-building results:

- (a) Strategies and initiatives that consider national capacity in an integrated manner have better chances of ensuring sustainable outcomes by identifying and acting on potential bottlenecks that might prevent the mobilization of the capacity being developed;

- (b) Some of the causes of the lack of sustainability are: lack of involvement of key decision makers; complex institutional policies including overly bureaucratic systems; lack of integrated/cross-sectoral approaches to environmental protection and more specifically climate change;
- (c) Building climate change capacity is more sustainable if a proper institutional needs assessment of core climate institutions is undertaken and individuals that are trained are trained as part of a process to strengthen the national institutional capacity in the climate change focal area, be it in the private sector, public sector, academia or civil society;
- (d) Sustainability of capacity-building programmes relating to climate change is optimized by integrating them into national planning and sustainable development strategies, and by ensuring that climate change activities are linked directly to national priorities;
- (e) When designing and implementing capacity-building activities, attention must be paid to the various issues to be considered when building capacity, be it at the systemic, institutional or individual levels;
- (f) Adequate strategies to address financial sustainability and resource allocation must be built from the outset in capacity-building projects and programmes.

30. The following are some of the key lessons learned when considering best practices in sustainable capacity-building:

- (a) Implementers of capacity-building activities should recognize the need to facilitate, promote and encourage local ownership as a prerequisite to effective and sustainable results, which in turn requires the involvement of local experts and key stakeholders from the onset of the planning effort;
- (b) Capacity development is a slow, progressive and sometimes unpredictable process;
- (c) Objectives of the capacity-building activities need to be commensurate with the capacities already available in the recipient country;
- (d) Effective monitoring and feedback processes on achieving progress towards capacity-building goals and sustainability of projects and programmes may be necessary.

31. Particular attention must be given to the integrated nature of capacity development activities in order to ensure sustainability in the implementation of capacity-building efforts by Parties. The priority needs contained in the CB framework should be taken into account when developing and implementing capacity-building projects and programmes.

32. A plan to ensure sustainability of capacity-building activities should be developed from the outset and should be pursued throughout project and programme implementation. It could be useful to conduct post-project/programme evaluation across regions and organizations and agencies.

G. Indicators for capacity-building

33. One of the challenges in determining the effectiveness of capacity-building projects and programmes is the selection and the use of performance indicators that will serve as basis for assessing project impacts (FCCC/SBI/2004/14). In recognizing the efforts of UNDP/GEF in this area, the COP, by its decision 4/CP.9, requested the GEF to take into account, in its work relating to the development of

capacity-building performance indicators for the climate change focal area, the CB framework, and to undertake this work in consultation with the Convention secretariat.

34. Although some work has been done to date, notably the preparation of the GEF/UNDP Resource Kit, there is further progress to be made in the development of robust and appropriate indicators for climate change capacity-building. Annex III to this note shows some of the links between the needs expressed in CB framework and the five strategic areas of support in capacity-building. The table also presents a list of suggestive (and not exhaustive) indicators that relate loosely to these various areas, levels and interventions in capacity-building for climate change.

35. Much reporting on capacity-building is based on activities rather than results. In order to effectively assess the outcomes of capacity-building activities, project and programme implementers may be encouraged to put emphasis on defining realistic results, identifying programme beneficiaries, monitoring the progress made towards expected results, identifying and managing risks and providing information on results achieved.

36. Capacity-building indicators are contextual by nature and need to be developed with this in mind. The key, therefore, is not to have an exhaustive or restrictive set of indicators but an appropriate set of indicator 'categories' that would allow for harmonization of different kinds of indicators that capacity-building project/programme implementers will use. A well-categorized system of indicators will not only enhance the assessment of the effectiveness of capacity-building projects and programmes on the results achieved and progress made, but would also facilitate sharing of information across geographic regions within an agency or organization, or across agencies and organizations.

III. Matters for consideration by the Subsidiary Body for Implementation

37. In their deliberations relating to the comprehensive review of the implementation of decision 2/CP.7, Parties may wish:

- (a) To ensure that the outcomes of the ongoing NCSA and NAPA processes feed into the prioritization of capacity-building needs to further guide the implementation of the CB framework;
- (b) To invite the GEF and bilateral, multilateral and other international organizations to provide information on the status and results of assessments of capacity-building activities to ensure that feedback is provided to decision makers;
- (c) To encourage publications on best practices and current capacity-building by donor agencies and non-Annex I Parties. Such publications could be posted on or linked to the UNFCCC web site to facilitate their diffusion;
- (d) To consider promoting a network of capacity-building experts to exchange information and lessons learned and coordinate efforts on capacity-building for climate change, especially at the regional and national levels;
- (e) To consider the current efforts of UNDP/GEF in the development of capacity-building indicators. Future work on the development of climate change capacity-building indicators may focus on outcomes rather than on results based on information provided by project/programme implementers.

Annex I

Climate change capacity-building levels of analysis and the capacity-building framework

Levels	Needs outlined in the capacity-building framework
Systemic	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enhancement and/or creation of an enabling environment • National climate change programmes • Improved decision-making, including assistance for participation in international negotiations
Institutional	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Institutional capacity-building, including the strengthening or establishment, as appropriate, of national climate change secretariats or national focal points • National communications • Greenhouse gas inventories, emission database management, and systems for collecting, managing and utilizing activity data and emission factors • Vulnerability and adaptation assessment • Assessment for implementation of mitigation options • Research and systematic observation, including meteorological, hydrological and climatological services • Information and networking, including the establishment of databases
Individual	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Education and training
Needs and areas that cover more than one level	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Capacity-building for implementation of adaptation measures • Development and transfer of technology • Clean development mechanism • Needs arising out of the implementation of Article 4, paragraphs 8 and 9, of the Convention • Public awareness

Annex II**Summary of capacity-building needs and priorities¹**

<p><u>Systemic level</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strengthening of policy framework (conflicting mandates, functions of responsible agencies) • Mainstreaming climate change into countries' environmental programming in all sectors • Need for stronger political commitment • Need for long-term financial resources for climate change activities • Information about benefits from the implementation of the UNFCCC at all levels • Enhancing capacity for policy formulation, planning and integration of climate change • A regional clearing house for information-sharing and networking on climate change • Government institutions need to consolidate priorities between departments to place climate change as a priority in their sustainable development plans • Participation of key stakeholders, such as public and private sector, non-governmental organizations, academia and scientific and technical personnel, as well as local communities • Capacity to enforce policy instruments at the national level; • Raising public awareness, incorporating climate change into national education systems • Establishment of regional centres of excellence
<p><u>Institutional level</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need for country-specific secretariats or climate change departments with enough human resources and political power, and well-defined functions in climate change • Need to strengthen the management and administrative institutional capacity for the collection of data for further research in local emission factors for national GHG inventories, management and operation of national GHG inventory systems, establishment of research centres, database development, and development and implementation of adaptation strategies and plans • Institutional capacity enhancement in preparation of projects and programmes; better data collection and monitoring; establishing and upgrading stations for systematic observation • Further technical and financial support for inventory preparation, climate change impact assessment and adaptation, institutional strengthening, and disaster mitigation
<p><u>Individual level</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need for trained personnel in management and operation of national GHG inventory systems, development of climate change scenarios, database development, and development and implementation of adaptation and mitigation responses and strategies • Need for improvement of negotiation skills, and an increase in the number of representatives at international meetings to address the main topics discussed • Capacity in technology transfer, negotiation and management, specifically referring to the CDM • Enhancing the analytical capacity of experts, policy makers and decision makers • Need to enhance capacity to prepare projects and programmes in the climate change area • Need to build capacity of a wide range of stakeholders from governments, non-governmental organizations, private sector, academia, and local communities

¹ The needs and priorities outlined in this table are based on information provided by survey/interview participants and taken from the following sources: FCCC/SBSTA/2001/INF.4, FCCC/SBI/2002/INF.15, FCCC/SBI/2003/14, FCCC/SBI/2003/INF.9, FCCC/TP/2003/1.

Annex III

Types of capacity-building indicators relating to the strategic areas of support in the UNDP/GEF resource kit and the needs presented in the capacity-building framework¹

UNDP/GEF resource kit: strategic area of support	Developing country capacity needs in the capacity-building framework	Relevant indicators that are linked to the strategic areas and capacity needs
<p><u>Systemic</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Capacity to conceptualize and formulate policies, legislation, strategies, and programmes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enhancement and/or creation of an enabling environment National climate change programmes Improved decision-making, including assistance for participation in international negotiations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number/quality of national or local adaptation and GHG mitigation plans, sustainable resource use/management policies and legislation developed and/or strengthened Level of integration of emission reduction/climate change adaptation into national/local policies, plans and decision-making Level of policy development as a result of lessons learned and training Number/quality of land-use plans and sustainable natural resource/energy management plans/strategies
<p><u>Institutional</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Capacity to implement policies, legislation, strategies, and programmes Capacity to engage and build consensus among all stakeholders Capacity to mobilize information and knowledge 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Institutional capacity-building, including the strengthening or establishment, as appropriate, of national climate change secretariats or national focal points National communications GHG inventories, emission database management, and systems for collecting, managing and utilizing activity data and emission factors Vulnerability and adaptation assessment Assessment for implementation of mitigation options Research and systematic observation, including meteorological, hydrological and climatological services Information and networking, including the establishment of databases 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number/quality of national or local adaptation and GHG mitigation plans, sustainable resource use/management policies and legislation implemented Level of capacity for policy-making and legislation Level/quality of environmental enforcement capacity Degree to which natural resource management conflicts are resolved Degree to which relevant officials and institutions are strengthened Level of capacity in problem identification and diagnosis Number/quality of national and local adaptation measures adopted Number/quality of vulnerability profiles created and strategies developed Degree of change in government and community priorities Quality of performance of environmental impact assessment Level of capacity to collect and analyse data Number/level of capacity of people and institutions to identify, diagnose, prioritize and address emission reduction and appropriate training Level of capacity of local/national energy providers to determine baseline emissions Number/types/quality of participatory and information-sharing mechanisms created for communities to be involved in GHG mitigation decisions and activities Quality of appropriate human, advisory and financial resources mobilized for adaptation Number/quality of adaptation technologies and practices developed or mobilized

¹ The table depicts some of the links between the needs expressed in the CB framework, which are here tentatively categorized by the ‘levels’ of intervention as defined in the UNDP/GEF resource kit for capacity development indicators, and the five strategic areas of support in capacity-building, also as defined in the resource kit. The table presents a list of suggestive (not exhaustive) indicators that relate loosely to these various areas, levels and interventions in capacity-building for climate change. The indicators listed in the right-hand column come from a thorough review of various international and bilateral agencies’ and organizations’ indicators that have been developed and used in climate change generally, and in capacity-building specifically. In the interests of brevity and to present information in a manageable way, the list is restricted to outcome level results. **The table is an illustration of how to develop a tool for using, tracking and reporting on results and indicators of climate change capacity-building.**

UNDP/GEF resource kit: strategic area of support	Developing country capacity needs in the capacity-building framework	Relevant indicators that are linked to the strategic areas and capacity needs
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Degree to which research and development activities funded and expanded by government and municipalities • Number/quality of measures taken to enhance adaptation at all levels • Level of change in practices and behaviour • Level of inter-institutional collaboration in adaptation • Change in quality of service provided by the organization • Change in organizational performance • Level of preparedness to respond to extreme weather events • Number/quality of sustainable income-generation activities
<p>Individual</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Capacity to mobilize information and knowledge • Capacity to monitor, evaluate, report and learn 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Education and training (and raising public awareness) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Level of knowledge and awareness of climate change issues • Type of changes in behaviour (e.g. energy management) • Degree to which people are learning and adapting • Level of individual performance in job • Level of capacity to monitor and evaluate projects and programmes • Quality of monitoring and evaluation processes/methodologies and practices • Quality and timeliness of reporting provided
<p><u>Needs and areas that cover more than one level</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Capacity to mobilize information and knowledge • Capacity to monitor, evaluate, report and learn 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Capacity-building for implementation of adaptation measures • Development and transfer of technology • Clean development mechanism • Needs arising out of the implementation of Article 4, paragraphs 8 and 9, of the Convention • Public awareness 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Level of knowledge, awareness and understanding of GHG emission causes, effects, benefits and strategies at all levels of society • Level of awareness of environmental and health impacts of GHG emissions and associated strategies • Number/quality/level of integration of appropriate renewable/cleaner energy technologies, knowledge and practices transferred • Number/quality of mechanisms for disseminating/utilizing transferred technology, practices, knowledge • Degree to which GHG mitigation practices/technologies are adopted and used by communities and government • Degree to which new/clean technologies are transferred, adopted and used • Quality of adaptation measures adopted and implemented • Level of change of practices • Quality of practices used • Number/quality of energy management improvements • Degree of efficiency of fossil-fuel-based power sources • Level of industrial energy intensity • Rate of introduction of clean/renewable energy sources • Frequency/quality of changes in fuel and power sources (transport and energy) • Level of expected reductions as a result of energy management improvements