



**UNITED
NATIONS**



**Framework Convention
on Climate Change**

Distr.
GENERAL

FCCC/SBI/2007/33
27 November 2007

Original: ENGLISH

SUBSIDIARY BODY FOR IMPLEMENTATION

Twenty-seventh session

Bali, 3–11 December 2007

Item 8 (a) of the provisional agenda

Capacity-building under the Convention

Capacity-building for developing countries

**Report on the expert workshop on monitoring and evaluating
capacity-building in developing countries**

Note by the secretariat*

Summary

This document provides a summary of the expert workshop on monitoring and evaluating capacity-building in developing countries, with a focus on climate change. The workshop was held in St. John's, Antigua and Barbuda, from 5 to 6 November 2007. Discussions at the workshop focused on the experiences of Parties in capacity-building and the experiences of intergovernmental organizations and other bodies in monitoring and evaluating capacity-building. The document concludes with a summary of discussions at the workshop.

* This document was submitted after the due date because the workshop took place from 5 to 6 November 2007.

CONTENTS

	<i>Paragraphs</i>	<i>Page</i>
I. INTRODUCTION	1–4	3
A. Mandate	1–2	3
B. Scope of the note	3	3
C. Possible action by the Subsidiary Body for Implementation .	4	3
II. PROCEEDINGS.....	5–12	3
III. EXPERIENCES AND LESSONS LEARNED IN MONITORING AND EVALUATING CAPACITY-BUILDING	13–44	4
A. Background.....	13–14	4
B. Capacity-building under the Global Environment Facility	15–20	5
C. Lessons learned from capacity-building activities in different regions	21–27	6
D. Monitoring capacity-building.....	28–36	7
E. Evaluating capacity-building	37–40	9
F. The Global Environment Facility indicator framework	41–44	10
IV. SUMMARY OF DISCUSSIONS	45–51	12

I. Introduction

A. Mandate

1. The Conference of the Parties (COP), at its twelfth session, requested the secretariat to organize, in collaboration with the Global Environment Facility (GEF),¹ an expert workshop on monitoring and evaluating capacity-building, before the thirteenth session of the COP, to exchange views on experiences in the monitoring and evaluation of capacity-building by Parties and multilateral and bilateral agencies as well as intergovernmental organizations (IGOs) and non-governmental organizations (NGOs); and to discuss the work of the GEF with regard to the development of capacity-building performance indicators relevant for monitoring the implementation of the framework for capacity-building in developing countries under the Convention.²

2. The Subsidiary Body for Implementation (SBI), at its twenty-sixth session, decided that a two-day workshop, organized pursuant to decision 4/CP.12, should focus on the following topics:

- (a) Approaches to monitoring capacity-building activities, including practical examples of such activities;
- (b) Approaches to evaluating capacity-building activities, including practical examples of such activities;
- (c) Enhancement of the effectiveness of capacity-building through sharing experiences, lessons learned and best practices on the use of results of monitoring and evaluation.

B. Scope of the note

3. This document provides information on the expert workshop organized by the secretariat under the guidance of the Chair of the SBI in response to the mandate referred to in paragraph 1 above. It includes an overview of the proceedings and presents a summary of the main points discussed under the three broad topics outlined in paragraph 2 above. Most efforts in monitoring and evaluation of capacity-building have been carried out for projects and programmes under the GEF, and this was reflected in many of the presentations given by the GEF and its implementing agencies.

C. Possible action by the Subsidiary Body for Implementation

4. The SBI may wish to consider this report with a view to making recommendations to the COP at its thirteenth session on further steps for monitoring and evaluating the capacity-building framework for developing countries.

II. Proceedings

5. The UNFCCC secretariat, in collaboration with the Environment Division of the Ministry of Tourism, Civil Aviation, Culture and the Environment of the Government of Antigua and Barbuda, organized the expert workshop on monitoring and evaluating capacity-building in developing countries from 5 to 6 November 2007. The Governments of Finland, Germany and Sweden and the Global Support Programme of the GEF provided financial support for the workshop.

¹ Decision 4/CP.12.

² Decision 2/CP.7, annex.

6. Participants at the workshop included 44 representatives from Parties, relevant international organizations, and IGOs and NGOs that are active in the area of capacity-building and in monitoring and evaluation.
7. The workshop was chaired by Mr. Bagher Asadi, Chair of the SBI. It was opened by Mrs. Sharon Peters, Permanent Secretary in the Ministry of Tourism, Civil Aviation, Culture and the Environment. Welcoming remarks were also made by Mrs. Diann Black-Layne, Chief Environment Officer, Mr. Ato Lewis, Senior Environment Officer, Mr. Bagher Asadi, Mr. Ravi Sharma of the GEF secretariat and a representative of the UNFCCC secretariat.
8. The workshop was arranged over five sessions. The introductory session provided background information on the capacity-building framework and progress in its monitoring and evaluation as guided by decisions of the COP, as well as on activities of the GEF in supporting capacity-building for climate change and other related environmental issues. The session concluded with representatives of developing countries discussing national and regional capacity-building activities with the emphasis on major needs, targets, lessons learned and identification of gaps. Presentations were given on the Caribbean and Pacific regions, and on the following countries: South Africa, Saint Lucia, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania and Uzbekistan.
9. The second session included presentations of case studies and national experiences on monitoring capacity-building activities by Parties (China, Finland, United States of America and Zambia), the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), the United Nations Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR) and NGOs (Pennsylvania State University Alliance for Earth Sciences, Engineering, and Development in Africa)³ and the Global Change System for Analysis Research and Training (START)).
10. The third session included presentations on experiences in evaluating capacity-building activities and programmes by the Organization of American States (OAS), the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) and the GEF Evaluation Office, and a joint presentation by GEF, UNDP and UNEP.
11. At the fourth session the enhancement of effective capacity-building through monitoring and evaluation was discussed in three breakout groups. The groups covered questions about the applicability of monitoring and evaluation to elements of the capacity-building framework and the related resources requirements, and issues such as establishing a baseline, targets, expected results and indicators of performance. These areas were chosen to achieve a better understanding of different approaches to monitoring and evaluation and of the implications of implementing the capacity-building framework under the Convention.
12. The fifth and final session discussed perspectives on a way forward, based on interventions from the GEF secretariat, Parties not included in Annex I to the Convention (United Republic of Tanzania on behalf of the Group of 77 and China) and Parties included in Annex II to the Convention (United States and Sweden).

III. Experiences and lessons learned in monitoring and evaluating capacity-building

A. Background

13. Capacity-building is fundamental for developing countries in meeting commitments under the Convention and in addressing climate change at the national level. It is a lengthy process, requiring a

³ <www.aeseda.psu.edu>.

long-term approach; this was reaffirmed in the opening remarks of government officials, and for many countries there is little room for error given the scarcity of resources for capacity-building and the urgent need to address climate change.

14. Steps in the regular monitoring of the implementation of the capacity-building framework for developing countries are defined in decision 4/CP.12. A comprehensive review is carried out every five years,⁴ with the last one having been completed in 2005 at COP 10. Monitoring is conducted through submissions by Parties and relevant organizations to the COP, and the compilation and synthesis of information on capacity-building contained in national communications and other national documents.

B. Capacity-building under the Global Environment Facility

15. A participant representing the GEF pointed out that more than 300 multilateral environmental agreements (MEAs) have been negotiated since 1972, and many presenters pointed out the severe shortage in national and regional capacities to adequately negotiate and deal with the obligations arising from these agreements. It was also pointed out that integration of these MEAs into national development plans remains a critical gap.

16. Capacity-building is a major activity for the GEF; it is carried out either as part of medium- and full-sized projects or through enabling activities. The capacity-building activities embedded in projects have not been monitored and evaluated explicitly, but the GEF is currently making efforts to develop an indicator framework for this purpose.

17. Enabling activities relating to climate change include: support to countries for the preparation of national communications; national adaptation programmes of action; technology needs assessments; a country support programme for focal points; knowledge management and national dialogue initiatives; a small grants programme; and a national capacity self-assessment (NCSA) for MEAs (such as the UNFCCC, the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) and the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD)).

18. Enabling activities have resulted in significant capacity being built in all developing countries through initiating activities on climate change, meeting reporting obligations to the Convention and preparing assessment reports, indirectly creating human capacity and an enabling environment for addressing climate change. Many countries have used enabling activity support to build a national climate change office to support awareness-raising and capacity-building planning and to initiate a coordinated approach to dealing with climate change issues. Although enabling activities have not been monitored explicitly there have been efforts to capture lessons learned and best practices, which, when fed back into implementation, has led to immediate improvements in the delivery of capacity-building.

19. The capacity development initiative of the GEF of 2000 was a strategic partnership between the GEF secretariat and UNDP, designed to respond to the priorities of, and requests for support from, developing countries. It concluded with the adoption of the strategic approach to enhancing capacity-building in the GEF, approved in 2003. The approach defines four main methods for access to GEF resources in support of capacity development:

- (a) NCSAs;
- (b) Enhanced attention to capacity-building in regular projects;
- (c) Targeted capacity-building projects;

⁴ Decision 2/CP.7, paragraph 11.

- (d) A programme for critical capacity-building activities in the least developed countries and small island developing States (SIDS).

20. A global support programme (GSP) for the NCSA provides countries with methodological support and knowledge management mechanisms, and one of their activities is to develop targets and indicators for benchmarking and impact assessments. This work is carried out in collaboration with the monitoring and evaluation units of the GEF, UNDP, UNEP and the World Bank.

C. Lessons learned from capacity-building activities in different regions

21. Participants representing different regions discussed their experiences in capacity-building. Amongst the SIDS, the Caribbean Community and Common Market countries described several major regional capacity-building projects that have been implemented over the past few years. These included the GEF Caribbean Planning for Adaptation to Climate Change, Adaptation to Climate Change in the Caribbean and Mainstreaming Adaptation to Climate Change projects. For the Pacific region, the Pacific Islands Climate Change Assistance Programme had similar capacity-building emphasis. Participants noted that regional projects such as these were a useful driver for capacity-building across many areas of the capacity-building framework. A major concern expressed was in maintaining capacity once it was developed, with staff movement to regional and international posts seen as a major drain on national capacity. For smaller countries, the smaller numbers of trained experts are often overwhelmed with work arising from international negotiations on the management and implementation of programmes at the national level. The GEF enabling activities have been of great benefit in supporting capacity development. It was also noted that use of the Internet is an integral part of many capacity-building activities, with rapid developments in web technology requiring frequent updates to training materials, and that use of regional experts in training and other capacity-building activities is highly desirable.

22. To address the need for a continuous approach to capacity development, the Pacific region is developing a new modality for continuous capacity development support through the Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme. This will also ensure that capacity-building is complementary to the efforts under way in the implementation of the Action Plan for the Pacific Islands Framework for Action on Climate Change (2006–2015). Each section of this Action Plan requires some degree of capacity-building. Monitoring and evaluation will also be covered through the process of a regional round table on climate change, involving all stakeholders and interested parties such as bilateral donors and academia.

23. Participants from the other regions described national efforts at capacity-building, including the role of national climate change committees in overseeing capacity-building for climate change. The committees are typically composed of government ministries, researchers, academia, industry and NGOs. National-level coordination aims to reduce duplication of effort in areas identified by governments and the key stakeholders. Differences in project management vary by donor, with some being flexible and others not. Activities that build strongly on country needs have been more effective. Countries have functional capacities in some areas, such as in the case of designated national authorities for the clean development mechanism. A major challenge in monitoring and evaluating capacity-building activities at the national level has been in assembling accurate records of all the activities being supported by relevant donors and organizations. No solution was immediately evident as to how to ensure that all activities are properly registered with national government coordinating bodies for climate change, especially since many projects could have climate change components, or links are established during project implementation.

24. Participants supported the principle of country-drivenness in terms of defining capacity-building priorities and implementation approaches and in reporting. It was noted that capacity-building support

should be provided in ways that best contribute towards national priorities, rather than through ad hoc project activities.

25. Participants pointed out the benefit of exchanging experiences at the regional level, and the need to have continuity in support for main climate change activities to avoid a loss of capacity through staff attrition and rotation. One presenter advocated a change in thinking about how capacity-building is designed and implemented, in order to help drive a new momentum of change.

26. Besides ensuring political and government support, the involvement of local stakeholders such as community leaders was identified as important in capacity-building. Translation of materials into local languages is of vital importance in awareness-raising and public participation efforts. The multiplier effect of small projects was especially highlighted, suggesting that bigger projects are not necessarily more effective or productive.

27. The importance of integrating capacity-building for climate change into broader capacity-building for development was also discussed at length. In this context the NCSA, supported by the GEF, addresses multiple MEAs; however, the mandate for monitoring the implementation of the capacity-building framework under the Convention requires efforts to be restricted to climate change. It is expected that efforts would be coordinated at the national level, to ensure a consistent and complementary approach to capacity-building. There are many challenges involved in coordinating activities across ministries and with NGOs and international organizations.

D. Monitoring capacity-building

28. According to the GEF, a total of 152 countries have received funding to conduct an NCSA. To date, a total of 1,117 enabling activities have been funded, with up to 11 per country. The NCSA culminates in a national capacity action plan that integrates elements of the MEAs and other GEF enabling activities, in the context of national sustainable development based on the United Nations Millennium Development Goals. A synthesis of completed NCSAs by the GSP indicates the following capacity needs:

- (a) Stakeholder engagement: mandates, organization of the leading agency, co-management arrangements, cooperation between stakeholders, and partnerships;
- (b) Information and knowledge: research, science, information access and sharing, communications, awareness and traditional knowledge;
- (c) Planning and policy: planning and strategy development, decision-making and regulatory frameworks;
- (d) Organization and implementation: mobilization of resources, technical skills and technology transfer, and execution of programmes and projects;
- (e) Monitoring and evaluation: monitoring, evaluation, learning and adaptive management.

29. The presentation on the work carried out by the GEF on capacity-building concluded that although capacity development is the core business of the GEF, capacity-building activities are not explicitly included in project design documents, and so are not reported in final project documents. This makes it difficult to verify progress and impact of the capacity-development at the country and programme levels, and impossible to quantify and attribute developed capacity. The indicator framework being developed by the GEF is aimed at overcoming this shortcoming.

30. A dual presentation by participants from Zambia and Finland discussed the implications of aid harmonization at the sectoral level on monitoring and reporting. Recognizing that capacity-building is a

cross-cutting issue and an integral part of most development assistance programmes, the presenters discussed the potential application of reporting under the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) Creditor Reporting System (CRS) database, including the use of "Rio markers". Members of the Development Assistance Committee (DAC) and multilateral donors report through the OECD-CRS, and, based on the policy objectives of a given aid activity, a marker is made to reflect support towards a Rio Convention (CBD, UNCCD or UNFCCC). It was pointed out that not all DAC members report against the climate change marker, and for those that do, the reporting is not comprehensive.

31. The Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness, Ownership, Harmonisation, Alignment, Results and Mutual Accountability, which has almost 100 developed and developing countries as members, advocates a country-driven approach to aid, with no individual donor activities, where funding is allocated through what is called basket-funding, at the sectoral level. A donor country serves as a sector group lead. Reporting to the UNFCCC is then done through the national communications of the countries involved, and in submissions. Each partner would thus reflect their priorities and experiences in terms of successes and failures.

32. A participant from China presented relevant experiences and lessons learned, including an acknowledgement of the importance of political will in building capacity and its critical role in development. Special attention was paid in the presentation to learning-by-doing for each area under the capacity-building framework within each relevant sector. The delivery of knowledge, information and awareness-raising to local governments, institutions, industries and citizens is a challenge for a large country like China with an unevenly distributed population. The participant also discussed principles for the design of indicators and how such indicators could be applied at the national, local and sectoral levels. Indicators could be used to evaluate capacity-building activities in terms of coverage of activities, range of beneficiaries, project inputs and the timing of activities. Another set of indicators could be used to evaluate capacity level in terms of performance of human capacity and institutions.

33. A participant from the United States described the approach of the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) to monitoring capacity-building activities to cover the series of assistance activities supported in developing countries. Over 45 countries are supported in clean energy technology, sustainable land use and forestry, and in adaptation to climate change. Monitoring and evaluation play complementary roles, with monitoring designed to support the performance of projects from a baseline towards a defined target, and evaluation designed to examine results, explore unintended results and provide lessons and recommendations. Output and outcome performance indicators used are carefully chosen to ensure that the data collected are useful for making management decisions and other enhancements to the implementation of the projects. It was mentioned that given the high cost of collecting data for monitoring and evaluation, it should be carried out sparingly, and that careful thought should be given to the use of the collected information.

34. The participant also described a new strategic framework designed to focus foreign assistance more strategically and help to track funds and associated results centrally. The foreign assistance coordination and tracking system was pilot tested in 2007, and was designed to collect standardized data to improve coordination and efficiency, increase transparency of assistance funds and improve performance and accountability of results. The presentation concluded that monitoring is complex, and that performance indicators can be used as tools, but there are limitations.

35. Lessons learned from different practitioners included the need to emphasize learning in the process of monitoring, where the approach used is participatory, to ensure a strong ownership and commitment to the process. A participant from UNDP described an approach used in monitoring and evaluating activities; an important element is a feedback loop in the community or project to ensure that results are used to improve the project implementation. A participant from UNITAR presented the

methods used for monitoring and evaluating its projects in different countries. Targets at the inception of projects are developed in a participatory way with project implementers, with regular reviews of their viability and appropriateness as projects are implemented. This flexibility ensures ownership and relevance as projects evolve. A template for capturing metrics of project execution has been developed for the UNITAR programme Advancing Capacity to Support Climate Change Adaptation⁵ to enable project advisors and implementers to keep a monthly journal. The intention is to capture information that would help evaluate progress towards reaching certain targets; the incentive for carrying out this work is to be tied to continued funding.

36. A participant from academia presented observations on education, based on the inter-university consortium project involving American and African universities referred to in paragraph 9 above. The speaker advocated a systematic approach that extends beyond the classroom and links with local institutions and national stakeholders, building on existing capacity in partner institutions; ensures that local interests are represented; and monitors and evaluates components of the education system, such as research, using conventional methods.

E. Evaluating capacity-building

1. Evaluating capacity development by the Global Environment Facility Evaluation Office

37. A participant from the GEF Evaluation Office presented the results of a case study by the GEF to evaluate capacity development. Case studies were conducted in two countries to assess GEF project portfolios. Results were generally positive and in some areas considerable progress has been made and it was concluded that capacity development support is relevant, if administered in line with national policy priorities and with a good level of national ownership. There were differences reported between the two case study countries in terms of main achievements, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability, with a mixture of positive and negative feedback. It was suggested that further work should be carried out to analyse capacity development across the GEF portfolio of projects. It was further suggested that a review of final evaluations of projects and earlier reports by evaluating offices and implementing agencies would be explored to look at the prevalence of key issues identified by country case studies.

2. Lessons learned from evaluation

38. Participants from the Evaluation and Oversight Unit of UNEP described a method for sharing knowledge,⁶ with the aim of basing the further implementation of activities on lessons learned. A framework of lessons has been developed based on a 'problem tree' structure using 'mind-mapping' software to explain a core problem statement or conclusion. Lessons are debated and underlying problems are identified or inferred. The problems are then clustered and organized in a hierarchy of causality. This approach enables multiple lessons to be clustered around commonly occurring issues or root causes. Particular lessons can be associated with more than one issue or problem. The framework can then be used to aid identification of common problems across a project or programme, to help cluster lessons around common problems, and as a tool to communicate evaluation lessons with intended users.

3. Project-level evaluation

39. Medium- and full-sized projects funded by the GEF have an evaluation component, to which seven per cent of the project budget is allocated. This usually involves collecting information through periodic reporting during project implementation, which is then used by an independent evaluator when the project ends to produce an evaluation report. The indicators used vary by project; no explicit indicators of capacity-building were required in the past unless the entire project was on capacity-

⁵ <www.unitar.org/ccp>.

⁶ <<http://www.unep.org/eou/Pdfs/Lessons%20Learned%20rpt.pdf>>.

building. The new indicator framework being developed by the GEF is expected to introduce indicators for capacity-building for all GEF projects. A participant from START described the approach that was used for the Assessments of Impacts and Adaptations to Climate Change project.⁷ This project was aimed at developing scientific capacity, with the emphasis on improving inputs into the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change Assessment Reports through peer-reviewed publications from developing countries. It was pointed out that some of the impact of the work carried out will emerge several years after the project is completed as the results continue to be used and applied. Indicators were defined to assess progress towards this broader goal, as well as the steps in the project implementation. Six main indicators have been developed to assess the following:

- (a) Successful completion of science assessments;
- (b) Scientific productivity and quality;
- (c) Participation and leadership in international science;
- (d) Engagement in policy and practice;
- (e) Recognition of scientific excellence;
- (f) Partnerships among institutions established and sustained.

40. Participants agreed that monitoring and evaluating capacity-building for climate change is most effective at the national level when it is not done in isolation, but is closely linked with broader monitoring and evaluation of development activities, since climate change is addressed in this context. A participant from the OAS emphasized the need to look at capacity-building in the context of the needs and demands articulated by countries, rather than from the point of view of supplying support for capacity-building activities; to design monitoring methods that ensure that the approaches used build on and support existing efforts and capacities; and to ensure that projects are designed to contribute to the assessment of climate change risk in the context of sustainable development.

F. The Global Environment Facility indicator framework

41. The GEF presented its draft framework for monitoring capacity development in its operations. It was pointed out that capacity-building is essential to improving performance and achieving positive results in GEF projects at the country level. Even though capacity development appears to be integrated into GEF operations, it remains an elusive concept with no way to measure its contribution. The draft indicator framework was presented as a solution to this problem.

42. Capacity development under the GEF is designed to create, enhance and maintain capacity in an environmental management system. Important attributes of capacity development include:

- (a) It requires ownership;
- (b) It requires collaborative agreements;
- (c) It is a continuous process;
- (d) It requires relevant information for effective decision-making;
- (e) It requires incentives and resources;
- (f) It needs to be part of early project design;

⁷ <www.aiaccproject.org>.

- (g) In relation to monitoring and measuring capacity development, it needs a baseline, benchmarks, specificity and the ability to be shown to result from a particular input or activity.

43. The proposed approach was designed to be reconciled with output/outcome measurement, in responding to the need of the GEF to monitor progress at the project and programme levels and its focus on delivering project outcomes and impacts during implementation to achieve global environmental benefits. A scorecard approach is used with specific indicators assigned a numeric value or ranking at the beginning of a project and then again at the completion, to assess progress. Different indicators would be developed for projects and programmes. The following indicators are proposed in five capacity areas:

- (a) Capacity for engagement;
 - (i) Legitimacy/mandate of lead organization;
 - (ii) Operational co-management mechanisms;
 - (iii) Cooperation with stakeholder groups;
- (b) Capacity to access and use information and knowledge;
 - (i) Awareness of stakeholders;
 - (ii) Information access and sharing by stakeholders;
 - (iii) Environmental education;
 - (iv) Research and science;
 - (v) Traditional knowledge;
- (c) Capacity for policy and legislation development;
 - (i) Planning and strategy development;
 - (ii) Adequate policy and regulatory frameworks;
 - (iii) Informed decision-making;
- (d) Capacity for management and implementation;
 - (i) Mobilization and organization of resources;
 - (ii) Technical skills and technology transfer;
- (e) Capacity to monitor and evaluate;
 - (i) Monitoring of projects and programmes;
 - (ii) Evaluation of projects and programmes.

44. Feedback was given to the GEF by participants, which included issues related to the use of quantitative measures to assess the indicators, and scaling between different levels of management from the local and project levels to the programme and national levels. Establishing a baseline in monitoring was reported to be a challenge; the initial assessment of the relevant indicators before starting a project

intervention was designed as an approach to overcome this. The GEF indicated that it will revise its proposed indicator framework before it is presented for endorsement by the GEF council at a future date.

IV. Summary of discussions

45. Presentations and a breakout group session generated much discussion on many issues for consideration in designing a monitoring and evaluation system at different levels. Most presentations were on project-level monitoring, with some work on evaluation, and some references to how the monitoring and evaluation is, or can, be carried out at the national or global level. Discussions raised many issues that could be taken into account in deciding the level of involvement by the SBI and the COP.

46. Participants agreed that monitoring should have a defined purpose and results should lead to specific management decisions. Specific indicators are useful if they are designed to provide specific information that is useful for a particular decision process, and such indicators would need to be chosen sparingly with the emphasis on being practical and useful to the process of capacity-building, rather than fulfilling a general desire for monitoring.

47. Constructing lessons learned is a useful approach to understanding why some projects are successful and others are not. It would also be useful if such lessons are actively fed back into programme and project management in order to adjust future operations and improve the effectiveness of capacity development.

48. Monitoring and evaluation at the national level is being carried out mainly by planning ministries in the context of development efforts. It was noted that it would be important to engage this community in a workshop setting, and that any future efforts should find ways and means of making this possible.

49. Many references were made to the monitoring and evaluation efforts in the context of the Paris Declaration, as a process that could contribute to the monitoring of capacity-building for climate change. A foreign assistance coordination and tracking system was presented by USAID as an example of a national-level approach to monitoring foreign assistance. It was concluded that this approach is feasible; however, it requires resources and data, will take time, and would involve communication between different stakeholders to be effectively implemented.

50. The choice of a baseline for future monitoring and evaluation of progress emerged as another important issue. Participants indicated that the information collected by countries through the NCSA could serve as a baseline, as long it was aggregated to measures that would directly support the indicators chosen.

51. All participants agreed about the long-term nature of capacity-building, and that monitoring and evaluation should support this long-term view in a practical way, without interfering with the process of capacity development itself.
