



**UNITED
NATIONS**



**Framework Convention
on Climate Change**

Distr.
GENERAL

FCCC/TP/2004/1
14 June 2004

ENGLISH ONLY

**The range and effectiveness of capacity-building in developing countries
relating to decision 2/CP.7**

Technical paper*

* This paper was prepared by Alain Lafontaine, Evan Green, Marie-Karin Godbout and Moreno Padilla of Le Groupe-conseil baastel ltée. The technical paper was commissioned by the secretariat of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. It does not necessarily reflect the views of the secretariat; the responsibility for the text remains with the authors.

CONTENTS

| | <i>Paragraphs</i> | <i>Page</i> |
|--|-------------------|-------------|
| I. INTRODUCTION..... | 1–3 | 5 |
| II. METHODOLOGY..... | 4–11 | 6 |
| A. Initial telephone scoping meeting | 5 | 6 |
| B. Preliminary documentation review | 6 | 6 |
| C. Interviews and survey | 7 | 6 |
| D. In-depth documentation review and analysis | 8–11 | 7 |
| III. CAPACITY-BUILDING IN CLIMATE CHANGE – NEEDS AND PRIORITIES | 12–27 | 8 |
| A. Summary of capacity-building needs and priorities..... | 12–21 | 8 |
| B. Analysis and conclusions | 22–25 | 11 |
| C. Lessons learned | 26 | 12 |
| D. Recommendations | 27 | 12 |
| IV. CLIMATE CHANGE CAPACITY-BUILDING ACTIVITIES | 28–63 | 12 |
| A. Multilateral efforts to address decision 2/CP.7 and country needs/priorities | 29–48 | 13 |
| B. Bilateral activities relating to the capacity-building framework | 49–50 | 16 |
| C. Analysis and conclusions | 51–58 | 18 |
| D. Remaining issues to address country priorities..... | 59–61 | 19 |
| E. Lessons learned | 62 | 20 |
| F. Recommendations | 63 | 20 |
| V. RESULTS/IMPACTS OF CLIMATE CHANGE CAPACITY-BUILDING ACTIVITIES..... | 64–92 | 20 |
| A. Results..... | 64–77 | 20 |
| B. Impacts | 78–80 | 23 |
| C. On the general effectiveness of capacity-building interventions | 81–84 | 24 |
| D. Analysis and conclusions | 85–86 | 25 |

| <i>Page</i> | | <i>Paragraphs</i> | |
|-------------|--|-------------------|----|
| | E. Lessons learned | 87–90 | 25 |
| | F. Recommendations | 91–92 | 25 |
| VI. | AVAILABILITY, ACCESSIBILITY AND EFFICIENCY OF RESOURCE USE | 93–130 | 26 |
| | A. Availability of resources | 93–97 | 26 |
| | B. Access to resources | 98–105 | 27 |
| | C. Efficiency of resource use | 106–118 | 28 |
| | D. Analysis and conclusions | 119–121 | 31 |
| | E. Lessons learned | 122–124 | 32 |
| | F. Recommendations | 125–130 | 32 |
| VII. | SUSTAINABILITY OF CLIMATE CHANGE CAPACITY-BUILDING RESULTS | 131–161 | 32 |
| | A. Framework for sustainability of climate change capacity-building activities | 131–132 | 32 |
| | B. Key factors affecting sustainability | 133–134 | 33 |
| | C. Building blocks of a sustainable “integrated approach” to capacity-building for climate change | 135–147 | 34 |
| | D. Stakeholder involvement | 148–154 | 37 |
| | E. Analysis and conclusion | 155–156 | 38 |
| | F. Lessons learned | 157–158 | 38 |
| | G. Recommendations | 159–161 | 39 |
| VIII. | INDICATORS FOR CAPACITY-BUILDING INTERVENTIONS ... | 162–188 | 39 |
| | A. Key international work on capacity-building indicators | 162–176 | 39 |
| | B. Possible application of capacity-building indicators | 177–179 | 41 |
| | C. Analysis and conclusions | 180–181 | 42 |
| | D. Lessons learned | 182–184 | 42 |
| | E. Recommendations | 185–188 | 42 |

| | <i>Paragraphs</i> | <i>Page</i> |
|---|-------------------|-------------|
| IX. SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS, LESSONS LEARNED AND RECOMMENDATIONS | 189–196 | 47 |
| <u>Annexes</u> | | |
| I. OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE OF CAPACITY-BUILDING IN THE FRAMEWORK OF DECISION 2/CP.7..... | | 49 |
| II. SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE: SURVEY OF SELECTED DEVELOPING COUNTRIES (NON-ANNEX I PARTIES)..... | | 51 |
| III. SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE: SURVEY OF SELECTED KEY ANNEX II PARTIES/DONOR ORGANIZATIONS) | | 58 |
| IV. CONCLUSIONS OF WORKSHOP ON IMPACT AND ADAPTATION METHODOLOGIES | | 65 |
| V. ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS..... | | 66 |
| VI. REFERENCES..... | | 67 |

I. Introduction

1. Following the implementation of decision 2/CP.7 of the Marrakesh Accords, which is directed at building the capacities of Parties not included in Annex I to the Convention (non-Annex I Parties), the Conference of the Parties (COP), by its decision 9/CP.9, requested the secretariat to prepare a paper with technical appendices investigating the range and effectiveness of capacity-building activities in developing countries aimed at implementing decision 2/CP.7. Using case studies as supporting evidence, this paper was to investigate the results and impacts of capacity-building activities, as well as lessons learned, successes, and challenges relating to this endeavour. In addition, indicators and factors contributing to the achievements and limitations of capacity-building activities were to be identified and discussed. The findings and conclusions of the technical paper may help improve the ability of developing countries to undertake needs assessments at country-level and to develop effective and far-reaching capacity-building activities outlined in the capacity-building framework annexed to decision 2/CP.7 (hereinafter referred to as the CB framework), as well as improve the sustainability and effectiveness of capacity-building activities relating to the implementation of the Convention objective.

2. The technical paper presented here focuses on capacity-building activities and explores existing gaps and possible complementary activities. It examines the conditions for the enhancement and/or creation of enabling environments for United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) capacity-building activities. Enabling environments refers to the overall policy – *economic and regulatory* – and the accountability within which institutions and individuals operate. The paper also provides an analysis of the sustainability of capacity-building activities implemented in developing countries. Specifically, the chapters of the technical paper contain:

- (a) An analysis of the capacity-building needs and priorities of non-Annex I Parties in relation to the initial scope of needs and areas as listed in paragraph 15 of the CB framework
- (b) An analysis of programmes and activities implemented by various international agencies and institutions relating to the CB framework
- (c) Key results and impacts achieved as a result of capacity-building activities, including an identification of needs and gaps, and an assessment of factors and constraints in developing countries that influence the effectiveness of capacity-building projects and programmes
- (d) An analysis of the availability of, and access to, resources and of the efficiency of their deployment
- (e) An analysis of the sustainability of capacity-building activities and the extent of national engagement, including an analysis of the extent and variety of stakeholders (non-governmental organizations (NGOs), the private sector, community organizations, etc.) involved in and benefiting from capacity-building activities
- (f) A presentation of indicators that can be used to determine the success of capacity-building activities, based on the review completed
- (g) Recommendations for the further implementation of the CB framework.

3. Premises that are used in these analyses include the following:

- (a) Capacity-building activities relating to the implementation of the Convention should build on work already undertaken by developing countries, as well as on the work undertaken with support from multilateral and bilateral organizations

- (b) The capacity-building needs already identified in the various decisions of the COP should continue to be comprehensively and promptly addressed to promote sustainable development in developing countries
- (c) Capacity-building must be country-driven, addressing the specific needs and conditions of developing countries
- (d) Capacity-building is a continuous, progressive and iterative process, the implementation of which should be based on the priorities of developing countries
- (e) Capacity-building activities undertaken within the CB framework should maximize synergy between the Convention and other global environmental agreements, as appropriate
- (f) Capacity-building is crucial to developing countries, especially those that are particularly vulnerable to the adverse effects of climate change
- (g) Capacity-building involves “learning by doing”. Demonstration projects may be used in identifying and learning about the specific capacities that need to be developed further in developing countries
- (h) Existing national institutions have an important role to play in supporting capacity-building activities in developing countries
- (i) National coordinating mechanisms, focal points and coordinating entities have an important role to play in ensuring coordination at the country and regional levels and may serve as the focal points for coordinating capacity-building activities.

II. Methodology

4. In keeping with the commitment of UNFCCC to a continuous, progressive and iterative approach, the following methodology was used in the preparation of this technical paper.

A. Initial telephone scoping meeting

5. The consultant began work with a telephone meeting with the UNFCCC secretariat in Bonn. The purpose of this initial meeting was threefold: to identify and locate relevant information and documentation and to identify key individuals to be interviewed; to develop a detailed understanding of the secretariat’s expectations; and to fine-tune the scope of the mandate and the proposed methodology for this project on the basis of the comments by UNFCCC.

B. Preliminary documentation review

6. Key documentation was reviewed for this paper. On the basis of the review process and additional specific guidelines provided by the secretariat, the consultant developed a detailed framework for systematic documentation analysis, building on the terms of reference and specifically on the CB framework. In addition, important information gaps to be filled by further reviews of the documentation and interviews were identified.

C. Interviews and survey

7. A list of key interviewees and survey respondents (developed by sampling) and a made-to-measure survey/interview questionnaire were drafted in conjunction with the secretariat. Once the questionnaire was developed and approved, a survey was carried out and interviews were held with some Annex II and non-Annex I Parties to the Convention to further identify current capacity-building interventions (experiences, lessons learned, etc.) and to prepare relevant case studies derived directly from the experience of both groups of stakeholders. To keep costs down, the interviews were conducted

by telephone and the surveys by e-mail. Of the Annex II Parties (including multilateral and bilateral agencies, foundations and NGOs), four multilateral organizations and one NGO responded to the survey. Eight non-Annex I Parties also responded. The results of the survey and interviews do not, however, reflect the general views of Parties but rather indicate some of the lessons learned in the process of implementing the CB framework.

D. In-depth documentation review and analysis

8. The consultant ensured a thorough review of relevant documents, including additional information deemed necessary by the secretariat or other stakeholders. This included:

- (a) Documents on capacity-building prepared by the secretariat, submissions of Parties and conclusions, including the terms of reference in annex III to document FCCC/SBI/2003/8, and COP decisions relating to capacity-building
- (b) National communications of Annex II and non-Annex I Parties
- (c) The technical paper on capacity-building in the development and transfer of technologies (FCCC/TP/2003/1) which the secretariat prepared for the Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice (SBSTA), under the guidance of the Expert Group on Technology Transfer
- (d) Documentation on current capacity-building activities of countries, including national adaptation programmes of action (NAPAs), national capacity self assessment (NCSA) reports, national poverty reduction strategy papers (PRSPs) and national sustainable development strategies
- (e) International literature and reports of the Global Environment Facility (GEF), bilateral and multilateral development agencies, international organizations and NGOs relating to the implementation of the CB framework.

9. Information for the analysis in this paper was also taken from the following sources:

- (a) UNFCCC secretariat activities:
 - (i) Training (for the greenhouse gas inventory, expert review teams, etc.)
 - (ii) Public information and awareness (databases, web-based information systems, etc.)
 - (iii) Workshops of the expert groups/bodies (the Expert Group on Technology Transfer, Consultative Group of Experts on National Communications of Parties not included in Annex I to the Convention, the Least Developed Countries (LDC) Expert Group and the clean development mechanism (CDM) Executive Board).
- (b) The GEF and its implementing agencies:
 - (i) Enabling activities (assistance with preparation of national communications, top-up projects, etc.)
 - (ii) Capacity-building activities integrated into mainstream GEF-funded climate mitigation and adaptation projects and programmes.

10. The review also built on the consultant's extensive past and current analytical work on capacity-building.

11. A complete bibliography of documentation reviewed can be found in annex VI.

III. Capacity-building in climate change – needs and priorities

A. Summary of capacity-building needs and priorities

12. In 2000, the UNFCCC secretariat conducted a study on the needs and priorities of developing countries on capacity-building in the area of climate change. This study was largely based on the initial national communications of 23 non-Annex I Parties submitted to UNFCCC before 1 March 2000 and on the experience of the capacity development initiative (CDI) assessment of needs.¹ The results of this study together with submissions by Parties were used to define the initial scope of needs and areas for the CB framework.²

13. Many non-Annex I Parties confirmed their capacity-building needs in the process of preparing their proposals for the first phase of GEF support for enabling activities (as part of their first national communications). Vulnerability and adaptation assessment, greenhouse gas (GHG) emission inventories, education and public awareness, and training were the needs most often mentioned. During the actual preparation of the initial national communications, non-Annex I Parties identified technical and financial assistance and institutional strengthening as key areas requiring assistance to address the needs that had been identified at the proposal stage.

14. Additional studies on the capacity development needs of developing countries in the area of climate change have since been conducted and come to similar conclusions. For instance, a study completed in 2001 by the United Nations Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR)³ concluded that “capacity-building needs are considerable and require high financial and human resource investments”. The study involved a survey of the views and perceptions of stakeholders in developing countries from Africa and the Middle East, Asia and Latin America. Some of the main needs identified through this project were capacity-building for improved decision-making, formal training in core skills, skill development in business promotion, technology acquisition negotiations and networking, and improvements to the institutional and legal framework, thus confirming some of the needs previously identified.

15. In document FCCC/SBI/2003/INF.9, non-Annex 1 Parties identified their own capacity-building needs in accordance with decisions 2/CP.7 and 3/CP.7. Some of the capacity-building activities identified were drawn from the national pilot studies, NCSAs, international cooperation projects that contain components on needs assessment, and reviews of past and ongoing capacity-building activities.

16. More recently, in accordance with decision 4/CP.7, the secretariat published a technical paper on capacity-building in the development and transfer of technologies.⁴ The needs identified in this study further echo those identified in the CB framework, the CDI, and the UNITAR study in the areas of development of various aspects of institutional, human resource and information management capacity.

17. Other sources of information about developing country needs are the PRSPs. In these documents, developing countries set out their priorities and most pressing development needs. Between March 2001 and January 2004, 52 countries had submitted their PRSPs to the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank. However, in the context of PRSPs countries define their priorities and

¹ The GEF Secretariat together with the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), launched the Capacity Development Initiative (CDI) in 2000 in order to achieve a better understanding of the scale and scope of capacity development needs where the Convention on Biological Diversity and the UNFCCC are concerned. The first phase of the CDI consisted of developing a comprehensive assessment of country needs undertaken regionally in Africa and the Middle East, Asia/Pacific, Central and Eastern Europe, and Latin America and the Caribbean. Reports identifying needs and priorities were made available between September and October 2000.

² See annex I for the list of needs and areas for capacity-building as outlined in the CB framework.

³ United Nations Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR). *Who Needs What to Implement the Kyoto Protocol?*

An Assessment of Capacity-building Needs in 33 Developing Countries. 2001.

⁴ FCCC/TP/2003/1.

needs within the broader scope of sustainable development and not specifically in terms of climate change. Countries' national environmental plans usually outline their environmental priorities in a much more detailed manner. Although many countries mention their commitment to participate in the implementation of the UNFCCC, only a minority mention capacity development in the area of climate change as a pressing need. Clean air, waste management and conservation issues are among the top environmental priorities of developing countries.

18. In order to simplify the analysis, this study will discuss capacity-building at the three levels of intervention – systemic, institutional and individual – which have been used by the GEF, UNITAR, the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC)⁵ as a basis for discussing capacity-building issues.

19. The *systemic level* is concerned with the creation of *enabling environments*, that is, the overall *policy – economic and regulatory* – and the accountability within which institutions and individuals operate. The development of *relationships and processes* between institutions, both formal and informal, is also a form of capacity-building at this level. At the *institutional level*, capacity-building is concerned with the development of relevant *institutions and organizations*. In particular, it means their *missions, mandates, cultures, structures, competencies, processes, human and financial resources, information resources and infrastructures*. Finally, capacity-building at the *individual level* is “the development of *personal skills and expertise, the establishment of personal networks, and improvement in accountability and motivation* of the national agents working on climate change issues”.⁶

20. The scope of needs and areas identified in the CB framework could be loosely regrouped roughly along the following lines:

⁵ These are categories used by the GEF guidelines for preparing the national capacity self-assessments, by the United Nations Development Programme (*Capacity Development Indicators, UNDP/GEF Resource Kit (No. 4)*), and by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (*Methodological and Technological Issues in Technology Transfer*).

⁶ FCCC/SBI/2004/9.

Table 1. 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, emissions 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 • The clean development mechanism • Needs arising out of the implementation of Article 4, paragraphs 8 and 9, of the Convention • Public awareness |

21. Table 2 summarizes the key capacity-building needs and priorities identified in the national communications, and the interviews and surveys conducted by this study on capacity-building.

Table 2. Summary of capacity-building needs and priorities

| |
|---|
| <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 |

B. Analysis and conclusions

22. The needs identified by the developing countries in the different kinds of country submission (national communications, etc.), in the literature and through interviews are numerous. The scope of the needs identified in the CB framework is still very pertinent and in line with the needs expressed by the countries through different assessments. As capacity-building is a slow, complex and resource-intensive process, needs are normally addressed over many years. Currently, there is no evidence that these countries' needs have changed. Instead, some *systemic* needs, such as better coordination between departments, *institutional* needs, such as the need to consolidate priorities, and *individual* capacity needs, such as the need for trained personnel in climate change research, are confirmed by virtually every developing country submission and study conducted.

23. The country needs and priorities identified by respondents were related to: the production of national communications and GHG inventories; emission database management; 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 the implementation of adaptation measures.

24. Some of the non-Annex I Parties surveyed in the course of this study⁷ identified the need for more support from the secretariat and the GEF in terms of:

- (a) Distribution of information and lessons learned from the experience of countries that are more advanced in the UNFCCC process;
- (b) A larger pool of human resources with expertise in capacity-building at the GEF secretariat in order to provide capacity-building support to countries;
- (c) A means of informing developing countries directly when new funding mechanisms are in the planning stage in order for these countries to start planning and acquire the necessary information and guidelines early in the process so that they are ready to submit their proposals as soon as funding becomes available. This will ensure a level playing field so that countries with better access to information do not have an advantage over others which have less information.

25. The results of the NCSA and NAPA processes, which will be made available starting in 2004, will shed more light on country-specific needs. These initiatives are under way and their results may be considered in further developing the scope of the needs addressed by the CB framework.

C. Lessons learned

26. Although the CB framework is still largely in line with the present priorities of non-Annex I Parties, a thorough and systematic assessment for and by non-Annex I Parties of their existing and required capacities in view of the implementation of the UNFCCC will be instrumental in clarifying further their specific needs and the relevant priority actions in each country. It would also probably help to refine the CB framework.

D. Recommendations

27. Overall guidance, such as that provided by the CB framework, should be complemented by a more precise, country-specific definition of needs and priorities. It is recommended that special effort be made to ensure that the outcomes of the ongoing NCSA and NAPA country-driven processes feed into the CB framework in order to guide and strengthen its implementation further.

IV. Climate change capacity-building activities

28. Chapter III above examined the nature and the extent of countries' capacity-building needs and priorities. This chapter will examine what actions have been or are being supported by multilateral and bilateral agencies in order to address these needs and priorities. It is not possible within the confines of space of this paper to provide an exhaustive list of the capacity-building projects and programmes supported by all donors in all non-Annex I countries in the area of climate change capacity. Instead, the discussion will be limited to a number of illustrative examples.

⁷ Non-Annex I countries surveyed during this study included Barbados, Bhutan, Malaysia, Mexico, Pakistan, Philippines, Samoa, South Africa and Uganda.

A. Multilateral efforts to address decision 2/CP.7 and country needs/priorities

29. The GEF funds capacity-building activities as the operating entity of the financial mechanism of the Convention. It channels its resources through UNDP, the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) and the World Bank as its implementing agencies (IAs). Although these agencies are the most active with respect to the implementation of the UNFCCC, other United Nations agencies such as the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO), the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) and UNITAR also provide assistance for this purpose as GEF executing agencies. This chapter discusses the main types of capacity-building activity conducted by the multilateral agencies. Chapter VI below examines in more detail the types of resources available to developing countries from these agencies for capacity-building programmes.

1. Global Environment Facility

30. Over the past decade, the GEF has provided more than USD 2 billion for more than 511 climate change projects implemented through UNEP, UNDP and the World Bank across the globe. Within the climate change portfolio, capacity-building represents a large fraction of this support. The GEF's capacity-building activities include a wide range of efforts at all levels, from the individual to the systemic, providing funding for developing countries all the way from the development of policies to financing specific training for researchers.

31. The largest source of financial support for capacity-building in the GEF climate change focal area is through mitigation projects⁸ within its four operational programmes.⁹

32. A preliminary analysis of the climate change portfolio shows that virtually all projects in these operational programmes include important capacity-building components.¹⁰ Through its operational programmes, the GEF addresses barriers to capacity-building in climate change at the systemic, institutional and individual levels, helping countries:

- (a) To develop and transfer technologies;
- (b) To change users' and consumers' behaviour;
- (c) To improve access to financial and other types of resource;
- (d) To develop political awareness and political support;
- (e) To develop managerial and business expertise.

33. Capacity-building in these areas is supported through: demonstration projects; information dissemination and support for networking; the creation and strengthening of institutions; the establishment of rules, regulations or plans; and teaching and training.

34. Apart from the operational programmes, additional support for capacity-building is provided through funding for enabling activities,¹¹ whose primary objective has been the preparation of initial national communications (thereby building capacity for the assessment of GHG emissions), the identification of national activities and programmes for implementing the UNFCCC, the integration of climate change issues into national planning, and the identification of options to address vulnerability

⁸ FCCC/SBI/2003/MISC.2.

⁹ OP5 Removal of Barriers to Energy Efficiency and Energy Conservation; OP6 Promoting the Adoption of Renewable Energy by Removing Barriers and Reducing Implementation Costs; OP7 Reducing the Long-Term Costs of Low Greenhouse Gas Emitting Energy Technologies; and OP11 Promoting Environmentally Sustainable Transport.

¹⁰ GEF unpublished data as of March 2004 (made available for this study).

¹¹ 238 projects for a total value of more than USD 177 million (as of March 2004, including projects in the pipeline).

and adaptation to climate change. Other enabling activities related to capacity-building for the implementation of the UNFCCC have been conducted in terms of:¹²

- (a) Identification of technology needs and modalities to acquire and absorb them, and to design, evaluate and host projects for that purpose;
- (b) Participation in systematic climate change observation networks;
- (c) Improvement of emission factors to assess GHG emissions;
- (d) Developing, strengthening and improving national activities for public awareness and education, and access to information.

35. As of December 2003, a total of 143 countries had submitted their national communications. Of the non-Annex I Parties, 121 had submitted their first national communication; two of these (Mexico and the Republic of Korea) had also submitted their second national communication. Valuable work has been done by all Parties on various topics directly related to the national communications, such as GHG inventories, and vulnerability and adaptation assessments. A level of capacity that would not have been possible otherwise has been developed through this process.

2. United Nations Development Programme

36. The GEF also funded (through the GEF Trust Fund) a GEF/UNDP project specifically designed to address the special needs of least developed countries (LDCs). The Building Human and Institutional Capacities to Address Climate Change Issues in 46 Least-Developed Countries project is specifically designed to strengthen the capacity of climate change focal points in LDCs. The project intends to build the human and institutional capacity of the climate change focal points by providing wider access to information and means of communication. While helping countries to meet some of their obligations under the UNFCCC, these activities also address some of their main needs and priorities.

37. Apart from the support given to non-Annex I Parties for their first national communications and phase II of enabling activities (i.e., technology needs assessments), and the expected support for the second national communications, UNDP/GEF is participating in five regional, three global and 316 country projects. The regional projects cover Africa, the Pacific Islands, Asia, Europe/the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) region, and Central America, Mexico and Cuba. They consist of building human and institutional capacity, capacity-building for global observation systems, assessment of technology needs, capacity-building for improving GHG inventories, abatement strategies and capacity-building for adaptation,¹³ and are funded through the GEF Trust Fund.

38. In LDCs, UNDP/GEF is supporting the preparation of the NAPAs (through the LDC Fund). Here it is involved in two key projects being executed by UNITAR aimed at capacity-building specific to the needs of these countries. The first is building the human and institutional capacity of LDCs in order to improve electronic communications with the UNFCCC secretariat. The second is providing technical assistance and training in the preparation of NAPAs¹⁴ by LDCs.

39. A third category of GEF enabling activity projects being implemented by UNDP/GEF is the NCSAs (funded through the GEF Trust Fund). Through this project, LDCs and small island developing States (SIDS) will have access to up to USD 25,000 to develop their proposals to the GEF, and these

¹² United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. Capacity-building. Information from the Global Environment Facility and relevant international organizations on progress in the implementation of projects and programmes responding to decision 2/CP.7. Submissions from the GEF and relevant international organizations. 26 May 2003. See document FCCC/SBI/2003/MISC.2.

¹³ Idem.

¹⁴ FCCC/SBI/2003/MISC.3.

together with developing countries will have access to up to USD 200,000.¹⁵ The objective of the NCSAs is to build upon past experience in order to prioritize the countries' most critical needs in view of the implementation of the Biodiversity and Climate Change conventions and to develop strategies to address them.¹⁶

3. United Nations Environment Programme

40. UNEP/GEF's 57 projects contributing to capacity-building on climate change focus on the areas of: assessment for implementation of mitigation options; the development and transfer of technology; vulnerability and adaptation assessment; capacity-building for the implementation of adaptation measures; national communications; research and systematic observation; education, training and public awareness; and the CDM, in accordance with the needs identified in the CB framework.

41. It has implemented successfully, in collaboration with UNDP, the GEF-funded National Communications Support Programme which provides technical assistance to non-Annex I Parties. With funding from the GEF, UNEP implemented the project on Country Case Studies on Sources and Sinks of Greenhouse Gases which assisted nine developing countries in drawing up comprehensive inventories of GHG emissions and sinks. Currently, UNEP is working to improve the capacities of developing countries in preparing climate change action plans linked to the national planning process.¹⁷

42. The UNEP/GEF enabling activities programme is also building capacity in countries to meet their obligations under the Convention and to prepare adaptation plans through NAPAs (through the LDC Fund). These activities build capacity in LDCs to assess how climate change affects them and how they can respond in the context of national circumstances. UNEP/GEF has initiated a global project entitled Assessment of Impacts of and Adaptation to Climate Change (AIACC), supporting 24 research activities in over 50 developing countries. In addition, UNEP/GEF is implementing several projects that assist national cleaner production centres in the integration of energy efficiency into their mainstream programmes. It is also implementing the Energy Management and Performance Energy Savings Scheme (EMPRESS) which helps in establishing specialized energy service companies, which provide services to industrial and commercial clients in Central and East European countries.

43. In terms of the CDM, UNEP/GEF through the UNEP Risø Centre (URC) in Denmark is supporting a four-year project on capacity-building for the CDM with funding from the Government of the Netherlands. The project will generate understanding of opportunities under the CDM in 12 developing countries and will allow the development of the necessary capacities for countries to formulate and implement projects under the CDM.

4. World Bank

44. The World Bank/GEF is implementing 134 projects in the climate change focal area. These projects "are designed to reduce the risks of global climate change while providing energy for sustainable development" by taking action in four main areas:¹⁸

- (a) Removing barriers to energy efficiency and energy conservation;
- (b) Promoting the adoption of renewable energy by removing barriers and reducing implementation costs;
- (c) Reducing the long-term costs of low-GHG-emitting energy technologies;
- (d) Supporting the development of sustainable transport.

¹⁵ FCCC/SBI/2003/14.

¹⁶ FCCC/SBI/2003/MISC.2.

¹⁷ Idem.

¹⁸ World Bank web site: [http://lnweb18.worldbank.org/ESSD/envext.nsf/46ByDocName/ClimateChange Projects](http://lnweb18.worldbank.org/ESSD/envext.nsf/46ByDocName/ClimateChange%20Projects).

45. Although the World Bank/GEF has implemented numerous projects, one example that incorporates some of these main areas listed above is the Lima Urban Transport project. This project will create and foster an efficient multi-modal and poverty-oriented urban transport system which should help to reduce GHG emissions and local air and noise pollution, and to enhance the legal and institutional framework that ensures the sustainability of measures implemented. There are similar examples in many countries across the world.

46. The World Bank has also launched the National Joint Implementation/Clean Development Mechanism (JI/CDM) Strategy Studies Programme (NSS Programme) with the objective of providing capacity-building assistance to the JI/CDM host countries regarding the application of the Kyoto Protocol mechanisms to reduce GHG emissions. In addition, the PCF Plus programme, associated with the World Bank's Prototype Carbon Fund (PCF), provides capacity-building, most importantly project development training, as well as research and assistance with methodological issues related to the CDM.

5. United Nations Conference on Trade and Development

47. UNCTAD's work on climate change capacity-building focuses on the CDM and GHG markets. It has three main projects in Africa, Brazil and the countries with economies in transition. In Africa, it is implementing a capacity-building project aimed at getting started with CDM in five LDCs (Tanzania, Uganda, Mozambique, Zambia and Malawi). In Brazil, the project aims to engage the private sector in the CDM. In that particular case, UNCTAD is focused on supporting Brazil's Inter-Ministerial Commission on Climate Change and the Brazilian Climate Change Forum to establish a public-private operational entity to facilitate CDM investments in Brazil. In the countries with economies in transition (Bulgaria, Croatia, Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia) the project consists of the development of plans of action to build the capacity of the countries to participate in the Kyoto Protocol mechanisms, including the proposed European Union (EU) emissions trading scheme.¹⁹

6. The United Nations Industrial Development Organization

48. UNIDO's work on capacity-building consists of six projects in 13 countries in Africa, the Middle East, and Central and Eastern Europe. The main activities supported by this agency have been: capacity-building and services for CDM/JI project financing; the provision of tools for awareness raising and CDM/JI project development; capacity-building and technology diffusion for the public and private sectors; and assessment and implementation of mitigation options. UNIDO is also supporting a CDM capacity-building project to assist host countries in preparing CDM project proposals.

B. Bilateral activities relating to the capacity-building framework

49. The country documents examined and the interviews/surveys conducted show that Annex II Parties make important direct contributions to capacity-building for climate change in developing countries, in addition to their contributions to multilateral agencies such as the GEF. For example, seven Annex II Parties have provided assistance in connection with national communications and GHG inventories to 45 countries in Latin America, Eastern and Central Europe, and Asia. Thirteen Annex II Parties reported on their capacity-building activities in the areas of research and systematic observations, including assistance in climate forecast research and training, air quality monitoring, setting up atmospheric models to study climate change, and exchange programmes. Eleven Annex II Parties reported substantial financial support for capacity-building for joint implementation and the CDM. Several Parties supported the establishment of technology and research centres in developing countries and LDCs. Three of the main foci in terms of direct cooperation are education and public awareness, technology transfer and capacity-building for the CDM. Box 1 shows some examples of initiatives undertaken by Annex II Parties.

¹⁹ FCCC/SBI/2003/MISC.2.

Box 1. Examples of supporting interventions by Annex II Parties

Australia supports climate change capacity-building activities in South East Asia and the Pacific Islands across a wide range of themes, for example, energy policy, the CDM, forestry, waste management, agriculture, coastal zone management and vulnerability assessments.

Belgium focuses on African countries with two main programmes: the Special Programme for Africa and the Southern African Development Community programme. The main activities are water management, forestation and soil degradation.

Through its Climate Change Fund and the CDM and JI Office, **Canada** supports among other things capacity-building activities regarding research, technology transfer and renewable energy in Central and Eastern Europe, Africa, Latin America and the Caribbean, and Asia.

The countries of the **European Community** conduct diverse climate change activities through numerous programmes on capacity-building in multiple countries in the areas of energy, the environment and agriculture, to strengthen technical and institutional capacity at all levels in research and systematic observation, vulnerability and adaptation assessment, the integration of adaptation responses into national development strategies, enabling environments and technology transfer, the CDM, and education and awareness.

France supports various capacity-building interventions in climate change in Africa, addressing land management, agricultural practices and reforestation.

Finland's contributions to capacity-building consist of projects in different parts of the world, focusing mainly on the CDM/JI and forest management.

Germany's Climate Protection Programme in Developing Countries aims to strengthen relevant organizations and institutions in developing countries, as well as enhancing their personnel resources, and to develop such organizations and institutions.

Japan has two main projects – the Kyoto Initiative, and the Environmental Conservation Initiative for Sustainable Development – and two regular courses that provide extended training to developing countries worldwide. The courses are on technology for GHG emission mitigation and capacity-building for policy makers regarding global warming (Kyoto Mechanisms).

New Zealand supports regional and national climate change workshops and adaptation projects in the Pacific SIDS. The type of activity varies from one project to another.

Norway contributes to capacity-building in different parts of the world by providing assistance for energy efficiency projects, forest conservation and replanting projects, technology transfer projects, and the CDM and JI.

The Netherlands' main programme is the Climate Change Studies Assistance Programme. This programme helps to develop climate programmes in developing countries and to conduct analyses of cost-effective measures.

Switzerland has supported studies of participation in the CDM. It also supports projects on sustainable urban development and transport, such as those in Bolivia and China.

The United Kingdom supports capacity-building through one fund and five main climate change programmes: (1) the Climate Change Challenge Fund; (2) the Technology Partnership Initiative; (3) the Environmental Technology Best Practice Programme; (4) the Knowledge and Research programme; and (5) the Cleaner Technologies to Lower GHG Emissions programme.

The United States supports four main capacity-building in climate change initiatives: the Initiative on Joint Implementation; the Country Studies Programme; the Climate Change Initiative; and the Border Program. These are mostly related to strategic planning, policy research and outreach on GHG reductions for transport, supporting environmental technology centres, and the transfer of technology and know-how. This assistance benefits many developing countries, including Brazil, China, India, Indonesia and Mexico.

50. More specific examples of bilateral activities relating to the capacity-building framework in the fields of the CDM, institutional capacity-building and technology transfer include the following:

- The Government of Japan is funding a capacity-building CDM project in five Asian countries to strengthen expertise, knowledge and understanding of the CDM in both the government and the industrial sector to help in the development and implementation of national strategies for the CDM.²⁰
- Australia supports the Forestry Human Resource Development project in the Pacific region. The project includes workshops and training courses aimed at increasing the capacities of non-Annex I Parties to participate in the CDM; 20 countries are represented at workshops and courses.
- The United States of America (US) supported a Technology Cooperation Pilot Project (TCAPP) from 1997 to 2001, which was designed to assist developing countries in defining clean-technology priorities.²¹
- Several European countries support Asia–Europe environmental technology centres, the introduction of appropriate technologies to aid adaptation and mitigation, and the strengthening of capacity to adopt and maintain new technologies.²²
- Japan provides support for capacity-building in the transfer of technology and know-how to developing countries and is supporting 48 projects in 11 countries.²³
- Canada provides support for the Technology Early Action Measures (TEAM) project, which funds new technology projects, assisted with the establishment of climate change technology promotion offices in Asia, Latin America and Eastern Europe.²⁴
- In Germany, within the framework of bilateral technical cooperation, technology transfer is promoted especially by the German Appropriate Technology Exchange Programme (GATE) to further the technological competence of industry, NGOs and other groups, and to promote technologies that use existing resources optimally. The programme provides comprehensive advice in the area of adaptation and dissemination of technologies²⁵ to developing countries.

C. Analysis and conclusions

51. Documentation such as the national communications and UNFCCC documents suggests that multilateral and bilateral agencies have tackled most of the priority issues identified in the CB framework and those expressed by developing countries as their main needs and priorities. However, as can be expected, some types of activity such as the elaboration of GHG inventories have been given more attention than others such as the implementation of adaptation measures.

52. Regarding the level of satisfaction with the support provided by donors for climate change capacity-building activities, developing countries in general characterize enabling activities as very useful, although they point out that important gaps still remain in their ability to meet their obligations under the UNFCCC in view of their own priorities and needs.

53. This section has discussed six issue areas in which more capacity-building activities have been conducted than in others. However, this does not suggest that capacities in these areas are fully built. In spite of the attention given to them so far, they still require further support.

54. Key capacity-building needs in the CDM continue to be: the development of a national institutional framework to coordinate actions for the preparation, acceptance, revision and implementation of CDM projects; the elaboration of studies about specific methodological and

²⁰ FCCC/SBI/2002/INF.15.

²¹ United States Environmental Protection Agency, <http://yosemite.epa.gov>.

²² European Community capacity-building submission. February 2004.

²³ Japan, Third National Communication.

²⁴ FCCC/SBI/2003/INF.9, p. 9.

²⁵ Germany, Third National Communication.

institutional aspects of the implementation of the CDM; and the enhancement or strengthening of technical capability to increase public awareness of the CDM.

55. Both non-Annex I and Annex II Parties have given priority to activities addressing institutional capacity issues that will help countries meet their obligations under the UNFCCC while enabling 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 committees and secretariats, establishing or revamping research centres, improving information management capacity, and providing equipment and institutional support to enable data collection and analysis. However, given the complexity of institutional capacity needs in developing countries, this remains one of the issues in need of further attention and investment.

56. In terms of education, training and public awareness, many Annex II Parties include education, training and the exchange of information in their capacity-building and technology transfer initiatives. 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.²⁶ The national communications show that all the Parties to the Convention have conducted and plan to continue developing and implementing activities related to education, training and public awareness, covering various types of actor from the private sector, government, NGOs, resource users and schools. These activities include general environmental and sustainable development capacity-building workshops and symposiums, and mass awareness programmes for the general public and schoolchildren.

57. In terms of the development and transfer of technology, many Annex II Parties provide assistance for different aspects of technology transfer, including training and demonstration on renewable energy and energy-efficient technologies, professional exchanges, and research and development, under the Climate Technology Initiative or through bilateral initiatives.²⁷

58. In their submissions on actions taken by Parties to implement decisions 2/CP.7 and 3/CP.7 on adaptation and vulnerability,²⁸ Annex I and non-Annex I Parties to the Convention reported that assistance ranged 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 the impacts of climate on agriculture and the costs of damage and adaptation. Other activities included the strengthening of institutions and research. This assistance covered countries and regions in Africa, Central America, the Caribbean, and Asia and the Pacific.²⁹

D. Remaining issues to address country priorities

59. In the interviews and surveys conducted in the context of this study, other non-Annex I Parties were asked to what extent capacity-building for climate change initiatives supported by donor organizations were in line with their country priorities in this area. Some countries felt that this was always the case, others felt that it was often the case, while still others felt that initiatives were only sometimes in line with their priorities. Some recipient countries pointed out that a good dialogue between them and the donors during proposal preparation ensured that the initiatives supported were in line with their priorities. For instance, the Adapting to Climate Change in the Caribbean (ACCC) project funded by the Canada Climate Change Development Fund (CCCDF) was cited as being very much in line with the Caribbean countries' priorities in capacity-building for adaptation.

²⁶ FCCC/SBI/2003/INF.9, p. 9.

²⁷ Ibid., pp. 8–9.

²⁸ FCCC/SBI/2003/INF.9.

²⁹ Idem.

60. On the other hand, those interviewed in recipient countries mentioned some issues that require further attention. For instance, some characterized the project development process as largely donor-driven and felt the need for on-the-ground activities to be implemented to address country needs and priorities such as urgent adaptation measures. Others mentioned the insufficient levels of assistance.

61. The information sources used in the development of this paper suggest that there are two types of needs in developing countries that require further support from donors. One type is those needs that have been addressed but still require further attention. These include: capacities built in the course of preparing national communications but which still require consolidation, for example, data collection and analysis capacities; and other capacities, such as country management and decision-making capacity to deal with the prospects of implementing activities relating to the CDM. The second type relates to those needs that have only been addressed peripherally, such as networking between institutions, improved decision-making and implementation of adaptation measures.

E. Lessons learned

62. Capacity-building efforts must address various levels, from policy to on-the-ground capacity mobilization around urgent actions, in order to ensure that they meet the priority needs of developing countries in a timely manner and respect the integrated nature of capacity-building. This is also instrumental in building “ownership” of the climate change agenda by various local actors.

F. Recommendations

63. Future capacity-building support should help to put in place the capacity to implement policies and strategies and therefore also help to address urgent needs on-the-ground, such as mobilizing the capacity to implement urgent adaptation measures.

V. Results/impacts of climate change capacity-building activities

A. Results

64. Within the framework of this paper, results are defined as the immediate, measurable and direct consequences of capacity-building activities and projects implemented with the purpose of assisting countries in achieving the objectives of the UNFCCC.³⁰

65. Some of the main results of recent efforts in the area of climate change capacity-building have been highlighted in national communications and in other documents published by bilateral and multilateral donors. Some of the results achieved at the different levels, including the systemic, institutional and individual capacity levels, are presented in the sections below.

1. Systemic level results

66. The CB framework identifies the need for the *enhancement and/or creation of an enabling environment*. According to the documents and reports reviewed for this study, the main results achieved in that regard are the preparation and development of adequate *policy, legal and regulatory frameworks*, and an increase in *general public awareness* in selected countries.

67. Activities related to the preparation of the national communications have helped to define many of the existing policy, legislative and regulatory needs and gaps in developing countries. Various capacity-building activities have helped countries to develop *policy, legal and regulatory frameworks* conducive to the achievement of the UNFCCC objective. These instruments cover the following sectors/areas: forestry, agriculture, disaster management and preparedness, water, energy, waste management, and more generally sustainable development and the environment. The UNDP/GEF

³⁰ These results are often referred to respectively as “outputs” and “outcomes” in results-based management.

Project Implementation Review 2003³¹ confirms, for example, that UNDP/GEF climate change projects have had concrete effects on sectoral policies, laws and regulations in various countries. Examples are:

- (a) The *Barrier Removal to Secure PV Market Penetration in Semi-Urban Sudan* project resulted in an increased number of state governments incorporating photovoltaic (PV) applications into sectoral development plans and earmarking funds for these applications. A Solar Act is being amended to accommodate new plans and approaches of the Ministry of Electricity. In addition, a Renewable Energy Master Plan is in preparation to ensure a proper role for renewable energy technologies;
- (b) The *Palawan New and Renewable Energy and Livelihood Support* project in the Philippines played a major role in the formulation and adoption of the Philippine Energy Plan, which outlines the energy blueprint for supporting the total renewable electrification of all villages in the country by 2006;
- (c) National minimum efficiency standards were prepared and implemented for compact and double-capped fluorescent lamps as a result of the *Barrier Removal for the Efficient Lighting Products and Systems in China* project. In addition, draft national minimum efficiency standards were prepared for high-pressure sodium lamps and ballasts, and National Certification Labels for compact and double-capped fluorescent lamps were approved and adopted by a number of major manufacturers, creating a policy environment conducive to energy efficiency.

68. Systemic level capacity-building results also include some level of cultural transformation, such as changes in perceptions of the climate change issues prevailing in a society. The documentation reviewed shows that in most countries capacity-building activities have contributed to an increased awareness of the causes and effects of climate change throughout the developing world. Awareness activities such as workshops and the incorporation of climate change issues in education systems, and the process of developing the national communications, increase awareness by involving a large number of players, students and the general public.

69. Despite the implementation of useful policy, legal and regulatory instruments, more capacity-building will be required in order to create conducive enabling environments, in particular, some areas within the scope of the CB framework, such as the development of *national climate change programmes* and *improvement in decision-making processes*, are in need of additional attention.³² The national communications show that in many cases national climate change programmes have been developed by countries which do not have the capacity to implement them. In other cases climate change is addressed by more general programmes, such as forestry strategies or programmes – hence the need for implementation of programmes specific to climate change. Improving decision-making may justify more activities such as “workshops for governmental and public sector staff and senior business executives as well as institutional support to strengthen relevant institutions and strengthen rapport between private and public sectors”.³³

2. Institutional level results

70. According to documents reviewed and the surveys and interviews conducted for this study, the following institutional needs identified in the CB framework have been addressed: the development and strengthening of *institutions with specific climate change-related mandates*; and improved availability and adequacy of information resources such as the *national communications* (including *GHG inventories, and mitigation, vulnerability and adaptation assessment*) and *meteorological, hydrological*

³¹ United Nations Development Programme/Global Environment Facility. Project Implementation Review. 2003.

³² FCCC/TP/2003/1.

³³ *Idem*.

and climatological research and observations. Some of the concrete results achieved in these areas are presented below.

71. Virtually all countries that are signatories to the UNFCCC have set up a National Climate Change Committee (NCCC). The NCCCs' role has been to coordinate countries' climate change strategies, oversee the implementation of and follow-up to the UNFCCC, and prepare national communications. More recently, the Kyoto Protocol called for the establishment of designated national authorities (DNAs) responsible for the implementation of the clean development mechanism at the national level. Over the course of the last two years nearly 40 DNAs have been created in non-Annex I Parties to the Convention.

72. In addition to these coordinating bodies, NGOs and research and academic institutions have been put in place or have integrated climate change issues into their mandate. Some examples of these are presented below:

- (a) **South Africa:** the National Botanical Institute, the Energy and Development Research Centre at the University of Cape Town and other universities undertake climate change research and related training, mainly on vulnerability and adaptation issues and policy. The Energy Research Institute at the University of Cape Town and the Minerals and Energy Training Institute in Johannesburg offer training courses specifically in CDM implementation. In addition, a number of industries are contributing to tertiary level training by funding the establishment of centres of excellence at local universities.
- (b) **Cuba:** Following the development of a CDM project portfolio, partly funded by UNDP/GEF, *Cubasolar*, a Cuban NGO focusing on the development of renewable energies, has included a CDM component in its development work. The NGO is now involved in the development of a wind-powered water-pumping project to be submitted as a CDM project.
- (c) **SIDS:** The Government of Finland has funded a project on *Preparedness to Climate Variability and Global Change in Small Island Developing States in the Caribbean Region*. The project has established a regional technical laboratory that provides calibration and maintenance services.
- (d) **Syria:** The UNDP/GEF project on *Supply-Side Efficiency and Energy Conservation and Planning* in Syria has contributed a good deal to the enhancement of energy professionals' awareness and to the development of the technical capacity of relevant institutions involved in the power and industry sectors. The project led to the establishment of the *National Energy Service Centre*.
- (e) **India:** The Canadian Government has funded a capacity-building project called the *India Rural Energy Network (IRENet)* which has participated in the development of small-scale CDM project ideas. For example, an India-wide Solar Lantern project involving 20 NGO members of IRENet was developed. The project aims to expand the availability of solar lighting for village communities by installing a total of 10,000 lanterns over its duration.

73. The availability of information has increased through capacity-building activities which have supported the undertaking of national studies and the preparation of awareness-raising materials, such as:

- (a) National communications;
- (b) National GHG inventories;
- (c) Scenarios of possible climate change and sea level rise;

- (d) Mitigation and adaptation scenarios and measures;
- (e) Vulnerability assessment studies;
- (f) Ancillary benefit studies;
- (g) Information material for the residential, commercial, industrial and institutional sectors on general and technical aspects relating to climate change;
- (h) Other studies, for example, resource management and human impact studies.

74. Capacity-building efforts have contributed to the emergence of some relevant institutions in developing countries dedicated to the achievement of the UNFCCC objectives. However, the number and the quality of such institutions vary across regions and countries. As some survey and interview participants stated, these institutions often lack the human and financial resources needed to sustain their activities and achieve their goals. This issue will be discussed further in chapter VII.

3. Individual level results

75. Judging from the documents reviewed and the surveys and interviews conducted for this study, substantial results have been achieved in capacity-building at the individual level. Improvements in individual capacity were noted in the following areas: *GHG inventories; the CDM; mitigation measures; vulnerability and adaptation; climate observation; and climate-friendly technologies.*

76. Thousands of individuals have attended workshops and training conducted in preparation for the national communications and participated in the implementation of climate change projects addressing the above-mentioned areas.

77. The workshops and training have resulted in an increased capacity to assess potential CDM projects, to record data and manage databases, to operate and maintain high-technology equipment, to predict extreme events, to assess vulnerability, to plan and cope with disasters and to carry out sustainable natural resources management. The development of contacts and the sharing and exchange of information and experiences have created opportunities for networking among professionals. The outcomes in individual capacity-building activities vary greatly from one country to another, but the weaknesses identified are in training in negotiation skills and technical training such as measuring climate change variability.

B. Impacts

78. Impacts here refer to the long-term effects or changes that usually occur beyond the life of a project or particular activities (3–5 years after) and are attributable to a particular initiative. Assessing the impacts of climate change capacity-building activities can be difficult, as they depend, in most cases, on a variety of interconnected factors, many of which may be not be possible to attribute to a particular activity. In addition, as both the documentation reviewed and the stakeholders interviewed have confirmed, the impacts of such capacity-building activities can take a long time to materialize or to be achieved. For example, results from education and public awareness activities may take a long time to “trickle down” and make a noticeable difference in the behaviour of the population. In this regard it is too early to determine the impacts of the capacity-building activities undertaken in response to decision 2/CP.7, since it was only adopted in 2001. Much of the documentation reviewed supports this finding. However, impacts from climate change activities that were implemented before the decision may help to provide some useful insights on what impacts can be achieved.

79. In addition, it is important to note that what can be considered as “impacts” of climate change capacity-building activities can also depend on the pre-existing level of capacity in an organization and society. For example, activities implemented in a country with low levels of capacity may only expect to increase the general level of awareness of climate change-related issues over time as an impact, whereas

activities implemented in a country where the level of capacity is higher could potentially lead to actual GHG mitigation or reduced vulnerability to climate change as impacts.

80. In 2002, the GEF conducted an evaluation of its climate change portfolio.³⁴ Impacts from 35–40 projects that were completed or had been operational long enough for such long-term results to become evident were analysed and documented. Some of these impacts are presented below.

- (a) Some GEF projects that focused on energy-efficient technologies have resulted in *sustained reductions in the price* of the energy-efficient products and in *highly cost-effective* abatement of carbon emissions. In addition, *market gains for efficient lights* in particular are being sustained and replicated over time;
- (b) Some GEF grid-connected renewable energy projects have facilitated the implementation of important and sustained regulatory frameworks that are supportive of grid-connected renewable energy. The GEF's largest *market impact* has been in India, where direct and indirect influences on private-sector power project development and financing have resulted in *nearly 1,000 MW of new renewable-energy generating capacity*;
- (c) As a result of GEF off-grid solar PV projects, *awareness of solar home systems* has increased in several countries and *technical standards have improved*;
- (d) In China, a World Bank/GEF energy conservation project led to the emergence and sustainability of energy services companies (ESCOs). The project also pioneered the *resolution of key policy and legal issues* that allowed the growth of the ESCO industry. Similarly, several GEF projects appear to be *increasing the awareness and acceptance of ESCOs* among industrial clients, policy makers and financiers.

C. On the general effectiveness of capacity-building interventions

81. The effectiveness of capacity-building activities refers to their ability to achieve their intended results and impacts. As discussed above, some capacity-building initiatives implemented under or relating to decision 2/CP.7 have been effective as they have led to concrete and substantial outcomes.

82. According to the documents reviewed and the surveys and interviews conducted for this study, the most relevant guiding principles for effective capacity-building are the following:

- (a) Capacity-building activities should be based on existing capacity and self-assessments of needs;
- (b) Capacity-building is a long-term approach;
- (c) Capacity-building is a learning-by-doing approach;
- (d) National ownership and leadership must be ensured;
- (e) Multi-stakeholder consultations and decision-making must be ensured;
- (f) The development of partnerships and networks must be promoted;
- (g) The constantly changing nature of capacity-building needs must be taken into account;
- (h) Capacity-building should be integrated into broader sustainable development efforts;
- (i) Adaptive management should be practised.

³⁴ Global Environment Facility. Evaluation Report #1-02. Results from the GEF Climate Change Programme Global Environment Facility, Monitoring and Evaluation Unit.

83. The World Bank/GEF project *Household Energy* in Mali is an example of a successful project that has used some of these guiding principles (such as the integration of capacity-building into wider sustainable development efforts, and ensuring national ownership and leadership). The project was designed to provide technical assistance and training to charcoal makers, producers and sellers of stoves, and urban consumers. The project recipients were trained in how to efficiently harvest and carbonize fuelwood, to manage the natural forest in a sustainable manner, and to effectively market and use improved kilns, biomass and kerosene stoves. The project components included: addressing the supply and demand for woodfuel and its efficient use; institution building in the energy sector; and education and communication. The project resulted in the following: fuelwood is being marketed on a sustainable basis in 200 rural markets; and stoves are being produced by local blacksmiths. Energy sector institutions in the central and local governments and the central unit responsible for the implementation of the Household Energy Strategy were improved to continue the public awareness campaign, in cooperation with the national energy authorities as well as NGOs.

84. Disregarding one or several of the above-mentioned principles may lead to difficulties in achieving results. Several donors and recipient countries surveyed and interviewed for this study mentioned that the most important challenge or barrier to the effectiveness of capacity-building activities was the lack of capacity to implement them. This indicates that capacity-building activities are more likely to be effective if they are implemented in an incremental manner and if proper consideration is given to the existing capacity. Often, capacity-building activities can be overambitious in their expected results or impacts.

D. Analysis and conclusions

85. 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.

86. This study has confirmed that results and impacts tend to be reported in a piecemeal and uncoordinated manner among the various donor agencies and non-Annex I Parties participating in capacity-building activities related to the UNFCCC. The analysis undertaken for this study demonstrates a lack of common tools, terminologies and approaches for reporting on results and impacts achieved through capacity-building activities, which means that it is not possible to present an overarching national, regional and global portrayal of what has been achieved so far.

E. Lessons learned

87. Ensuring that a thorough self-assessment of needs has been conducted and that proper consideration is given to the pre-existing capacity at all levels is crucial to the effectiveness of capacity-building activities.

88. In the long term, learning-by-doing approaches which favour the development of partnerships and networks and which integrate capacity-building in broader sustainable development efforts have greater chances of success than others.

89. Ensuring national ownership and leadership as well as multi-stakeholder consultations and decision-making at all stages of an initiative creates a favourable environment for the achievement of results.

90. The practice of adaptive management and consideration for the dynamic nature of capacity-building considerably increase the likelihood of an initiative achieving its intended results.

F. Recommendations

91. It is recommended that due attention be given to capacity-building in monitoring and evaluation for Annex II and non-Annex I Parties, in particular for those proposing capacity-building programmes.

This could help to ensure a coherent assessment of the results and impacts achieved through capacity-building interventions and adequate feedback into decision making, both at the project and at the national level.

92. Tools for conducting thorough assessments of pre-existing levels of capacity should be made readily available to those proposing capacity-building interventions. More urgently, their thorough application should be actively promoted within the framework of the ongoing NCSA and NAPA processes.

VI. Availability, accessibility and efficiency of resource use

A. Availability of resources

93. Out of seven submissions received from donor countries and agencies, only two included quantitative information about their investments in capacity-building for climate change. Further literature reviews, including donor agencies' web sites and annual reports, proved unfruitful in the search for up-to-date information for this study. Although the national communications from donors show the type of activity they are contributing to, dollar amounts are for the most part not readily available. In the absence of more recent data, table 3 shows financial contributions made by most major bilateral donors up to the year 2000 for efforts relating to adaptation to climate change, as originally presented in 2003 by UNFCCC in the document *Compilation and synthesis report on third national communications*.³⁵

94. Some quantitative and qualitative information reviewed shows that multilateral agencies and Annex II Parties regularly make resources available for developing countries to conduct climate change capacity-building activities. This chapter discusses the most substantial efforts in terms of the size of the resources made available by multilateral and bilateral agencies.

Table 3. Bilateral financial contributions related to adaptation in the implementation of the UNFCCC, 1991–2000 (USD million)

| Donor/Year | Capacity-building | | | | Coastal zone | | | | Other vulnerability assessments | | | |
|---------------------------------------|-------------------|-------|--------|--------|--------------|-------|-------|------|---------------------------------|------|------|------|
| | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 |
| Australia | 0.07 | 0.05 | 0.8 | 0.8 | 0 | 0 | 0.02 | 0.3 | 1.3 | 0.9 | 1.0 | 1.1 |
| Canada | 21.6 | 24.5 | 32.9 | | 2.3 | 4.2 | 2.3 | | 0.8 | 1.1 | 2.1 | |
| Germany | | | | | | | | | 70.8 | 16.4 | 9.1 | |
| Spain | | 1.1 | 1.4 | 1.8 | | | | | | | | |
| Finland | 0.09 | 2.6 | 4.7 | | 0.2 | 0.7 | 0.5 | | 8.5 | 1.9 | 2.7 | |
| Italy | 2.9 | 4.9 | 3.7 | 3.0 | | 0.6 | | | | 0.09 | 0.04 | 0.04 |
| Japan ^a | 43.2 | 48.9 | 46.6 | | 589.3 | 145.5 | 497.9 | | 51.1 | 81.0 | 42.0 | |
| Norway | | | 0.6 | 0.5 | | | | | | | | |
| New Zealand | 0.7 | 1.6 | 1.6 | 2.2 | 0.3 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.03 | |
| Sweden | 3.0 | 34.8 | 31.3 | 35.7 | 0.4 | 4.3 | 6.7 | 3.2 | 11.5 | 19.1 | 27.0 | 21.7 |
| United States of America ^b | 779.11 | 754.6 | 2484.7 | 943.24 | 9.1 | 15.5 | 5.2 | 22.2 | 1.9 | 2.0 | 2.9 | 3.4 |

a) Figures shown in the table are obtained by adding loan aid, grant aid and technological cooperation presented in three separate tables by Japan.

b) Figures in the table include direct financing and commercial sales.

95. As seen in table 3 and box 1 in chapter III of this report, Annex II Parties have contributed appreciably to capacity-building in climate change. Some of the most active Annex II Parties in this regard are Australia, Belgium, Canada, Finland, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, New Zealand, Norway,

³⁵ FCCC/SBI/2003/7/Add.1.

the Netherlands, Switzerland, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America. Their main capacity-building programmes include activities in the CDM and JI; adaptation and vulnerability; education, awareness and information exchange; and technology transfer.³⁶

96. Various Annex II Parties have support programmes specific to the implementation of the UNFCCC that are available to developing countries, for instance, Australia (the National Strategy Studies Program), Canada (Protecting the Future through Climate Protection and the Climate Change Action Fund), projects of the Global Environment Facility of France (FFEM), the Netherlands (the Climate Change Studies Assistance Programme (NCCSAP)), Germany (the German initiative) and the US (the United States Initiative on Joint Implementation; the United States Country Studies Programme; and the Climate Change Initiative).³⁷ The European Union countries fund 80 programmes supporting capacity-building in the context of climate change. The majority address technical and institutional capacity-building. Although a wide range of capacity-building activities are addressed, demand from developing countries is greatest for these two aspects.³⁸

97. However, the above is not an exhaustive list. For example, Belgium also funds soil conservation projects in Africa, Denmark funds technology transfer projects, Finland funds CDM/JI and forest management projects, and Norway funds capacity-building in activities implemented jointly (AIJ) and forest management,³⁹ all of which may have a bearing on capacity-building for climate change.

B. Access to resources

98. This section discusses some of the funding resources available to non-Annex I Parties to the Convention for capacity-building in climate change and some of the difficulties experienced in accessing these funds.

99. As already mentioned in an earlier section, non-Annex I Parties have had access to funding for capacity-building interventions related to decision 2/CP.7 as part of regular GEF climate change projects, the preparation of the national communications or the preparation of NCSAs and NAPAs, or as stand-alone projects targeting capacity-building.

100. More than 130 non-Annex I Parties have received financial and technical support from the GEF and its implementing agencies to prepare their initial national communications. The GEF has established operational guidelines for expedited funding to assist Parties in accessing up to USD 200,000 for NCSAs and up to USD 100,000 for "top-up" activities. LDCs and SIDS can also access project development and preparation facility resources up to USD 25,000. The GEF is also funding up to USD 200,000, using the expedited procedure, to support the preparation of NAPAs by non-Annex I Parties. The Parties, however, may opt to go through regular and non-expedited procedures to apply for funding above the funding ceiling. The Small Grants Programme, which provides funding of up to USD 50,000, also builds the capacity of non-governmental and community-based organizations to address climate change.

101. The experience of Bolivia shows that sometimes countries can have difficulty in accessing funds, as the process can prove to be complicated and long. This point has also been noted before in the regional CDI reports⁴⁰ and other documentation.⁴¹ Bolivia submitted its proposal for the second national communication based on paragraph 4 of decision 32/CP.7 which stipulates that "non-Annex I Parties wishing to start the preparation of their subsequent national communications may do so using the initial guidelines." This was reviewed and revised for six months while "a number of corrections required by

³⁶ FCCC/SBI/2003/INF.9.

³⁷ *Idem*.

³⁸ European Community submission contained in FCCC/SBI/2004/MISC.1.

³⁹ Third national communications of Belgium, Denmark, Finland and Norway.

⁴⁰ See CDI reports from SIDS, Asia and the Pacific, Latin America and the Caribbean, Eastern Europe and Central Asia, and Africa. September 2000.

⁴¹ Huq, Saleemul. *The Bonn-Marrakesh Agreements on Funding*. Climate Policy 2. 2002. pp. 243–246.

the GEF were made to the proposal". During this period, new guidelines were developed and Bolivia was informed that it had to wait for the new guidelines. In the end, "Bolivia's request for funding was not approved". In the case of one African country interviewed for this project, there was miscommunication in the preparation of a proposal to develop the first national communication where the country concerned developed a comprehensive proposal but only part of this was approved. Other Parties such as Argentina, Morocco, Sudan, Uruguay, Bhutan and the Philippines have reported satisfactory experiences in accessing funding from the GEF.⁴²

102. Annex II Parties have also made funds available or promote activities that can be accessed by non-Annex I Parties. For instance, 77 countries have access to Canada's initiatives. Thirty-seven of these have received support more than once, although sometimes proposals had to be turned down on the basis of cost-effectiveness, the quality of the proposal or funding limitations.⁴³ The first phase of the Netherlands' Climate Change Studies Assistance Programme supported activities in 13 countries (Bhutan, Bolivia, Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Ghana, Kazakhstan, Mali, Mongolia, Senegal, Suriname, Yemen and Zimbabwe) to enable them to implement commitments under the UNFCCC, to create a greater public awareness of climate change issues, and to increase the involvement of policy makers, scientists and the general public.⁴⁴ Phase II is currently under implementation. Another example is Japan's Kyoto Initiative, which has trained more than 200 individuals from 41 countries around the world.⁴⁵ Since 1993, the US Country Studies Program (USCSP) has provided technical and financial support to 55 countries to enhance their capacity to address the issue of climate change and to participate more fully in the international response to this issue. Many of these countries have indicated that this support contributed much to their initial national communication.

103. NGOs and the private sector also have access to funds from multilateral agencies and from Annex II Parties. In the case of the NGOs, they have access to both GEF funding and Annex II Party contributions. In general, the GEF/UNDP Small Grants Program provides funding to NGOs, and numerous GEF-financed projects are executed or co-executed by, or include contracts or subcontracts with, non-governmental groups. This programme has provided grants of up to USD 50,000 to more than 1,200 NGO-executed projects.⁴⁶ These projects deal with the whole scope of the global environment and not only with climate change capacity-building.

104. The private sector participates in capacity-building as executing agencies or subcontractors for projects and by participating in workshops, in particular on the CDM and technology transfer. The GEF/World Bank also supports the private sector through project loans, credits and grants. The cost of projects such as those in support of mitigation projects through the development of ESCOs generally amounts to millions of dollars.

105. In the surveys and interviews conducted for this study, developing country participants expressed the need for further capacity-building in project development to improve their capacity to access donor funding. In addition, the need to engage the private sector further has also been noted.⁴⁷

C. Efficiency of resource use

106. The literature examined for this study suggests that, although results are being achieved, financial resources are not always being used as efficiently as they could be.

⁴² FCCC/SBI/2003/MISC.9.

⁴³ Survey by Canada.

⁴⁴ Taken from <http://nccsapnet.eriya.com/>

⁴⁵ Survey by Japan.

⁴⁶ Taken from <http://www.gefweb.org>

⁴⁷ European Community submission, Barbados submission.

107. The main issues in this regard are a lack of coordination between donors, both bilateral and multilateral, leading to inefficiencies in the use of limited resources and a lack of prioritization of climate change capacity-building activities.⁴⁸

108. In addition, with reference to efficiency issues, the paper Climate Policy 2 of the Bonn–Marrakesh Agreements on Funding⁴⁹ reported that, because of conflicts between the three executing agencies for GEF projects (World Bank investments, UNDP capacity-building, and UNEP technical and scientific support), there has been some overlap and competition between the agencies, thus reducing the efficiency of the overall efforts to address capacity-building relating to climate change.

109. Developing countries surveyed for this study suggested that efficiency in the use of resources could be enhanced in the following ways:

- (a) By using local and regional personnel as opposed to international human resources;
- (b) By establishing regional centres of excellence where staff can go on training for short periods of time;
- (c) By developing and sharing success stories in order to learn from countries that are more advanced in the UNFCCC process.

1. Information dissemination

110. In the context of capacity-building, more dissemination of information is important to achieve efficient use of resources:

- (a) Lessons learned and case studies can help both donors and developing countries to examine what worked, or what did not, in projects of a similar nature and the obstacles and successes found in a particular country. Many lessons learned can be found on web sites and in documents; however, more case studies could better reflect different situations encountered in capacity-building;
- (b) Information such as guidelines, technical papers and new methodologies can increase the capacity of implementers and decision-makers to develop project proposals or to design plans, assessments and strategies;
- (c) Dissemination of information can help donors to develop partnerships among themselves, which may result in a more efficient use of the resources available and may contribute to greater project impact. Apart from the activities coordinated by multilateral agencies, there seem to be relatively few cases where this type of partnership is developed in the field of climate change, either by donors or by developing countries. Dissemination of information can also help developing countries to know what type of funding is available. The next section, on South–South collaboration, discusses this point in more detail. Document FCCC/SBI/2003/14 calls for improvements to the coordination and effectiveness of capacity-building efforts, including dissemination;⁵⁰
- (d) Developing countries learn from other countries' experiences in developing project proposals to the GEF for the national communications and NCSAs;
- (e) Developing countries also know what type of regional expertise is available so that they can access it or develop partnerships with neighbouring countries.

⁴⁸ Huq, Saleemul. The Bonn–Marrakesh Agreements on Funding. Climate Policy 2. 2002. pp. 243–246.
See also FCCC/SBI/2003/14 and FCCC/TP/2003/1.

⁴⁹ Idem.

⁵⁰ FCCC/SBI/2003/14.

111. The COP, in its decision 9/CP.3, and the SBSTA, at its twelfth session, requested that the secretariat collect and disseminate information on environmentally sound technologies and know-how conducive to mitigating and adapting to climate change, to collect examples of methods and tools for assessing climate change impact and adaptation, and to enhance the capability of developing country Parties to make the best use of the available methods and tools. At its thirteenth session, the SBSTA requested that the secretariat organize a workshop to explore: (1) the experience of developing countries in applying current impact and adaptation methodologies, and their emerging needs; (2) the current state of the art of methodologies and how these apply to the specific circumstances of developing countries; and (3) options for improving the quality and dissemination of information.⁵¹ This workshop was conducted in St Adele, Quebec, Canada in June 2001, in cooperation with UNDP/GEF. Annex IV shows the main recommendations from this workshop.

112. In addition, the secretariat has recently initiated informal collaboration on capacity-building with the GEF secretariat and its implementing agencies in order to improve the exchange and dissemination of information on activities relating to: (1) “mainstreaming” sustainable development into climate change programmes; (2) the development and implementation of national climate change policies and programmes; and (3) participation in the Convention and the Kyoto Protocol processes.⁵² The secretariat has also collaborated with the Global Climate Observing System (GCOS) secretariat⁵³ to implement the conclusions of the SBSTA relating to climate observation systems.

113. The Climate Technology Initiative (CTI) is one example of Annex II Parties’ efforts to facilitate information dissemination among governments, industry, academia and relevant international organizations and NGOs in order to support the diffusion of climate-friendly and environmentally sound technologies and practices. It also provides support for UNFCCC-organized seminars and workshops which is designed to inform participants better on key technology transfer issues, including enabling environments, technology needs assessment, technology information resources and capacity-building.

114. Through the work of the Commission on Education and Communication, the International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN) also supports countries in improving their ability to disseminate information related to climate change and other environmental issues among the general public and specific social groups such as local communities and government officials. The Commission is also a network for information dissemination on climate change. The Commission is revamping its web site to be a node of knowledge on how to prepare education and communication plans relating to environmental issues, including climate change.⁵⁴

115. Apart from the above-mentioned examples, experiences in capacity-building are disseminated through other, more localized, and mostly country-specific, methods such as media campaigns, demonstration projects, national, local or regional workshops, school programmes, web sites and publications. However, there is room for improvement in disseminating lessons learned and case studies, and for the coordination of activities being planned or conducted by donors and non-Annex I Parties. For instance, in one of the summaries of the workshop on methodologies on climate change impact and adaptation, participants noted that “the role of UNFCCC in collecting and disseminating information should be more active and meaningful to be really useful for Parties. The suggested role for the secretariat would be permanent advisor and clearinghouse in vulnerability and adaptation methods. Providing continuity and maintaining institutional memory about vulnerability and adaptation methods are essential for the process.”⁵⁵

2. South–South collaboration

⁵¹ FCCC/SBSTA/2001/INF.4.

⁵² FCCC/SBI/2002/INF.15.

⁵³ FCCC/SBSTA/2001/8.

⁵⁴ FCCC/SBI/2003/INF.9.

⁵⁵ UNFCCC Workshop on methodologies on climate change impact and adaptation, available at <http://unfccc.int/sessions/workshop/010611/s3bre.pdf>

116. South–South cooperation is necessary to increase the efficiency of capacity-building activities because countries in the same region are likely to share some characteristics – for instance, SIDS may have experienced similar effects from climate change such as floods – or to share similar economic constraints, as well as being geographically close. Cooperation can help them take advantage of their geographic location to reduce costs and develop regional priorities. Interaction and interlinkages within and across regions might be achieved through regional and global projects, as well as through increased support and assistance to existing regional centres of excellence working on climate change issues.⁵⁶

117. Experiences show that some South–South collaboration has taken place, but the number of countries involved in this endeavour is still limited. During the interviews, two countries reported positive experiences in regional collaboration with neighbouring countries during the preparation of the first national communications, but apart from the following activities and discussions at the negotiation meetings or regional workshops cooperation between southern countries is limited. In addition to the interviewees mentioned above, three Latin American countries reported positive experiences. Cuban experts have helped other Latin American countries in the development of their GHG inventories and their vulnerability and adaptation studies. At the same time, this collaboration has enriched the capacity of Cuban experts.⁵⁷ In a workshop in Mexico, Costa Rican experts were invited to give a presentation on their experience with the first carbon bonds in Latin America.

118. Other, larger South–South initiatives are reported in the Caribbean, Africa and Asia. For example, the Planning for Adaptation to Climate Change project supports 12 Caribbean Community (CARICOM) countries in preparing to cope with the adverse effects of global climate change, through vulnerability assessment, adaptation planning, and capacity-building linked to adaptation planning.⁵⁸ The Southern African Development Community (SADC) climate change research project helps 12 nations in Southern Africa to explore the impacts and implications of climate change for the SADC countries.⁵⁹ Finally, the South South North project is a capacity-building initiative to promote cooperation between Southern countries, and between countries in the South and the North, helping four Southern countries to learn from the experience gained in CDM projects in Brazil, South Africa, Bangladesh and Indonesia.⁶⁰

D. Analysis and conclusions

119. Developing countries require further capacity-building for project proposal and overall development in order to improve access to the financial resources available. Uruguay, for example, has expressed the need for additional resources, noting that limitations on the finances available to address multiple needs and obligations “restrict the possibility of properly attending the totality of the activities of identification and evaluation of the 15 items relative to climate change. There are subjects that due to their characteristics and complexity, would require a special and specific financial assistance”.⁶¹

120. According to data collected for this paper, there is a need to enhance the cost-effectiveness or efficiency of use of the financial resources available for capacity-building.

121. Although the secretariat is currently providing information on GHG mitigation and adaptation, the interviewees noted the need to improve efficiency in information exchange that could help to enhance cooperation. Efficiency could be improved through enhanced dissemination, South–South cooperation, and facilitation of the exchange of success stories, lessons, information and knowledge (in addition to increased use of local rather than international human resources). This enhanced dissemination and exchange of information would help both developing countries and donors to share lessons and

⁵⁶ FCCC/SBI/2003/14.

⁵⁷ First National Communication of Cuba.

⁵⁸ Taken from <http://www.irf.org/irgefcli.html>

⁵⁹ Taken from <http://www.uccee.org/c2e2/issue9s/sadc.htm>

⁶⁰ Taken from <http://www.southsouthnorth.org/>

⁶¹ FCCC/SBI/2002/MISC.7.

knowledge, potentially increase partnerships, and help developing countries to be more aware of the financial resources available.

E. Lessons learned

122. Non-Annex I Parties still do not receive enough guidance on how to access funding resources, in particular from the multilateral agencies. The interviews conducted show that countries receive different levels of guidance in accessing financial resources: for example, two Asian countries reported high support from the GEF and UNFCCC during proposal development, while an Asian and an African country expressed the opposite view.

123. The lack of adequate dissemination of success stories, lessons, information and knowledge, information about available funding and other information is impeding both Annex II and non-Annex I Parties in the advancement of their climate change agendas and their ability to learn from one another.

124. Challenges in the efficiency of capacity-building efforts are being experienced because of weak sharing mechanisms and a lack of South–South cooperation. Although there are some positive experiences, given the number of Southern countries involved in capacity-building which have similar conditions and issues to address, South–South cooperation should be more widespread.

F. Recommendations

125. It is recommended that additional assistance for capacity-building for project proposals and overall development be provided to developing countries in order to promote equitable access to the financial resources available.

126. It is recommended that additional financial and technical resources be provided to non-Annex I Parties to enable them to comply with their obligations under the UNFCCC and to address their complex and still outstanding capacity-building needs.

127. Publications on best practices and current efforts in capacity-building by donor agencies and non-Annex I Parties should be encouraged. Such publications could be posted on or linked to the UNFCCC web site to facilitate their diffusion.

128. The creation of a practitioners' network, bringing all key players together and focused on the exchange of lessons learned and coordination of efforts on capacity-building for climate change, especially at the regional and national level, is also recommended.

129. Partnerships and collaboration among donors should be strengthened in order to enhance efficiency by avoiding duplication and facilitating exchanges.

130. Further work is required to enhance sharing mechanisms among developing countries and to improve South–South cooperation.

VII. Sustainability of climate change capacity-building results

A. Framework for sustainability of climate change capacity-building activities

131. Experience from development cooperation globally over the past 25 years has shown that capacity-building is a key factor in ensuring the sustainability of development interventions. Efforts by both donors and recipients to implement the UNFCCC are no exception to this overall conclusion. Capacity-building – or capacity development, as it is often referred to in this context – is defined as the process of development and enhancement of the abilities of individuals, groups, organizations and institutions to address development issues as part of a range of efforts to achieve sustainable

development.⁶² The key question then becomes, how does one build sustainability into capacity-building efforts themselves? This is a crucial question, as an examination of the document *Results from the GEF Climate Change Program*⁶³ shows that, although a number of projects have proved to be sustainable or are well on the way to achieving sustainability, the sustainability of other projects is less clear. For example, the privatization of power utilities supporting demand-side management in Thailand has an uncertain fate.⁶⁴ In fact, this review confirmed that very few Parties have given adequate and systematic attention to sustainability concerns in the review and management of their capacity-building activities.

132. The sustainability of capacity-building activities, as recognized by the CB framework and numerous donors,⁶⁵ depends on an integrated approach that looks at the management system in place for climate change issues in a given country and/or region and builds on this system to make it effective at the local, national and regional levels. Indeed, different capacities are likely to be located at different levels (e.g., capacity to legislate is likely to be mostly a national-level issue, while the capacity to effectively implement that national legislation will have ramifications at the municipal and local levels, depending on the governance system in place in a country). The absence or weakness of capacity at one level or another may act as a bottleneck to the mobilization of capacity at the other levels, therefore limiting the potential for effective and sustainable capacity to manage climate change issues. In essence, an integrated approach is a key factor in ensuring sustainability. This integrated and holistic nature may pose a challenge to the vast majority of developing countries, which, in spite of having made progress at various levels, still require further assistance to tackle their multiple capacity needs adequately.

B. Key factors affecting sustainability

133. Numerous factors affecting the sustainability of capacity-building results have been identified through the review of the literature as well as the surveys and interviews conducted for this study. The list below summarizes the main views encountered through this review process.⁶⁶

- (a) In the interests of sustainability, it is important that responses to climate risks be mainstreamed within nationally-owned strategies, such as poverty reduction strategies, and into existing projects and programmes relating to the range of government ministries. Climate-specific projects are more successful when they establish policy links to other ministries such as those for agriculture, water, energy and finance;
- (b) Capacity-building should involve both institutional and human resource development. These, combined with external financial and technical support, are usually required to achieve sustainable results;
- (c) Institutional capacity-building should involve decision makers at the highest level. This is necessary to ensure ongoing support for capacity development after the initial programme has finished;
- (d) It is essential to have the support of the appropriate regional and national authorities and institutions to ensure full acceptance and support of the local and regional-scale programmes;

⁶² Adapted from: Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development/Development Assistance Committee, *Capacity Development in Environment: Principles in Practice*. 1997.

⁶³ Global Environment Facility. *Evaluation Report #1-02. Results from the GEF Climate Change Programme* Global Environment Facility, Monitoring and Evaluation Unit.

⁶⁴ *Idem*.

⁶⁵ See submission by Denmark on behalf of the European Community (FCCC/SBI/2002/MISC.7). See also document FCCC/SBI/2003/14.

⁶⁶ This list is taken from the European Community submission on capacity-building, February 2004, as it summarizes well the views that the consultant came across throughout this review process.

- (e) Both donors and host countries must adopt a long-term approach to capacity development, and this requires financial sustainability, ultimately supported by national policies and budgets that reflect national policy priorities;
- (f) Capacity-building requires the participation of a wide variety of stakeholders to be successful in the long term;
- (g) Capacity-building activities should be country- and demand-driven in order to ensure the level of support needed to make their results sustainable;
- (h) Without the financial and technical resources and the know-how necessary to maintain equipment and new technologies, the outcomes are limited and are unlikely to be sustained in the long term;
- (i) The loss of trained staff to take up more attractive offers outside the public sector results in a “brain-drain” and compromises future capacity development;
- (j) Support for well functioning institutional, policy and legal frameworks is necessary in order for capacity-building plans, programmes and policies developed in developing countries to be incorporated into their national programmes as a priority.

134. Although both recipient countries and donors agree on the factors affecting sustainability, in practice project implementation does not always take all these factors into account. In particular, the need for a long-term integrated approach to capacity-building, for activities to be country-driven, for an adequate institutional framework and for incentives which will make it possible to retain trained human resources does not generally get all the attention it deserves.

C. Building blocks of a sustainable “integrated approach” to capacity-building for climate change

135. This section provides a summary review of the efforts of Parties to address the building blocks of a sustainable approach to capacity-building. In particular, it focuses on efforts targeted at the enabling environment, the institutional arrangements and human resources as the three main building blocks of the integrated and holistic approach to capacity-building which was introduced at the beginning of this report.

1. The enabling environment

136. The importance of adequately taking into account the enabling environment in designing and implementing capacity-building strategies and actions cannot be overemphasized. This includes ensuring, among other things: that the overall policy environment is conducive; that appropriate legislation is in place; that institutional responsibilities are adequately defined between actors; that market forces affecting the country are taken into account; that the human and financial capacity to undertake new initiatives exists; and that the players involved in capacity development interact to mobilize the capacity being cultivated in different organizations at different levels.

137. Examples of good practices are starting to emerge and confirm the importance of an adequate enabling environment. For instance, in India, half-way through implementation, the executing agency for the GEF/WB-funded *Energy Efficiency* project revised the technical assistance plan of the project to consider the developments in energy efficiency/demand side management issues (e.g., the setting up of a National Bureau for Energy Efficiency and the enactment of an Energy Conservation Law) and to take

into account the outputs from other ongoing activities funded by other donors.⁶⁷ The institutional and policy changes led to an increase in energy efficiency investments from the original loan allocation planned under the project. The favourable enabling environment and the strategies enacted increased the likelihood of the project objectives being achieved. The transformation of the market for energy efficiency in India is likely to happen because some of the approaches in promoting energy efficiency used by the project are being replicated by various other actors in the market.

138. Without systematic acknowledgement of the presence or absence of an enabling environment and of the need to address it adequately from the outset, capacity-building projects and programmes will continue to be a challenge.⁶⁸

2. Institutional sustainability

139. The national communications reviewed listed a large number of national institutions, programmes and committees that have been set up to address climate change issues at the national level and to comply with countries' 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, even before the UNFCCC came into force. For example, the Philippine Government created the Inter-agency Committee on Climate Change as far back as 1991. This is not, however, to say that the long-term existence of all these committees or agencies is assured. Sometimes countries with fewer resources cannot maintain them. As the European Community pointed out in its submission, "although national climate change committees exist in many developing countries, they are either inactive or not operational due to lack of human, technical and financial resources to effectively implement the activities under the Convention".⁶⁹

140. Non-Annex I Parties mentioned the following as causes for lack of sustainability: the lack of involvement of key decision makers; complex institutional policies, including overly bureaucratic systems; and the lack of integrated/cross-sectoral approaches to environmental protection and more specifically to climate change.

141. Sufficient financial commitment at the country level must be coupled with a dedication of sufficient human resources for the country to support an activity once the externally funded project has ended. Integrating climate change activity into national priorities and addressing the needs for resources at the outset of a project will assist in ensuring project/programme sustainability.

142. In addition to financial concerns and concerns relating to mainstreaming into national priorities, experience from multilateral and bilateral organizations shows that other factors come into play in ensuring the sustainability of institutional capacity-building activities.⁷⁰ Critical questions to be answered in this respect include the following:

- (a) Do the institutions have clearly defined and understood missions and mandates?
- (b) Are the institutions effectively structured and managed?
- (c) Do institutional processes such as planning, quality management, and monitoring and evaluation work effectively?
- (d) Are the human resources adequate, sufficiently skilled and appropriately deployed?

⁶⁷ Global Environment Facility Monitoring and Evaluation Unit. Specially Managed Project Review: World Bank–India Energy Efficiency Project, September 2003.

⁶⁸ FCCC/SBI/2004/9.

⁶⁹ European Community submission on capacity-building contained in FCCC/SBI/2003/MISC.1.

⁷⁰ Japan submission; European Community submission.

- (e) Are financial resources managed effectively and allocated appropriately to enable effective operation?
- (f) Is the required information available and effectively distributed and managed?
- (g) Are material requirements such as buildings, offices, vehicles and computers allocated appropriately and managed effectively?

143. Important challenges remain before it will be possible to ensure that both non-Annex I and Annex II Parties effectively integrate all these concerns into their ongoing efforts to build institutional capacity for implementation of the UNFCCC.

3. Sustainability of human resources

144. Capacity-building activities have been successful in training large numbers of individuals from different sectors to sustain human resources, both within and across institutions. For example, the Canada Climate Change Development Fund (CCCDF) financed the USD 4 million Egypt Environmental Initiatives Fund, by which training has been provided to clients and Implementation Partner Teams (IPTs) in the areas of gender and the environment, environmental audit, feasibility studies, and impact assessment and pollution control. Training workshops and related activities included 1,691 participants (1,397 men and 294 women). As a result, 708 initial applications for funding for cleaner production activities have been received.

145. However, factors such as the high turnover of technical staff threaten the sustainability of the human resources needed for capacity-building activities such as training. Ensuring sustainability of human resources also requires incentives and constant reinforcement. In the case of personnel turnover, incentives such as career opportunities have to be provided within the agency/institution in order not to lose the human resource. Reinforcing education and public awareness programmes are necessary for greater retention of knowledge.

146. The CDI framework that guides the ongoing NCSA process also lists the following issues that need to be taken into account to ensure sustainability in building the capacity of human resources/individuals:

- (a) Correctly defining jobs and required skills;
- (b) Ensuring that appropriate learning is taking place through training;
- (c) Ensuring that responsibilities are delegated effectively and that individuals are held accountable;
- (d) Ensuring adequate access to information by the individuals;
- (e) Ensuring that individuals are in contact and exchanging knowledge with appropriate peers;
- (f) Ensuring that performance is measured;
- (g) Ensuring that values, integrity and appropriate attitudes are in place and maintained;
- (h) Ensuring that morale and motivation are adequately maintained;
- (i) Ensuring that individuals in organizations have access to work redeployment and job-sharing schemes;
- (j) Providing opportunities for effective interaction and functional teams;
- (k) Ensuring appropriate levels of interdependence between individuals in organizations;

- (l) Ensuring the development of adequate communication skills.

147. The tendency so far when building individual capacity has been to focus on training without paying due attention to the factors mentioned above, which are crucial in ensuring the sustainability of human resource development efforts.

D. Stakeholder involvement

148. The promotion of participation by a wide range of stakeholders, such as government agencies, national and international organizations, civil society and the private sector, is one of the provisions of the CB framework. Stakeholder involvement is key to the sustainability and to the effectiveness, efficiency and ownership of capacity-building activities.

149. Multilateral donors, Annex II and non-Annex I Parties involve a broad range of stakeholders in recognition of their role in ensuring success in capacity-building activities. Most of the documentation reviewed, as well as the surveys and interviews conducted in the context of this study, shows that the main stakeholders involved in capacity-building activities are central governments, research, academic and scientific institutions, NGOs and local communities. Depending on the nature of the initiative, the private sector may be involved, for instance, in workshops and energy efficiency projects relating to technology transfer or the CDM.

150. The GEF and its implementing agencies have reported the active involvement of various stakeholders in project implementation, particularly in enabling activities and other regular GEF climate change projects. For example, the GEF evaluation report⁷¹ stated that a variety of stakeholders, including policy makers, financial institutions, firms, utilities, investors and NGOs, have become more knowledgeable and confident about technologies as a result of the GEF commitments of funds, along with the dialogues, training efforts, priority-setting exercises and institutional coordination that typically occur during project preparation and implementation. Increased awareness and confidence have in turn influenced investment decisions or policy actions in parallel with GEF projects.

151. Many bilateral donor organizations also have stakeholder involvement as one of their guiding principles. Canada's CCCDF and CDM/JI Office projects ensured the participation of developing country partners by requiring the Canadian Executing Agency to partner with an organization in the non-Annex I country in order to be eligible for funding. Partners might come from the public, private, academic or NGO sector. In many cases, these projects also involved local communities, often creating linkages between communities and governments, NGOs or institutions. The European Community suggests that capacity-building activities must involve all sectors of society and levels of authority to ensure effective delivery of programmes and sustainable outcomes. For example, a programme with the objective of enhancing capacity to adapt to climate change at the local level could involve community groups that are directly involved, local and regional authorities, NGOs, the private sector, academic institutions, and national-level government agencies and decision makers.

152. Indigenous communities are one social group that is often excluded as a participant in climate change capacity-building activities. Although these groups might be included when local stakeholders are considered, only New Zealand specifically mentioned consultations with the native communities of the Pacific Islands concerned with adaptation in its national communication. Review of the national communications of other countries with large indigenous populations has shown that this concern is not always explicitly taken into account.

153. The IPCC, referring to indigenous populations in Australia and New Zealand, notes that "the effects of climate change on health will be most severe in populations that already are marginal. For

⁷¹ Global Environment Facility. Evaluation Report #1-02. Results from the GEF Climate Change Programme Global Environment Facility, Monitoring and Evaluation Unit.

these populations, climate change and sea-level rise impacts will be one more cause for ““overload””.⁷² In addition, “a changing climate has implications for vector-borne and waterborne diseases in indigenous communities”.⁷³ Although the IPCC was discussing the cases of Australia and New Zealand with respect to their responsibility towards the Pacific Islands, this applies to most developing countries with indigenous populations. One further point is that, since technological solutions available to other groups of society may not be available to indigenous groups, it is important to work with them by providing them with information materials in their own language and to target adaptation initiatives to their specific needs. For instance, building their capacity for appropriate agricultural and fishing practices can help these populations cope with the effects of climate change. Alternatively, traditional practices and knowledge may help provide successful and adapted solutions to climate change challenges.

154. Another important aspect is that the social and political structures, beliefs and knowledge of these groups can have positive or negative impacts on capacity-building efforts, for example, in the case of agricultural practices such as deforestation and slash-and-burn. Indigenous leaders usually have strong political power and strong support from their communities. This leadership role in building awareness can be critical in bringing much sought-after and sustained behavioural change in resource use and management.

E. Analysis and conclusion

155. Although both non-Annex I Parties and donors agree on the factors affecting sustainability, in practice project implementation does not always take into account all these factors. Generally, very few Parties are giving sufficient attention to the sustainability of capacity-building efforts.

156. Addressing sustainability requires an integrated approach that incorporates sustainability at all these levels, as the building blocks for sustainability include the enabling environment, the institutional set-up, and human resource issues. Many countries, however, still require a great deal of assistance if they are to be able to address their capacity-building needs in an integrated way.

F. Lessons learned

157. The key lessons learned when considering the sustainability of capacity-building results include the following:

- (a) Strategies and initiatives that consider national capacity in an integrated fashion have better chances of ensuring sustainable outcomes if they identify and act on potential bottlenecks that might prevent the mobilization of the capacity being developed;
- (b) Experience suggests that the sustainability of capacity-building programmes relating to climate change is optimized by integrating them into national planning and sustainable development strategies, as well as ensuring that climate change activities are linked directly to national priorities;
- (c) To be in line with this integrated approach, when designing and implementing capacity-building interventions, attention must be paid to the various issues to be considered when building capacity, be it at the systemic, the institutional or the individual level;
- (d) Adequate strategies to address financial sustainability and resource allocation must be built in from the outset in capacity-building interventions with a view to ensuring long-term sustainability and adequate scope of the actions to be undertaken.

⁷² Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. Working Group II: Impacts, Adaptation and Vulnerability to Climate Change 2001.

⁷³ Taken from <http://www.grida.no>

158. Experience in development cooperation has also yielded numerous lessons when it comes to best practice in sustaining capacity-building activities, for example:

- (a) Capacity-building activities must involve key decision makers;
- (b) Implementers of capacity-building activities must recognize the need to involve local experts and all the main stakeholders from the onset of project planning in order to facilitate and encourage local ownership;
- (c) Partners in capacity development must recognize the need to support slow, progressive, and sometimes unpredictable processes, which are sometimes influenced by the changing political or institutional conditions of a country, and the lack of human resource capacities for project implementation;
- (d) The objectives of the capacity-building activities need to be commensurate with the current capacities found in the recipient country;
- (e) Processes for effective monitoring and feedback on progress towards capacity-building projects and programmes and sustainability measures are required.

G. Recommendations

159. Particular attention must be paid to the fact that capacity-building initiatives are not developed in isolation; rather, they should be “nested” in an overall enabling environment in order to ensure the sustainability of capacity-building activities. This makes it worthwhile to see the priority actions under the CB framework in the light of the other capacity-building concerns highlighted in this section and which must be taken into account when developing and implementing capacity-building interventions at the systemic, institutional and individual levels.

160. From the outset, capacity-building initiatives require a sustainability plan that should be pursued throughout project and programme implementation. The plan should encompass an integrated approach to the sustainability of capacity-building initiatives.

161. It could be useful to conduct a thematic post-project evaluation across regions, organizations and agencies that would focus on reviewing efforts to ensure the sustainability of capacity-building for climate change initiatives, as coverage of this aspect tends to be weak in the documentation available.

VIII. Indicators for capacity-building interventions

A. Key international work on capacity-building indicators

162. This chapter aims to explore and discuss in a summary way present knowledge about indicators for capacity-building.

163. An *indicator* seeks to measure a result of projects and programmes or to provide evidence that a result has been achieved or to provide information that progress is being made. An indicator is also a means of measuring actual results against planned or expected results.

164. In the context of this technical paper, indicators would be used to determine the progress of capacity-building activities. The information derived from analysing changes using selected indicators could provide insights into the status of the capacity-building activity, including its strengths and its weaknesses. Indicators point to areas where results are being achieved and to where progress is impeded, allowing for adaptation and improvement when and where necessary.

165. Important recent work on capacity-building indicators has been done and was reviewed in the context of this study. Some of the most relevant work in this area emanates from the UNDP/GEF

Resource Kit.⁷⁴ The definitions of capacity-building found in the kit are useful, and its classification of key capacity-building interventions at the different levels – *systemic*, *institutional* and *individual* – has been used in this study.

166. The UNDP/GEF capacity development indicator framework and resource kit include the following five strategic areas of support for capacity-building:

1. Capacity to conceptualize and formulate policies, legislation, strategies and programmes

167. This includes analysing global conditions that may affect country needs and performance in a given area, developing a vision, developing a long-term strategy, and setting objectives. It also includes conceptualizing broader sectoral and cross-sectoral policy, and legislative and regulatory frameworks, including synergies between global environmental conventions. It further includes the prioritization, planning and formulation of programmes and projects.

168. This strategic area of support could be related in particular to the following UNFCCC capacity-building needed interventions, as outlined in the CB framework:

- (a) The enhancement and/or creation of an enabling environment;
- (b) The development of national climate change programmes;
- (c) Improved decision-making, including assistance for participation in international negotiations relating to climate change.

2. Capacity to implement policies, legislation, strategies and programmes

169. This category includes process management capacities that are essential in the implementation of any type of policy, legislation, strategy or programme. It also includes execution aspects of programme and project implementation. It includes the mobilizing and managing of human, material and financial resources, and the selection of technologies and procurement of equipment.

170. This strategic area of support could be related in particular to the following UNFCCC capacity-building interventions that are needed, as outlined in the CB framework:

- (a) Capacity-building for implementation adaptation measures;
- (b) Institutional capacity-building, including the strengthening or establishment, as appropriate, of national climate change secretariats or national focal points;
- (c) Development and transfer of technology;
- (d) Assessment for implementation of mitigation options.

3. Capacity to engage and build consensus among all stakeholders

171. This includes issues such as the mobilization and motivation of stakeholders, the creation of partnerships, awareness-raising and developing an enabling environment for civil society and the private sector, stakeholder identification and involvement, the managing of large group processes and discussions, including mediation of divergent interests, and the establishment of collaborative mechanisms.

172. This strategic area of support is related in particular to the following UNFCCC capacity-building interventions that are needed, as outlined in the CB framework:

⁷⁴ United Nations Development Programme/Global Environment Facility. Capacity Development Indicators. UNDP/GEF Resource Kit (No. 4). November 2003.

- (a) Institutional and regional collaboration, coordination and partnership;
- (b) Education, training and public awareness.

4. Capacity to mobilize information and knowledge

173. This pertains to the mobilization of, access to and use of information and knowledge. It includes issues such as gathering, analysing and synthesizing information effectively, identifying problems and potential solutions, as well as consulting experts and peers. It further covers technical skills that are related specifically to the requirements of the GEF's 22 strategic priorities and associated Conventions, including the capacity to carry out scientific and technical assessments in the areas relevant to GEF focal areas and related conventions.

174. This strategic area of support is related in particular to the following capacity-building activities as outlined in the CB framework:

- (a) GHG inventories, emission database management, and systems for collecting, managing and utilizing activity data and emission factors;
- (b) Vulnerability and adaptation assessment;
- (c) Research and systematic observation, including meteorological, hydrological and climatological services;
- (d) Information and networking, including the establishment of databases.

5. Capacity to monitor, evaluate, report and learn

175. This pertains to the monitoring of progress, the measuring of results, the codification of lessons, learning and feedback, and ensuring accountability to the ultimate beneficiaries and partners. It also covers aspects such as reporting to donors and global conventions. It naturally links back to policy dialogue, planning and improved management of implementation.

176. This strategic area of support is related in particular to the following UNFCCC capacity-building interventions that are needed:

- (a) National communications;
- (b) Education and training.

B. Possible application of capacity-building indicators

177. Table 4 below depicts some of the links between the needs expressed in the CB framework, which are tentatively categorized here by the levels of intervention and the five strategic areas of support in capacity-building as defined in the UNDP/GEF resource kit for capacity development indicators. The table also presents a list (not exhaustive) of suggested indicators that relate loosely to these various areas, levels and interventions in capacity-building for climate change. The list of indicators, found in the right-hand column, comes from a thorough review of various indicators from international and bilateral agencies and organizations that have been developed and used in climate change generally, and in capacity-building specifically. The list therefore presents various "aspects" of capacities to be built and tracked at various levels. In the interests of brevity and in order to present the information in a manageable way, the list is restricted to outcome-level results. The scope of this technical paper does not allow for an exhaustive review or depiction of indicators for short-term, medium-term and long-term results.

178. The table's contents are also relevant in the light of another conclusion from this paper presented in an earlier chapter, namely, that there is a lack of common reporting tools and methodologies for measuring and reporting on capacity-building interventions that would be flexible for use by developing

countries according to their own and unique situations and/or characteristics. The table is merely meant, at this stage, as an input to the discussion of how to develop a tool for using, tracking and reporting on results and indicators of climate change capacity-building. Such a tool should build in a general way on the UNFCCC capacity-building framework and the GEF/UNDP resource kit while also capturing the broader scope of climate-change capacity-building interventions that might be undertaken by Annex II and non-Annex I Parties to the Convention.

179. It should be remembered that this list of indicators is not a blueprint from which alternatives can be chosen to measure performance of all capacity-building interventions, at all levels. This is due to the fact that non-Annex I Parties must define capacity-building indicators in the light of the unique and contextual reality within which capacity-building interventions are undertaken. Capacity-building is by definition contextual. As previously mentioned in this study, capacity-building results at certain levels are prerequisites for capacity-building results at higher levels. In addition, countries with different political or governance structures, or different geographies and economies, may require slightly different capacity-building strategies or different capacities altogether. This is why, in addition to indicators, this table presents the five strategic categories of potential capacity-building efforts. The list should trigger reflection on the national or international “roll-up”/reporting of results achieved at the particular level rather than through the application of strict indicators as such. This could become an alternative way to “tell a story” about the types of capacity-building effort being undertaken to assist in the implementation of the UNFCCC.

C. Analysis and conclusions

180. Indicators are key tools for measuring and tracking performance in climate change capacity-building projects and programmes. Although some work has been done, notably with the UNDP/GEF Resource Kit, there is further progress to be made in the development of strong and appropriate indicators for climate change capacity-building. In a results-based management context, there is a need for a more results-based approach to the development of such indicators.

181. In addition, there is a lack of common reporting tools and methodologies for measuring and reporting on capacity-building interventions for climate change. Capacity-building indicators are contextual by nature and need to be developed with this in mind. A well-categorized system of capacity-building indicators for climate change would not only enhance measurement and reporting on capacity-building results achieved and progress made, but would also facilitate a roll-up of results across geographic regions within an agency or organization, or across agencies and organizations. The key 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 indicator and facilitate roll-up in measurement and reporting on results achieved and progress made.

D. Lessons learned

182. In line with the premises of results-based management, sound indicators to measure the performance of climate change capacity-building activities are instrumental in increasing the effectiveness of such initiatives.

183. Much reporting on capacity-building tends to be based on activities rather than results.

184. The development of categories of climate change capacity-building results and indicators could help to synthesize reporting on capacity-building activities and the harmonization of indicators and methods of measurement, as well as reporting across geographic regions, agencies and organizations.

E. Recommendations

185. It is recommended that the secretariat and the Parties pursue further the development of sound guidelines and methodologies for the development of adequate performance indicators for climate change capacity-building initiatives.

186. Further exploration of the potential categorization of climate change capacity-building results and indicators to facilitate roll-up in reporting is required.

187. Future work on the development of climate change capacity-building indicators should focus on measuring progress towards results rather than activities. Indeed, the adoption of results-based management principles in the development of climate change capacity-building initiatives and their indicators would strengthen the measurement of performance in that respect.

188. In line with the discussion on sustainability in an earlier chapter of this paper, capacity-building performance indicators should pay particular attention to measuring the potential for sustainability of capacity-building efforts.

Table 4. 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 framework⁷⁵

| UNDP/GEF resource kit: strategic area of support | Developing country capacity needs in the CB framework | Relevant indicators that are linked to the strategic areas and capacity needs |
|---|---|---|
| <p>Systemic</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 GHG mitigation and 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>Institutional</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 needs |

⁷⁵ 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 suggested (and 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 merely 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 CB framework | Relevant indicators that are linked to the strategic areas and capacity needs |
|---|---|--|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 • Degree to which research and development activities are 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><u>Individual</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"> • 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 and 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 |

| UNDP/GEF resource kit: strategic area of support | Developing country capacity needs in the CB framework | Relevant indicators that are linked to the strategic areas and capacity needs |
|--|---|---|
| | | <p>and used</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 |

IX. Summary of conclusions, lessons learned and recommendations

189. The main conclusions, lessons learned and recommendations on the range and effectiveness of capacity-building activities in developing countries aimed at implementing decision 2/CP.7 include the following.

190. In terms of the *capacity-building needs and priorities of developing countries*, several studies confirm that the framework for capacity-building in developing countries (non-Annex I) is still largely in line with the present priorities of non-Annex I Parties. However, as capacity-building needs identified by the developing countries are many and wide-ranging, a thorough and systematic assessment for and by non-Annex I Parties of their existing and required capacities in the context of the implementation of the UNFCCC is needed in order to clarify further their specific needs and the relevant priority actions in each country. Findings from the NCSA and NAPA country-driven processes should be used as further guidance for the selection and sequencing of capacity-building initiatives and the proper implementation of the UNFCCC framework by all Parties.

191. Multilateral and bilateral agencies have tackled a wide range of priority issues identified in the framework for capacity-building in developing countries, as well as those expressed by developing countries as their main needs and priorities. However, some types of *capacity-building programme and activity* have been given more attention than others, such as institutional capacity-building, education, training and public awareness raising, the development and transfer of technology, and vulnerability and adaptation assessment. Good dialogue between the proposers and the donors during proposal preparation could help to ensure that the initiatives supported are in line with non-Annex I Parties' priorities. This is also instrumental in building ownership of the climate change agenda by various local actors. Capacity-building efforts must also address various levels, from policy to capacity mobilization on-the-ground, in a timely manner and take account of the integrated nature of capacity-building.

192. The main *results/impacts of capacity-building initiatives* thus far include the creation of relevant and efficient institutions, improvements in the quantity and quality of information generated and disseminated, and the increased capacity of thousands of individuals to tackle a wide range of climate change issues. However, developing countries clearly need further assistance to strengthen their existing institutions in terms of human and financial resources. The lack of common tools, terminologies and approaches for reporting on results and impacts achieved through capacity-building activities is making it difficult to present an overarching national, regional and global portrayal of what has been achieved so far. However, previous experience has demonstrated that the most effective capacity-building initiatives are based on existing capacity and self-assessments of needs, take a long-term approach, ensure stakeholder participation and attempt to integrate capacity-building in wider sustainable development efforts.

193. The *amount of resources available* for capacity-building activities has been considerable. By March 2004, the GEF had invested more than USD 2 billion in a wide range of climate change activities. More than 130 non-Annex I Parties have received financial and technical support from the GEF and its implementing agencies to prepare their initial national communications. Annex II Parties have also made funds available or promoted activities that can be open to non-Annex I Parties. However, additional financial and technical resources should also be provided to non-Annex I Parties to enable them to comply with their obligations under the UNFCCC and to ensure that their numerous and complex capacity-building needs are addressed. Also, to promote *equitable access to resources*, adequate sharing and dissemination of information on funding available for non-Annex I Parties should be encouraged further. The *efficiency of capacity-building efforts* could be increased through increased information dissemination through improved sharing mechanisms and improved South-South cooperation. Within that context, it would be beneficial to encourage further the publication and sharing of best practice and knowledge concerning climate change capacity-building efforts overall. Networks and other sharing

mechanisms among non-Annex I Parties and between donors and non-Annex I Parties that are focused on the crucial exchange of knowledge and lessons are needed. Overall efficiency could also be improved by furthering collaboration between donors.

194. The *sustainability of capacity-building efforts* depends on an integrated approach that looks at the management system in place for climate change issues in a given country and/or region and builds on it to make this system effective at the local, national and regional levels. This integrated and holistic approach may pose a challenge to the vast majority of developing countries and, to date, many initiatives have not taken the key factors affecting sustainability into account.

195. Experience over the past 25 years suggests that, to ensure sustainable results, capacity-building efforts must build on a high degree of political commitment, encourage local ownership, place emphasis on local expertise and participation, ensure that interventions match national capacities, recognize the slow pace at which results may emerge, and ensure effective monitoring and feedback on progress made. The sustainability of capacity-building initiatives is also enhanced when national capacity is considered and when initiatives are in line with national priorities and integrated into national strategies. By their very nature, capacity-building initiatives are complex and integrated. An integrated approach to capacity-building which considers the systemic, institutional and individual levels can make it possible to avoid potential bottlenecks that might prevent the mobilization of capacities. Such integrated approaches to sustainability must be well planned at the outset of project development. It would be useful to conduct a study on this issue in order to further learning and the sharing of lessons.

196. Some important recent work on *capacity-building indicators* has been done, including the GEF/UNDP Resource Kit, although generally there is a need for further research and work on this issue. Data currently available suggest that indicators for and reporting on capacity-building tend to be activity-based rather than results-based. In a results-based management context, strong and appropriate results-based indicators to measure the performance of climate change capacity-building initiatives are required in order to strengthen the effectiveness of such initiatives. To address the lack of common reporting tools and methodologies, the development of categories of climate change capacity-building results and indicators could facilitate a roll-up of reporting on such initiatives and could also be the catalyst for a harmonization of indicators, measurement and reporting across geographic regions, agencies and organizations.

Annex I

Objective and scope of capacity-building in the framework of decision 2/CP.7¹

A. Scope

1. The following is the initial scope of needs and areas for capacity-building in developing countries as broadly identified in the annex to decision 10/CP.5, in the compilation and synthesis document prepared by the secretariat, and in submissions by Parties:

- (a) Institutional capacity-building, including the strengthening or establishment, as appropriate, of national climate change secretariats or national focal points;
- (b) Enhancement and/or creation of an enabling environment;
- (c) National communications;
- (d) National climate change programmes;
- (e) GHG inventories, emissions database management, and systems for collecting, managing and utilizing activity data and emission factors;
- (f) Vulnerability and adaptation assessment;
- (g) Capacity-building for implementation of adaptation measures;
- (h) Assessment for implementation of mitigation options;
- (i) Research and systematic observation, including meteorological, hydrological and climatological services;
- (j) Development and transfer of technology;
- (k) Improved decision making, including assistance for participation in international negotiations;
- (l) Clean development mechanism;
- (m) Needs arising out of the implementation of Article 4, paragraphs 8 and 9, of the Convention;
- (n) Education, training and public awareness;
- (o) Information and networking, including the establishment of databases.

2. Other capacity-building needs and possible responses are being identified by the Parties in their discussions of other issues. The decisions resulting from these discussions, as well as other activities related to the implementation of the Convention and preparation for the effective participation by developing countries in the Kyoto Protocol process, should continue to inform the scope and implementation of this framework.

¹ Capacity-building framework annexed to decision 2/CP.7.

Specific scope for capacity-building in least developed countries

3. The least developed countries, and small island developing States among them, are among the most vulnerable to extreme weather events and the adverse effects of climate change. They also have the least capacity to cope with and adapt to the adverse effects of climate change.
4. The following is the initial assessment of needs and priority areas for capacity-building in these countries:
 - (a) Strengthening existing and, where needed, establishing national climate change secretariats or focal points to enable the effective implementation of the Convention and effective participation in the Kyoto Protocol process, including the preparation of national communications;
 - (b) Developing an integrated implementation programme which takes into account the role of research and training in capacity-building;
 - (c) Developing and enhancing technical capacities and skills to carry out and effectively integrate vulnerability and adaptation assessments into sustainable development programmes and develop national adaptation programmes of action;
 - (d) Strengthening existing and, where needed, establishing national research and training institutions in order to ensure the sustainability of the capacity-building programmes;
 - (e) Strengthening the capacity of meteorological and hydrological services to collect, analyse, interpret and disseminate weather and climate information to support implementation of national adaptation programmes of action;
 - (f) Enhancing public awareness (level of understanding and human capacity development).

Annex II**Survey questionnaire: Survey of selected developing countries (non-Annex I Parties)****February 2004**

Data gathering phase

Elaboration of a technical paper on the range and effectiveness of capacity-building in developing countries relating to decision 2/CP.7**Prepared for***United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change Secretariat***Note:**

*This completed questionnaire should be sent back to the attention of Moreno Padilla and/or Alain Lafontaine, via e-mail, fax or express mail by **February 27 at the latest**, at the **Baastel address** provided above. It should be sent along with any accompanying document deemed useful to further inform the overall position and approach of the respondent's organization regarding the issues covered herein. Thank you in advance for your collaboration!*

I. Identification of the respondent's organization and country:**Organization's name:** _____**Country:** _____**Region:** _____**II. Questionnaire****I- Scope of capacity-building activities**

Please check (✓) from the list below the types of capacity-building initiatives for climate change (CC) that have been the focus of your country's efforts over the period 2002–2004. Also assign a priority ranking (from one (1) to five (5) for the five CB types (**5 maximum please**) that were seen as the main priorities in terms of your capacity-building needs over that period (no. 1 being the most significant need for your country):

| Check | Types of capacity-building efforts | Ranking |
|--------------------------|---|---------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Institutional capacity-building, including the strengthening or establishment, as appropriate, of national climate change secretariats or national focal points | ___ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Enhancement and/or creation of an enabling environment | ___ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | National communications | ___ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | National climate change programmes | ___ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Greenhouse gas inventories, emission database management, systems for collecting, managing and utilizing activity data and emission factors | ___ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Vulnerability and adaptation assessment | ___ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Capacity-building for implementation of adaptation measures | ___ |

- Assessment for implementation of mitigation options _____
- Research and systematic observation, including meteorological, hydrological and climatological services _____
- Development and transfer of technology _____
- Improved decision making, including assistance for participation in international negotiations _____
- Clean development mechanism _____
- Needs arising out of the implementation of Article 4, paragraphs 8 and 9, of the Convention (*please see appendix I*) _____
- Education, training and public awareness _____
- Information and networking, including the establishment of databases _____
- Other capacity-building activities, **please specify** _____
- _____ _____
- _____ _____
- _____ _____

1.2. To what extent do you feel the CB for CC initiatives supported by donor organizations in your country during the period 2002-2004 were in line with your country's priorities when it comes to CB for CC?

| Never | Sometimes | Often | Always |
|-------|-----------|-------|--------|
| | | | |

1.3. Please explain:

2- Key results and impacts

2.1. Looking at the completed or ongoing initiatives of your country in capacity-building for CC, could you please give examples in point form of some of the key outcomes and impacts achieved and provide two or three success stories:

i) Key outcomes achieved:

1-
2-
3-

ii) Key impacts achieved

1-
2-
3-

iii) Success stories*:

| |
|----|
| 1- |
| 2- |
| 3- |

**Please do not hesitate to attach detailed case studies of the success stories to your completed questionnaire.*

2.2. In your country, what types of capacity-building for CC initiatives have proved more successful in yielding results, and why?:

| Type of CB initiatives | Reason for higher success rate |
|------------------------|--------------------------------|
| | |
| | |
| | |

2.3. Please describe below the key indicators that you found useful in measuring the success of capacity-building for CC initiatives in your country (*if you have a list of success CB indicators, please provide it in an annex to this survey*):

| |
|------|
| i) |
| ii) |
| iii) |
| iv) |
| v) |

3- Effectiveness of capacity-building

3.1. Based on your country's experience, what are key challenges and or pitfalls to the effectiveness (*effectiveness is defined as the ability to achieve the objectives set forth*) of capacity-building for CC initiatives and efforts?

| |
|--|
| |
|--|

3.2. What would be, in your country's view, the best practices when it comes to effectively managing capacity-building initiatives (*i.e., managing for results*)?

| |
|--|
| |
|--|

3.3. Could you provide one or two examples of capacity-building for CC initiatives which have succeeded at incorporating those practices and have indeed been effective in yielding results?

(You are welcome to annex particular cases studies to this completed survey questionnaire, if different from those provided above.)

| |
|------------|
| Example 1: |
| Example 2: |

3.4. What do you see as the most important areas for future efforts in support of capacity-building for CC in your country and why?

| Area | Why? |
|------|------|
| | |
| | |
| | |

4- Sustainability

4.1. What would you define the key elements/strategies (regional, national, administrative, institutional, technological, ecological) required to ensure the sustainability of the capacity-building for CC efforts in your country?*

| |
|--|
| |
|--|

**You are welcome to attach to your completed questionnaire any document you might be using as a guide in your project or programme development work to help ensure greater sustainability of CB for CC initiatives.*

4.2. Based on the elements defined above, how sustainable in the long-term is your overall portfolio on ongoing CC projects *(please provide examples as relevant)*

| Highly Sustainable | Sustainable | Marginally Sustainable | Unsustainable |
|--------------------|-------------|------------------------|---------------|
| | | | |

4.3. What mechanisms exist, that you are aware of, for dissemination, sharing of information and experiences, coordination and cooperation in CB for CC between your country and other developing countries? And is your organization benefiting from or involved in the development and promotion of any of these mechanisms?

| Mechanisms | Describe role of/benefit to your country, if any |
|------------|--|
| | |
| | |
| | |

4.4. What are the key lessons learned when it comes to ensuring the retention of capacity built in your country?

5- Stakeholder involvement and ownership

5.1. What types of stakeholder are typically involved in your country’s CB initiatives? (*Please check the appropriate lines.*)

| | |
|---|---|
| Local communities____ NGOs____ Research, academic or scientific institutions____ Private sector____ International organizations____ | Central government____ Line agencies____ Provincial government____ Municipal government____ Regional government____ Others____ |
|---|---|

5.2. In what capacity are they typically involved?

5.3. How are you involving national coordinating mechanisms, focal points and other coordinating entities in your CB for CC initiatives?

5.4. What, in your view, are the key indicators to measure adequate country ownership of the initiatives supported by international donors?

5.5. What measures can be used to ensure further country ownership and adequate participation of relevant stakeholders, if any?

6- Availability, access to resources and efficiency in resource use

6.1. List below the key donors and funding mechanisms your country has used during the period 2002–2004 to access support for its capacity-building activities in support of the implementation of the UNFCCC?

| Donor (bilateral, multilateral, NGO or private sector) | Names of programmes/mechanisms | No. of proposals approved for support by donor | Size of donor funding approved in US\$ | Summary description: objective, average size of projects, focus etc. |
|--|--------------------------------|--|--|--|
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

6.2. Were any of your funding requests for CB for CC proposals *formally* turned down on the basis of cost rather than quality and relevance of the proposals over the period 2002–2004? (*check appropriate box*)

| | | | |
|-------|-----------|-------|--------|
| Never | Sometimes | Often | Always |
| | | | |

6.3. If any, what were the particular difficulties or constraints your country has faced in accessing resources in support of your CB for CC priorities?

6.4. What types of additional programme/support to CB for CC would be useful in view of the needs identified in your country?

6.5. Has your country gained from the CB experiences or knowledge from other developing countries? If so, please provide an example:

Example:

6.6. What have been to date the most efficient types of CB for CC interventions in your country (i.e., the initiatives yielding the best results for the amount of resources and/or time invested)?

| |
|--|
| |
|--|

6.7. Based on your country's experience, how could the efficiency (i.e., the amount of resources and/or time required to achieve a given result) of CB efforts be further enhanced?

| |
|--|
| |
|--|

7 Lessons learned

7.1. What are the main lessons learned (positive or less positive) that could help improve CD initiatives and their focus in support of the implementation of the UNFCCC in the future?

| |
|--|
| |
|--|

8- The way forward

8.1. Do you have general or specific recommendations that could help improve the effectiveness, efficiency, impacts and/or sustainability of capacity-building initiatives in support of the implementation of the UNFCCC?

| |
|--|
| |
|--|

Annex III

**Survey questionnaire: Survey of selected key
Annex II Parties/donor organizations)**

February 2004

Data gathering phase

Elaboration of a technical paper on the range and effectiveness of capacity-building in developing countries relating to decision 2/CP.7

Prepared for

United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change Secretariat

Note:

*This completed questionnaire should be sent back to the attention of Moreno Padilla and/or Alain Lafontaine, via e-mail, fax or express mail **by February 27 at the latest**, at the **Baastel address** provided above. It should be sent along with any accompanying document deemed useful to further inform the overall position and approach of the respondent's organization regarding the issues covered herein. Thank you in advance for your collaboration!*

I. Identification of the respondent's organization and country:

Organization's name: _____

Country: _____

Region: _____

Questionnaire

1- Programmes and activities

1.1. What is the annual overall level of commitments from your agency in climate change-related activities for the following fiscal years (FY)? (*Please specify the currency and the number of projects this commitment covers.*)

| | | | |
|-----------|--------------|---------------|-----------------------|
| FY 2002: | Amount:_____ | Currency_____ | No. of projects:_____ |
| FY 2003: | Amount:_____ | Currency_____ | No. of projects:_____ |
| FY 2004:* | Amount:_____ | Currency_____ | No. of projects:_____ |

**Figures for 2004 are planned figures*

1.2. Of that overall amount, what is the approximate annual commitment directed at capacity-building initiatives for CC (*provide currency value if available, otherwise approximate percentage value*):

| | | |
|----------|--------------|--|
| FY 2002: | Amount:_____ | or % of total CC actual commitment _____ |
| FY 2003: | Amount:_____ | or % of total CC actual commitment _____ |

FY 2004: Amount: _____ or % of total CC planned commitment _____

1.3. If possible, please provide the overall regional distribution of these capacity-building commitments (*please express in percentages of the total commitment provided above- under 1.2 - for each fiscal year*):

FY 2002: Central & Latin America: ___%, Asia & Pacific ___%
Africa and Middle East ___%, C &E Europe ___%; Others ___%

FY 2003: Central & Latin America: ___%, Asia & Pacific ___%
Africa and Middle East ___%, C &E Europe ___%; Others ___%

FY 2004: Central & Latin America: ___%, Asia & Pacific ___%
Africa and Middle East ___%, C &E Europe ___%; Others ___%

2- Scope of capacity-building activities

2.1. Please check (✓) from the list below the types of capacity-building initiatives for CC that have been the focus of your country’s efforts over the period 2002–2004. Also assign a priority ranking (from one (1) to five (5) for the five CB types (**5 maximum please**) that were seen as the main priorities in terms of your capacity-building needs over that period (no. 1 being the most significant need for your country):

| Check | Types of capacity-building efforts | Ranking |
|--------------------------|---|---------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Institutional capacity-building, including the strengthening or establishment, as appropriate, of national climate change secretariats or national focal points | ___ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Enhancement and/or creation of an enabling environment | ___ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | National communications | ___ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | National climate change programmes | ___ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Greenhouse gas inventories, emission database management, systems for collecting, managing and utilizing activity data and emission factors | ___ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Vulnerability and adaptation assessment | ___ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Capacity-building for implementation of adaptation measures | ___ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Assessment for implementation of mitigation options | ___ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Research and systematic observation, including meteorological, hydrological and climatological services | ___ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Development and transfer of technology | ___ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Improved decision making, including assistance for participation in international negotiations | ___ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Clean development mechanism | ___ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Needs arising out of the implementation of Article 4, paragraphs 8 and 9, of the Convention (<i>please see appendix 1</i>) | ___ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Education, training and public awareness | ___ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Information and networking, including the establishment of databases | ___ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Other capacity-building activities, please specify | ___ |
| | _____ | ___ |
| | _____ | ___ |
| | _____ | ___ |

3- Key results and impacts

3.1. Looking at the completed or ongoing initiatives of your country/agency in capacity-building for CC, could you please give examples in point form of some of the key outcomes and impacts achieved and provide two or three success stories:

i) Key outcomes achieved:

| |
|----|
| 1- |
| 2- |
| 3- |

ii) Key impacts achieved:

| |
|----|
| 1- |
| 2- |
| 3- |

iii) Success stories*:

| |
|----|
| 1- |
| 2- |
| 3- |

**Please do not hesitate to attach detailed case studies of the success stories to your completed questionnaire.*

3.2. Looking at ongoing initiatives of your agency in capacity-building for CC, could you please describe some of the key initial results achieved?

| |
|--|
| |
|--|

3.3. What types of capacity-building for CC initiatives supported by your country/agency have proved more successful in yielding results, if any type in particular, and why?

| Type of CB initiatives | Reason for higher success rate |
|------------------------|--------------------------------|
| | |
| | |
| | |

3.4. Please describe below the key indicators that you found useful in measuring the success of capacity-building initiatives supported by your country/organization or by others. *(If your organization has an agreed or draft list of success CB indicators, please provide it in annex to this survey.)*

| |
|------|
| i) |
| ii) |
| iii) |
| iv) |
| v) |

4- Effectiveness of capacity-building

4.1. Based on your country’s experience, what are the key challenges and or pitfalls to the effectiveness *(effectiveness is defined as the ability to achieve the objectives set forth)* of capacity-building for CC initiatives and efforts?

| |
|--|
| |
|--|

4.2. What would be, in your country’s view, the best practices when it comes to effectively managing capacity-building initiatives *(i.e., managing for results)*?

| |
|--|
| |
|--|

4.3. Could you provide one or two examples of capacity-building for CC initiatives which have succeeded at incorporating those practices and have indeed been effective in yielding results? *(You are welcome to annex particular cases studies to this completed survey questionnaire, if different from those provided above)*

| |
|------------|
| Example 1: |
| Example 2: |

4.4. What do you see as the most important areas for future efforts in support of capacity-building for CC by your country/agency, and why?

| Area | Why? |
|------|------|
| | |
| | |
| | |

5- Sustainability

5.1. What would you define the key elements/strategies (regional, national, administrative, institutional, technological, ecological) required to ensure the sustainability of the capacity-building for CC efforts in your country?*

**You are welcome to attach to your completed questionnaire any document you might be using as a guide in your project or programme development work to help ensure greater sustainability of CB for CC initiatives.*

5.2. Based on the elements defined above, how sustainable in the long-term is your overall portfolio for ongoing CC projects? *(Please provide examples as relevant.)*

| Highly sustainable | Sustainable | Marginally sustainable | Unsustainable |
|--------------------|-------------|------------------------|---------------|
| | | | |

5.3. What are the key lessons learned when it comes to ensuring the retention of capacity built in developing countries?

6- Stakeholder involvement and ownership

6.1. What types of stakeholders are typically involved in CB initiatives supported by your agency? *(Please check the appropriate lines)*

| | |
|---|---|
| Local communities____ NGOs____ Research, Academic, Scientific Institutions____ Private Sector____ International organizations____ | Central Government____ Line Agencies____ Provincial Government____ Municipal Government____ Regional Government____ Others____ |
|---|---|

6.2. In what capacity are they typically involved?

6.3. How is your agency involving national coordinating mechanisms, focal points and other coordinating entities in the initiatives it supports??

6.4. What are the key indicators used to measure country ownership of the initiatives supported, if any?

| |
|--|
| |
|--|

7- Availability, access to resources and efficiency in resource use

7.1. Briefly describe the key mechanisms/programmes which exist in your agency that developing countries can access for capacity-building activities in support of the implementation of the UNFCCC?

| Name of programme/ mechanism | Start date/ Finish date | Overall size of programme/ mechanism in US\$ | Summary description: objective, eligibility, average size of projects, focus, etc |
|---------------------------------|----------------------------|--|---|
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

7.2. Did your organization have to turn down CB for CC proposals from developing countries on the basis of cost rather than quality and relevance of the proposals over the period 2002–2004? (check appropriate box)

| | | | |
|-------|-----------|-------|--------|
| Never | Sometimes | Often | Always |
| | | | |

7.3. How many different developing countries had access to CB for CC support from your country/agency between 2002 and 2004? ____ **countries**

7.4. How many of these countries received support for more than one CB for CC initiative over that same time period? ____ **countries**

7.5. What types of additional programme/support to CB for CC would be useful in view of the needs identified by your country/agency if the financial resources were available?

| |
|--|
| |
|--|

7.6. What mechanisms exist, that you are aware of, for dissemination, sharing of information and experiences, coordination and cooperation in CB for CC between developing countries? And is your country/agency supporting the development of any of these mechanisms?

| Mechanisms | Describe support, if any |
|------------|--------------------------|
| | |
| | |
| | |

7.7. What have been to date the most efficient types of CB for CC interventions supported by your country/agency (i.e., the initiatives yielding the best results for the amount of resources and/or time invested), if any?

7.8. Based on the experience gained in your country/agency, how could the efficiency (i.e., the amount of resources and/or time required to achieve a given result) of CB efforts be further enhanced?

8 Lessons learned

8.1. What are the main lessons learned (positive or less positive) that could help improve CD initiatives and their focus in support of the implementation of the UNFCCC in the future?

9- The way forward

9.1. Do you have general or specific recommendations that could help improve the effectiveness, efficiency, impacts and/or sustainability of capacity-building initiatives in support of the implementation of the UNFCCC?

Annex IV**Conclusions of workshop on impact and adaptation methodologies**

1. As requested by the SBSTA at its thirteenth session, the UNFCCC secretariat organized a workshop on the impact and adaptation methodologies for climate change. The main recommendations of this workshop are that there is a need to:
 - (a) Ensure that national vulnerability and adaptation assessments focus on policy options, are oriented towards national planning, processes and decisions, incorporate traditional knowledge, and are integrated into national sustainable development programmes;
 - (b) Modify approaches to impact, vulnerability and adaptation assessments and promote the evolution of methods to better address risks associated with variability and extreme events;
 - (c) Involve key stakeholders in national impacts, vulnerability and adaptation assessments in order to ensure that relevant aspects of the climate change issue are taken into account;
 - (d) Compare vulnerabilities and adaptation to previous and current experience in adapting to climate variability and extremes, and ensure that methods employed are practical, appropriate, feasible and easy to implement, and that they use data which are readily available;
 - (e) Build national capacity for developing, identifying and applying the most appropriate methods based on national circumstances and, where needed, establish national climate change technical teams to this end.

2. Participants further concluded that, in relation to the improvement of methodologies and the dissemination of information about them, there is a need:
 - (a) To promote interaction between end-users and developers of methodologies;
 - (b) To ensure that the evolution of methodologies takes into account the experience acquired in socio-economic and environmental disciplines;
 - (c) To coordinate the development of methods and encourage testing at the regional level where feasible;
 - (d) To apply different methods within one country to determine the variance and/or uncertainty of the results;
 - (e) To improve data quality, including meteorological data, and promote observation systems;
 - (f) To improve the dissemination of information on methods and improve the exchange of information in an interactive manner;
 - (g) To disseminate information on methods and tools for assessing climate change impact, vulnerability and adaptation in accordance with the needs and priorities of stakeholders/users;
 - (h) To supplement the information for dissemination with an evaluation of the methods based on experience gained from their application.

Annex V**Abbreviations and acronyms**

| | |
|-----------------|--|
| CB | Capacity-building |
| CCCDF | Canada Climate Change Development Fund |
| CDI | Capacity Development Initiative |
| CDM | Clean development mechanism |
| CFL | Compact fluorescent lamp |
| CICC | Inter-institutional Climatic Change Council |
| CIDA | Canadian International Development Agency |
| CO ₂ | Carbon dioxide |
| COP | Conference of the Parties |
| EU | European Union |
| GEF | Global Environment Facility |
| GHG | Greenhouse gas |
| GTZ | Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit |
| IA | Implementing Agencies (of the GEF) |
| IMF | International Monetary Fund |
| IPCC | Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change |
| IUCN | International Union for the Conservation of Nature |
| JI | Joint Implementation |
| LDC | Least developed country |
| MOU | Memorandum of understanding |
| NAPA | National Adaptation Programme of Action |
| NCCC | National Committee on Climate Change |
| NCSA | National Capacity Self Assessment |
| NGO | Non-governmental organization |
| NSS | National Strategy Studies |
| OPS2 | Second Overall Performance Study |
| PCF | Prototype Carbon Fund |
| PRSP | Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper |
| SIDS | Small island developing State(s) |
| UN | United Nations |
| UNDP | United Nations Development Programme |
| UNEP | United Nations Environment Programme |
| UNESCAP | United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific |
| UNESCO | United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization |
| UNFCCC | United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change |
| UNIDO | United Nations Industrial Development Organization |
| UNITAR | United Nations Institute for Training and Research |
| WB | World Bank |

Annex VI**References**

- Agence française de Développement et Ministère des Affaires Étrangères. *Développement de l'Agro-Écologie et Stockage de Carbone dans les Agricultures Intertropicale et Méditerranéenne*. Project document.
- Agence française de Développement et Ministère des Affaires Étrangères. *Programme d'Amélioration des Systèmes d'Exploitation en Zone Cotonnière (PASE) au Mali*. Project document.
- Agence française de Développement et Ministère des Affaires Étrangères. *Programme d'Efficacité Énergétique dans la Construction en Chine*. Project document.
- Agence française de Développement et Ministère des Affaires Étrangères. *Financial Resources and Transfer of Technology*. Project document.
- Australia. Third National Communication.
- Barbados. First National Communication.
- Barbados – Ministry of Housing, Lands and The Environment. Region: Latin American and Caribbean Group (GRULAC)/SIDS.
- Bolivia. First National Communication.
- Canada. Third National Communication.
- Chile. First National Communication.
- Canadian International Government Agency's Monitoring and Reporting Framework for the Canada Climate Change Development Fund. 2001.
- Cuba. First National Communication.
- Danish International Development Assistance. *The Planning and Monitoring of Capacity Development in Environment (CDE) Initiatives*. May 1998.
- Global Environment Facility. *Capacity Development Initiative. Assessment of Capacity Development in the GEF Portfolio*. October 2000.
- Global Environment Facility. *Capacity Development Initiative. Scientific and Technical Capacity Development, Needs and Priorities*. October 2000.
- Global Environment Facility. *Capacity Development Initiative. Country Capacity Development Needs and Priorities, Report for Small Island Developing States*. September 2000.
- Global Environment Facility. *Capacity Development Initiative. Country Capacity Development Needs and Priorities, Regional Report for Asia Pacific*. September 2000.
- Global Environment Facility. *Capacity Development Initiative. Country Capacity Development Needs and Priorities, Regional Report for Africa*. September 2000.
- Global Environment Facility. *Capacity Development Initiative. Country Capacity Development Needs and Priorities, Regional Report for Eastern Europe and Central Asia*. September 2000.
- Global Environment Facility. *Capacity Development Initiative. Country Capacity Development Needs and Priorities, Regional Report for Latin America and the Caribbean*. September 2000.
- Global Environment Facility. Monitoring and Evaluation Unit. *Evaluation Report #1-02. Results from the GEF Climate Change Program*.

Global Environment Facility. *Focusing on The Global Environment. The First Decade of the GEF. Second overall Performance Study (OPS2)*. January 2002.

Global Environmental Facility. Monitoring and Evaluation Unit. *Specially Managed Project Review: WB-India Energy Efficiency Project*. September 2003.

Global Environment Facility. *Proposed Elements for Strategic Collaboration and a Framework for GEF Action on Capacity Development for Climate Change. Global Environment – A Briefing Document*. September 2001.

Global Environment Facility. *Review of Climate Change Enabling Activities*. GEF/C.16/10. 30 October 2000.

Germany. Third National Communication.

Ghana. First National Communication.

Huq, Saleemul. *The Bonn-Marrakesh Agreements on Funding*. Climate Policy 2. 2002. pp. 243–246.

Huq, Saleemul and Klein, Richard. *Summary of UNFCCC session III Break-out group on dissemination of information*.

Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. Working Group II: Impacts, Adaptation and Vulnerability Climate Change 2001.

Japan. Second National Communication.

Le Groupe-conseil Baastel Itée, *Capacity Development Initiative, Assessment of Capacity Development Efforts of Other Development Cooperation Agencies. Final Report*. 28 July 2000.

Malaysia. First National Communication.

Mali. First National Communication.

Mexico. First National Communication.

Morocco. First National Communication.

Panama. First National Communication.

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development/ Development Assistance Committee. *Capacity Development in Environment: Principles in Practice*. 1997.

Philippines. First National Communication.

Republic of Chad. National Capacity Assessment – General Directorate of Environment and Water.

South Africa. First National Communication.

The Australian Overseas Aid Program and the Challenge of Global Warming. *Capacity-building for the Clean Development Mechanism. Fact Sheet*.

Australia's Third National Communication on Climate Change. *A Report under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change*. 2002.

Third Netherlands' National Communication on Climate Change Policies, prepared for the Conference of the Parties under the Framework Convention on Climate Change. October 2001.

United Nations Development Programme/Global Environment Facility. *National Capacity Self-Assessments*. UNDP/GEF Resource Kit (No. 3). November 2003.

United Nations Development Programme/Global Environment Facility. *Capacity Development Indicators*. UNDP/GEF Resource Kit (No. 4). November 2003.

United Nations Development Programme/Global Environment Facility. *Project Implementation Review*. 2003.

United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. *Capacity-building. Progress report on the status of activities to implement decisions 2/CP.7 and 3/CP.7*. 18 October 2002. FCCC/SBI/2002/INF.15.

United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. *Capacity-building. Views from Parties on the implementation of the national capacity needs self-assessment projects. Submissions from Parties*. FCCC/SBI/2002/MISC.7.

United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. *Capacity-building in the development and transfer of technologies*. Technical Paper. 26 November 2003. FCCC/TP/2003/1.

United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. *Capacity-building. Analysis of the implementation of the framework for capacity-building in developing countries. Note by the secretariat*. 16 October 2003. FCCC/SBI/2003/14.

United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. *Capacity-building. Compilation and synthesis of actions taken by developing countries and Parties with economies in transition to identify their priority needs and of actions taken by Parties included in Annex II to the Convention to implement decisions 2/CP.7 and 3/CP.7*. FCCC/SBI/2003/INF.9.

United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. *Capacity-building. Compilation and synthesis of information provided by the Global Environment Facility and relevant international organizations on progress made in the implementation of capacity-building projects and programmes*. 28 May 2003. FCCC/SBI/2003/INF.10.

United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. *Capacity-building. Comprehensive review of the implementation of capacity-building frameworks for developing countries and countries with economies in transition and actions taken by Parties relating to capacity-building. Submissions from Parties*. 5 May 2003. FCCC/SBI/2003/MISC.5.

United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. *Capacity-building. Information from the Global Environment Facility and relevant international organizations on progress in the implementation of projects and programmes responding to decision 2/CP.7. Submissions from the GEF and relevant international organizations*. 26 May 2003. FCCC/SBI/2003/MISC.2.

United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. *Compilation and synthesis report on third national communications. Addendum 1*. FCCC/SBI/2003/7/Add.1.

United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. Conference of the Parties. *Report of the Conference of the Parties on its seventh session, held at Marrakesh from 29 October to 10 November 2001*. 21 January 2002. FCCC/CP/2001/13/Add.1.

United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. *Implementation of Article 4, paragraphs 8 and 9, of the Convention. Progress on the implementation of activities under decision 5/CP.7. Further views relating to progress in the implementation of decision 5/CP.7*. FCCC/SBI/2003/MISC.3.

United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. *Report of the Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice on its fifteenth session, held at Marrakesh. 29 October to 6 November 2001*. FCCC/SBSTA/2001/8.

United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. *Reports on inter-sessional activities methods and tools to assess climate change impact and adaptation. Report of the workshop on methodologies on climate change impact and adaptation. Note by the Chairman*. 16 July 2001. FCCC/SBSTA/2001/INF.4.

United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. Subsidiary Body for Implementation. *Report of the Subsidiary Body for Implementation on its eighteenth session, held at Bonn from 4 to 13 June 2003*. 31 July 2003. FCCC/SBI/2003/8.

United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. Subsidiary Body for Implementation. *National communications from Parties not included in Annex I to the Convention. Provision of financial and technical support. Experiences of Parties not included in Annex I to the Convention with the Global Environment Facility or its implementing agencies in relation to the preparation of national communications. Submissions from Parties*. 17 September 2003. FCCC/SBI/2003/MISC.9.

United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice. *Third assessment report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. Scientific, technical and socio-economic aspects of impacts of, and vulnerability and adaptation to, climate change. Scientific, technical and socio-economic aspects of mitigation. Draft conclusions proposed by the Chair. Addendum. Recommendation of the Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice*. 9 December 2003. FCCC/SBSTA/2003/L.26/Add.1.

United Nations Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR). *Who Needs What to Implement the Kyoto Protocol? An Assessment of Capacity-building Needs in 33 Developing Countries*. 2001.

World Bank Environment Department. Climate Change Team. *World Bank GEF Energy Efficiency Portfolio Review and Practitioners' Handbook*. Thematic Discussion Paper. 21 January 2004.

Some web sites visited:

African Development Bank

<http://www.afdb.org/>

Asian Development Bank

<http://www.adb.org>

Australia

Australian Agency for International Development (AusAID)

<http://www.ausaid.gov.au/>

Austria

Department for Development Cooperation (DDC) of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs

<http://www.bmaa.gv.at/eza/index.html>

Belgium

Directorate-General for Development Cooperation (DGDC)

<http://www.dgic.be/>

Canada

Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA)

<http://www.acdi-cida.gc.ca/index.htm>

Denmark

<http://www.um.dk/english/dp/index.asp>

Finland

Department for International Development Cooperation in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs

<http://global.finland.fi/>

Germany

<http://www.gtz.de/english>

Global Environment Facility

<http://www.gef.org>

Inter-American Development Bank

<http://www.iadb.org>

International Union for the Conservation of Nature

<http://www.iucn.org>

Island Resources Foundation

<http://www.irf.org/irgefcli.html>

Italy

Directorate General for Development Cooperation

<http://www.esteri.it/eng/>

Japan

Japan International Corporation of Welfare Services (JICWELS)

Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA)

MOFA <http://www.mofa.go.jp/index.html>

JICA <http://www.jica.go.jp/english/index.html>

Netherlands

Ministry of Foreign Affairs

<http://www.minbuza.nl>

<http://nccsapnet.eriya.com>

New Zealand

New Zealand Agency for International Development (NZAID)

<http://www.nzaid.govt.nz/>

Norway

Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation (NORAD)

<http://www.norad.no>

Sweden

Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (SIDA)

<http://www.sida.se/>

Switzerland

Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC)

<http://www.deza.admin.ch/>

The World Bank Group

<http://www.worldbank.org>

<http://lnweb18.worldbank.org/ESSD/envext.nsf/46ByDocName/ClimateChangeProjects>

SouthSouthNorth Project

<http://www.southsouthnorth.org/>

United Nations Development Programme

<http://www.undp.org>

<http://www.undp.org/ye/undp-progs-nat-res-ncsa.htm>

United Nations Environment Programme

<http://www.unep.org>

UNEP Risoe Centre on Energy, Climate and Sustainable Development

<http://uneprisoe.org/>

United Kingdom

Department for International Development (DFID)

<http://www.dfid.gov.uk/>

United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change

<http://unfccc.int>

World Wildlife Fund for Nature

<http://www.wwf.org>
