

26 September 2008

ENGLISH ONLY

UNITED NATIONS FRAMEWORK CONVENTION ON CLIMATE CHANGE

**SUBSIDIARY BODY FOR IMPLEMENTATION**

**Twenty-ninth session**

**Poznan, 1–10 December 2008**

**Item 8 of the provisional agenda**

**Capacity-building under the Convention**

**Item 9 of the provisional agenda**

**Capacity-building under the Kyoto Protocol**

## **Experiences with monitoring and evaluation of capacity-building at the national level**

### **Submissions from Parties**

1. The Conference of the Parties, at its thirteenth session, invited Parties to submit to the secretariat, by 15 August 2008, information on their experiences with monitoring and evaluation of capacity-building at the national level, for consideration by the Subsidiary Body for Implementation at its twenty-ninth session (FCCC/CP/2007/6, para. 87).
2. The secretariat has received six such submissions. In accordance with the procedure for miscellaneous documents, these submissions are attached and reproduced\* in the language in which they were received and without formal editing.

---

\* These submissions have been electronically imported in order to make them available on electronic systems, including the World Wide Web. The secretariat has made every effort to ensure the correct reproduction of the texts as submitted.

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
1. BRAZIL (Submission received 12 September 2008) .....	3
2. CHINA (Submission received 18 August 2008) .....	5
3. ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN (Submission received 19 August 2008) .....	6
4. SRI LANKA (Submission received 8 August 2008) .....	7
5. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA (Submission received 4 September 2008) .....	8
6. URUGUAY (Submission received 15 August 2008) .....	16

PAPER NO. 1: BRAZIL

**Submission by Brazil to the UNFCCC**

**Capacity-building under the Convention and the Kyoto Protocol**

The Government of Brazil welcomes the opportunity to submit views on capacity-building requirements under the Convention and the Kyoto Protocol on activities pursuant to Decisions 2/CP.7, 2/CP.10 and 29/CMP.1.

2. Brazil reaffirms the importance of capacity-building in all stages of the development process and recognizes it as a necessary element to ensure an effective implementation of the UNFCCC and its Kyoto Protocol by developing countries.

Capacity-building activities

3. Brazil provided support to some climate change-related capacity-building activities to assist other developing countries on a South-South cooperation basis. Brazil believes it is helpful to share some of this information.

4. During the period of July 13 to 18, 2008, Brazil organized a capacity-building activity for other Latin American countries. The "Training in Modeling of Eta/CPTEC Climate Change Scenarios", carried out at the Brazilian Space Research Institute (INPE), had the participation of several countries: Argentina, Bolivia, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Dominican Republic, Uruguay, Venezuela and Spain; with a total of 52 participants. INPE is developing a regional model called Eta/CPTEC, which has a spatial resolution of 40 km and will be used together with two global models. This training activity was financed by the Brazilian Ministry of Science and Technology and by the Spanish Government, with the support of the Ibero-American Network of Climate Change Offices (RIOCC) and the Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (CEPAL). The experts at this event could exchange experiences with other developing countries in Latin America and helped to improve the Eta/CPTEC model so that any country in the region could use it. This activity will also strengthen impact assessments and vulnerability and adaptation activities in priority sectors in any of the Latin American countries.

5. Between August 5 and 12, 2008, the Brazilian Designated National Authority, the Interministerial Commission on Global Climate Change, received the Delegation of Botswana for a technical visit. The goal of this visit was to understand the rules and procedures adopted by the Brazilian DNA for assessment and approval of CDM project activities. The first part of the visit was a thorough study of the work that has been undertaken by the Commission, including administrative procedures, legal issues, technical assessment and information technology. The second part was composed of on-site visits to successful CDM projects and to stakeholders involved with this Kyoto mechanism.

6. This South-South cooperation will continue with a technical cooperation in Cape Verde and in Sao Tome and Principe on issues related to CDM activities, greenhouse gas inventory and national communication. Brazil will send experts to improve the training on these issues at each country.

7. Brazil is willing to move further with the South-South and trilateral cooperation.

8. Brazil also offered to host the Expert Meeting on Monitoring and Evaluating Capacity-Building in Developing Countries. The meeting will be held on November 6-7, 2008 in Rio de Janeiro.

### Needs and gaps

9. Financial resources are still the major need of the Brazilian Technical Focal Point and the Brazilian Designated National Authority.

### Monitoring and evaluation

10. Monitoring and evaluation activities can play an important role in ensuring an effective implementation of the capacity-building framework - they can be used to address gaps and needs in capacity building, promote best practices, and encourage more efficient use of resource.

11. Monitoring and evaluation aim to maximize the impact and lessons learnt and to minimize the risk of project failure. Monitoring is an asset to follow project progress and to influence project success. Project success is seen as the project achieving or exceeding its intended impact within its allocated resources. Besides systematic reports, some other tools can be applied in the ongoing monitoring and evaluation process/ actions, such as:

- \* monitoring visits
- \* meetings with project partners and stakeholders
- \* narrative reporting
- \* financial reporting

12. To understand if the project achieved full success, key performance indicators are needed regarding both qualitative and quantitative aspects. These indicators are important to evaluate and make it possible to compare activities and past experiences.

13. Monitoring and evaluation activities will require technical and financial resources, which should be made available to developing countries.

14. In Brazil, climate change related projects are using a monitoring and evaluation system to assure the quality and best impact of the work. For each output of the projects, a progress report has to be made with a detailed assessment. The project progress is rated using qualitative indicators on how it is meeting its objective. But not only the results are evaluated; the technical aspects are also assessed to ensure the quality of the project. Qualitative indicators are also used to rate the progress in project implementation and on-site visits are used as a tool to assess some of the projects.

## **China's Submission on Monitoring and Evaluating Capacity Building at the National Level**

Capacity-building is closely related to the capacity of developing countries to adequately deal with climate change issues. Developing countries attach great importance to it. According to Decision 2/CP.10 on the first comprehensive review of the implementation of the framework for capacity building in developing countries, the present situation of capacity building in developing countries is unsatisfactory and resources for capacity building are far from enough. It is clear that there are significant gaps in capacity building in developing countries and much more efforts are urgently needed in this regard. We believe regular monitoring of capacity building activities undertaken pursuant to decision 2/CP.7 is one of the important measures to enhance capacity building activities in developing countries.

According to Decision 2/CP.7, paragraph 9 and 10, Decision 4/CP.9 paragraph 1 (b) and Decision 9/CP.9, paragraph 2 (a), and Decision 2/CP.10 paragraph 8 and 9 (c), and taking into account the work of the Global Environment Facility on capacity-building performance indicators for the climate change focal area, as well as other relevant work, China proposes as follows:

1. It is necessary to develop an Evaluation System including concrete steps, procedures and indicators to assess and monitor the effectiveness of capacity-building activities. The Secretariat may be requested to coordinate and facilitate the development of such evaluation system, taking into account the work undertaken by the Global Environment Facility and other organizations. For this purpose it may be required to hold workshops on such a system.

2. Given that capacity building is a long-term multi-facet and broad cross-cutting issue, medium and long-term objectives are needed. It is desirable to adopt a stage by stage and/or sector by sector approach to promote the implementation of the framework of capacity building in developing countries. It is also necessary to develop a five-year program on capacity building with clear objectives, tasks, steps, measures and activities. The implementation of such a program should be monitored regularly in accordance with the above-mentioned evaluation system.

3. Developed country parties should provide adequate financial resources for capacity-building in developing countries. The Secretariat should assign appropriate staff to take care of the capacity-building issue. It is proposed to establish an expert group to provide technical advice on capacity-building. The COP and/or MOP may provide further guidance/recommendation to enhance capacity-building in developing countries.

PAPER NO. 3: ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN

**Submission by the Islamic Republic of Iran on**

**Monitoring and Evaluation of Capacity-Building at the National Level under the Convention**

The Islamic Republic of Iran would like to make this submission pursuant to decision of COP 13 (FCCC/CP/2007, paragraph 87) and the conclusion of the SBI at its twenty-eighth session (FCCC/SBI/2008/L.4, paragraph 3) on capacity-building under the Convention with focus on “monitoring and evaluation”.

The Islamic Republic of Iran strongly believes that capacity-building is extremely important in the implementation of the Convention in developing countries and would like to share its experiences with COP in this regard. Since 1996 that Iran has ratified the Convention, and in the process of preparation of the first and second national communications under the Enabling Activity Projects, Iran had built some capacity which is leading to National Action Plan and incorporation of the objectives of the Convention into the Official National Development Plans.

Regarding monitoring and evaluation. In addition to the international monitoring by GEF through UNDP, the national monitoring system comprise of two complementary approaches:

1. The Steering Committee of the Enabling Activity Project comprising of representatives of all relevant ministries and organizations. This committee oversees, reviews and approves all sections of the national report on climate change for their accuracies, completeness and compatibility with the existing and future official development plans. The Committee, which holds meetings three to four times per year, also monitors the work plan and the project budget. In addition, the information of the national report after approval is disseminated through this committee to organizations.
2. The Sub-committee for Climate Change under the National Committed for Sustainable Development (NCSD). The NCSD meets every month and in the past two years climate change has been in the agenda and the focus of this Committee with the objective of developing policies and plans for important areas such as vulnerability & adaptation, mitigation and identification of problems and gaps. The final objective is to streamlining climate change considerations with the official development plans. These activities have recently led to preparation of a “Climate Change Declaration” and a draft “Climate Change Act” which is under consideration by the Government. Once approved, it will be undertaken as an official “National Climate Change Program” to be incorporated in the Fifth Official National Development Plan which will start in 2009. The program has taken into consideration all articles of the Convention.

It should be noted that the National Capacity Self Assessment (NCSA) report on Climate Change, Desertification and Biodiversity Conventions which was recently concluded, has carried out extensive monitoring and evaluation of the existing capacity for Iran and had identified the areas of weak and strong points in the national capacity for implementation of these Conventions.

PAPER NO. 4: SRI LANKA

**Submission of Information and Views**

**1. Capacity Building under the Convention FCCC/CP/2007/L5**

- Sri Lanka appreciates the efforts of the Secretariat on sharing of information, and for organizing capacity enhancement programs.
- Developing countries need improved capacity for implementing provisions under the UNFCCC, its monitoring and evaluation. Therefore, it is necessary to establish a specific framework within which country specific Action Plans with targets could be developed. Use of performance indicators for monitoring and evaluation at regional and national level needs to be integrated in to these plans. Capacities in formulating and using such indicators needs to be established in developing countries like Sri Lanka the UNFCCC to assist developing countries in this regard.
- In addition to the proposed regional capacity building program on negotiation, Sri Lanka would like UNFCCC to consider facilitating country specific capacity building programs for developing countries

## PAPER NO. 5: UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

### **United States Capacity Building Submission**

The United States welcomes the opportunity to submit views on the important topic of capacity building, and we are pleased to provide the Secretariat with information on U.S. experiences in monitoring and evaluation of capacity building activities at the national level.

The United States has garnered the most extensive experience in capacity building through the work of the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID), and as a result, our submission is focused on the experiences of, and lessons learned by, USAID. USAID is an independent U.S. government agency that provides economic, development, and humanitarian assistance around the world in support of the foreign policy goals of the United States. USAID serves as the lead capacity building agency for the United States and undertakes critical work in five key regions around the world. Its activities are conducted in close partnership with other governments, indigenous organizations, private voluntary organizations, universities, U.S. businesses, and other U.S. government agencies.

USAID's many years of experience in capacity building have led the United States to believe that monitoring and evaluation are quite useful at the project level but that the requirements must be balanced with tight budgets and the goal of effective capacity building projects, where the funds should be directed first. We have found that no matter how outstanding monitoring and evaluation efforts are, they are ultimately only useful if their results are utilized; otherwise the funds expended to undertake the monitoring and evaluation have not been well spent. We hope that the experiences and lessons learned described in this submission will serve as valuable input to the Secretariat report and to the workshop and subsequent discussion on capacity building topics at COP-14.

While countries may have different approaches to monitoring and evaluation, it is important to understand the terminology by which these terms are used. We note that often monitoring and evaluation are used interchangeably, but in fact they are different, yet complementary functions that mutually reinforce each other. Monitoring is different from evaluation in two ways. In monitoring, data is collected repeatedly, on a continuous basis and preferably on a schedule; monitoring asks "is the activity/strategy progressing as planned?" Managers review monitoring data with two questions in mind: *how are things going?* and *is the expected amount of change occurring?* Monitoring and evaluation are both program, as well as activity management, tools that help project implementers understand "whether" and *to what degree* project objectives are being achieved. For monitoring and evaluation to make a real difference in performance management terms two things must be true:

- They must provide high quality, applicable and available information and data.
- There must be processes in place that ensure that information is not just delivered, but that it is actually used.

The success of U.S. capacity building efforts requires learning about what works and what does not, and applying those lessons.

### **U.S. EXPERIENCES WITH MONITORING**

USAID uses an eight step process to collect monitoring data, which include:

- Develop a list of performance indicators and their definitions
- Identify the data source
- Select the method of data collection
- Determine the frequency of data collection
- Assign responsibilities for acquiring data
- Generate data analysis plans
- Create plans for complementary evaluations
- Develop Plans for reporting, using, sharing performance information



### Using Indicators for Performance Monitoring

Performance indicators are measures that describe how well a program is achieving its objectives. Indicators tell project implementers specifically “what” to measure to determine whether the objective has been achieved. Indicators are usually quantitative measures but can also be qualitative observations. They define how performance will be measured along a scale or dimension, without specifying a particular level of achievement. Performance indicators in general can be useful at the project or program level. In some cases, performance indicators can be at the heart of a performance monitoring system. Often indicators can be used to communicate achievements, and/or help to identify problems, thus allowing corrective action to be taken. Indicators often help orient/move people toward achieving results. Finally, they can often act as a management tool for making performance based decisions about program strategies and activities.

There are two types of indicators used at USAID which are used at the project, or program, level: an *output* indicator and an *outcome* indicator. An *output* indicator measures immediate things the project produced (e.g., number of people trained), while an *outcome* indicator measures the impact of the program (e.g., number of tons of CO<sub>2</sub> sequestered).

USAID uses a four step process to determine, or select, what indicators to use for a project/program:

- 1) Clarify the results statements, usually done with a program implementer
- 2) Develop a list of possible indicators
- 3) Assess each possible indicator
- 4) Select the “best” indicator or set of indicators.

As a general rule, USAID’s experience points to using two to three (maximum) indicators that represent the most basic and important dimensions of the project’s goals. The number of indicators drives the cost, time, and difficulty of monitoring. It is useful, therefore, to avoid overly broad results statements, and thus be clear about what type of change is intended and be clear about where change should appear.

It is also important to identify more precisely the specific targets for change (“who” or “what” are the specific targets for the change?) For example, if individuals, which individuals? Average citizens or government officials or students? If students, what type of students? The key to creating a useful list of performance indicators is to be inclusive and allow for creative ideas; at the same time, one must narrow a list of indicators for management purposes. Data availability can also limit what indicators one chooses. A common danger is having too many indicators that are not often used, which can lead to poor quality data.

To determine the best indicator, or set of indicators, USAID has identified six characteristics of good indicators.

*Validity:* The measure actually measures what we want to measure. Valid indicators are accurate measures of a specific result, not something else. An indicator should only attempt to measure one aspect of a result, and it should do that well.

*Reliability:* The measure can be used repeatedly; it is a trustworthy measure of change. Physical measures are among the least subjective and therefore the most reliable indicators of change.

*Useful for Management:* The measure is relevant for decision-making at one or more management levels. Adaptive management is important in climate change- so it is possible to change course if needed through activity/project.

*Adequate:* The indicators for a result measure its important dimensions. If a result is narrowly defined, a single indicator may be enough.

*Timely:* The information on the indicator will be available when it is needed to make decisions. What constitutes timely depends on what decisions must be made and who is making them. [Weekly; quarterly; annually; every semester]

*Practical:* Data on indicators can be obtained at a reasonable cost and in a timely fashion (avoid wishful thinking about ideal data sets).

While indicators can be useful to help communicate results of activities or projects, and be used as a management tool, USAID has learned that there are also limitations with indicators. Common, standard or broad overarching indicators may tell a story, but they do not necessarily capture what is going on at the local level in a host country. They also may be extremely subjective and specific to particular countries, and often cannot be generalized.

Custom indicators can be useful, but they also can be costly and time consuming. There are tremendous costs associated with data collection and analysis, and it is preferable to optimize direct funding to the capacity building activity itself to the extent possible.

With regard to capacity building, USAID often measures number of people trained, but that may not be adequate. More useful questions include: What did those participants learn? How did they apply what they learned (at the work place or at the local level)? How do you measure behavior change? Capacity building indicators often focus on the development of the enabling environment or the establishment of partnerships and linkages. A limitation is that such indicators do not reveal whether government actions led to improved performance. For example, rather than using a statement like “improved capacity” of a host country institution, it is preferable to clarify those aspects that program activities emphasize (like “improved management skills” or “improved personnel recruitment process”).

*For more information on monitoring, see:*

**Preparing a Performance Monitoring Plan**

[http://www.usaid.gov/pubs/usaid\\_eval/pdf\\_docs/pnaby215.pdf](http://www.usaid.gov/pubs/usaid_eval/pdf_docs/pnaby215.pdf)

**Performance Monitoring Toolkit**

<http://www.usaid.gov/policy/ads/200/200sbn.pdf>

*For more information on indicators, see:*

**Selecting Performance Indicators**

[http://www.usaid.gov/pubs/usaid\\_eval/pdf\\_docs/pnaby214.pdf](http://www.usaid.gov/pubs/usaid_eval/pdf_docs/pnaby214.pdf)

**Establishing Performance Targets**

[http://www.usaid.gov/pubs/usaid\\_eval/pdf\\_docs/pnaby226.pdf](http://www.usaid.gov/pubs/usaid_eval/pdf_docs/pnaby226.pdf)

## **U.S. EXPERIENCES WITH EVALUATION**

An evaluation is a relatively structured, analytical effort undertaken to answer specific program management questions. The goal is to determine the relevance and fulfillment of objectives, effectiveness, impact and sustainability of a project or activity. USAID has found that evaluation can be a powerful learning tool to identify lessons learned, and to improve the quality of the work of all partners involved in the process of capacity building. Evaluation is distinguished from performance monitoring because it looks back at the structure of the design of the capacity building programs to understand “why” things have changed. Evaluations should be done when a decision is pending on whether or not to continue or extend an important project or program for a significant period of time. Evaluations can be critical to understanding an activity’s performance.

It is useful to think of evaluation as the analysis part of the project management cycle:

- Analyze why and how intended results were/were not achieved
- Assess contributions of activities to results
- Examine results not easily measured
- Explore unintended results
- Provide lessons learned/recommendations

USAID looks at two main types of evaluation:

Traditional Evaluation: This type of evaluation is often donor focused, whereby USAID would be in charge of the evaluation; often stakeholders do not participate; the focus is on accountability; the

design of the evaluation is predetermined; there are formal evaluation methods; and often, the evaluators are individuals who did not participate in the activity.

Participatory Evaluation: In participatory evaluation, the focus is on the participant and the ownership of the evaluation; a broad range of stakeholders participate; the focus is on learning; the design is flexible; there are rapid appraisal methods; and the facilitators are individuals who did not participate in the activity.

Evaluations can only make a difference in capacity building programs if the right things are being evaluated. Many evaluations are undertaken, but never read; others are undertaken, but there is a question of whether it is the right type of evaluation. Evaluation can be a tool for learning, as well as a method for teaching at the same time. What is needed is the development of a framework for evaluations - not because there is a problem, but because there is a reason to build knowledge and to learn from experiences.

#### Lessons learned from evaluations:

- Evaluation is not always needed, but may be helpful when the monitoring results of a project or activity indicate that progress isn't being made.
- Pre- and post evaluations and surveys can be useful (i.e. for trainings), yet, impact and effectiveness can both be difficult to measure.
- The most difficult thing to gauge is how to measure changes in behavior when it comes to capacity building efforts.
- Participatory evaluations can be highly complex, statistical, and costly, but they can help with future capacity building efforts.
- There are limits to what can be evaluated or assessment based on the time, cost, and data quality constraints.
- Despite the fact that most of donor aid is aimed at capacity building and development efforts, evaluation results confirm that development of sustainable capacity remains one of the most difficult areas of international development practice.

#### USAID's Development Experience Clearinghouse

USAID's Development Experience Clearinghouse (DEC) (<http://dec.usaid.gov>) is USAID's largest online resource for USAID funded, international development documentation. It collects, computerizes, and publicizes evaluation and other reports. In response to changing policy guidance in 1995, USAID is now undertaking fewer evaluations so that funds can be preserved for the activities themselves. Only a small percentage of completed evaluations are being submitted to the DEC, hindering the sharing of lessons in the Agency. Around 1996, USAID policy changed from requiring every project to be evaluated, to recommending that evaluations only be done in response to management needs. This led to a lot of good, but fragmented evaluation work. USAID is now conducting markedly fewer evaluations based on this policy change. In 2000, another revision to policy guidance took a step forward by stating that USAID is a learning organization as well as a planning and achieving one. Often evaluations now are carried out *on an as needed basis*.

#### Methodologies for Evaluations

USAID takes a decentralized approach to conducting evaluations. It is often done on a case by case, or project-by-project, basis. It is important to have a good understanding of how to decide when to evaluate; a sufficient understanding of evaluation methods to write a good scope of work; as well as enough savvy to know how to work the system to make an evaluation happen. Often, however, technical employees (like climate change specialists) are not well versed in evaluation methods. A lesson that we have learned is that while there are climate change experts and evaluation experts, there are not many climate change evaluation experts.

Good scopes of work (SOW) are the first step in a successful evaluation. Quality SOWs can be difficult because people have different expectations about what an evaluation is supposed to do. Therefore, a

good SOW will convey to the entity conducting the evaluation what the objective is. It is therefore important to get the SOW right initially, to hire someone with evaluation expertise, as well as a keen understanding of the political environment, and sufficient technical understanding of climate change. In USAID's experience, often evaluation teams are comprised of sector experts (i.e. in climate change), but not experts in evaluations. A lesson that we have learned is that a lack of climate change evaluation experts can result in weak evaluation methods.

It is important for evaluations to be objective and comprehensive, with actionable recommendations. An evaluation methodology often consists of field visits, interviews, and documentation reviews. We have found that if evaluation is to become credible and a useful part of USAID's learning strategy, then more attention must be paid to developing sound questions, good research designs, and methods that will go beyond the kind of knowledge already at hand. In our experience, clearly distinguishing findings (ie the facts) from the conclusions of the evaluators is the first step in the empirical presentation. We have learned that refining evaluation questions and identifying appropriate and timely methods are critical to a successful evaluation. Our experience has been that on average, good evaluations can take up to a year to complete and are costly.

### Assessments

Instead of formal evaluations, more "quick assessments" are now being done at USAID, which are often flexible in nature. As a result, assessments have become more popular tools. Assessments are valued to the extent they tell USAID managers about the trends and dynamics in a sector's political, social, economic environment. Too much of the evaluation function has been shifted to partners for USAID to be a learning organization. Assessments tend to be broader than an evaluation. For example, a sector assessment looks at an entire sector, not just what has changed due to USAID's programs (which is what is done in evaluations). Assessments are used widely and vaguely, and are valued to the extent they tell the USAID managers about the trends and dynamics in a sector's political, social and economic environment. Sometimes these assessments are "evaluations" in disguise, avoiding the negative stigma of an evaluation, and imposing no requirement that the findings and conclusions be widely shared.

### Evaluation Examples

The following examples illustrate how USAID has conducted evaluations of major capacity building programs. The need to take a case-by-case approach is evident in the differences in the way in which these examples are presented. A lesson that we have learned through the USAID work is that although that agency has guidelines and lessons learned for how to conduct evaluations, it remains difficult to compare across programs, even within a single agency, since there is not a comprehensive template.

#### Example: Evaluation of the Watergy Program in India

[http://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf\\_docs/PDACG954.pdf](http://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/PDACG954.pdf)

The Alliance to Save Energy has been working for more than six years with municipalities in various parts of the world to build local capacity and promote the efficient use of energy and water in municipal systems. The Alliance to Save Energy, in cooperation with USAID, has developed the concept of "Watergy" to describe the linkage that exists between water and energy in the context of municipal water utilities. "Watergy efficiency" encompasses the spectrum of water efficiency activities, energy efficiency activities, and resulting synergies from co-managing water and energy resources. An independent evaluation of Watergy in India was completed, which offered recommendations to assist USAID and the Alliance improve, scale-up and commercialize the program in India.

In the case of the Evaluation of the Watergy program in India, the *methodology* used included the following activities:

- Task 1: Review of background Watergy documents - This included the Watergy program statement, stated objectives, program strategies and approaches, annual program descriptions and quarterly progress reports for India, and program performance indicators.

- Task 2: Evaluation Framework - This included definition of the program evaluation objectives, identification of broad quantitative indicators for the program, number of successful project models developed and disseminated, and other program impacts, as well as more qualitative measures such as effectiveness of the awareness and capacity building activities, stakeholder satisfaction, effectiveness of communications strategy, and indirect effects of the program. The evaluation framework also included program organization, effectiveness and efficiency of program management, and program sustainability.
- Task 3: U.S. Data Collection - This included necessary data required for the evaluation from U.S. sources, including Alliance reports, interviews with Alliance headquarters management and program staff, and discussions with USAID staff.
- Task 4: Site Visits - The site visits were conducted in India to meet in-country representatives, key project partners and client organizations (water utilities and government partners at the state, local and national levels).
- Task 5: Watergy Evaluation Report - The report included major results from data collection and interviews. The major findings of this evaluation included:
  - The Alliance has done a very good job with limited resources to create awareness, increase the motivation and lay the groundwork for implementation of water sector energy efficiency projects.
  - The audits conducted with Alliance support have led to some implementation activities and are likely to lead to more.
  - The focus of the Watergy activities has not been on project implementation and the Alliance has not emphasized private sector participation in implementation.
  - Stakeholders are pleased with the Alliance activities, see a continuing Alliance role, and have expressed some specific needs, some of which the Alliance may be able to address.
  - The opportunity for energy efficiency improvement is huge, and with some patience, perseverance and modifications/refinements in focus and approach, much more can be accomplished in the future.
  - The stakeholders need assistance and support in financial structuring and project implementation, but it is not clear whether the Watergy program as currently structured can effectively and efficiently provide such support.
  - Better measurement and documentation of the results of Watergy activities are needed.

Example: Evaluation of the ICLEI program  
[http://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf\\_docs/PDACF594.pdf](http://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/PDACF594.pdf)

USAID supported the International Council for Local Environmental Initiatives (ICLEI)'s Cities for Climate Protection (CCP) program, which was geared toward reducing greenhouse gas emissions in several developing countries at the municipal level. The program operated over a seven year period, in 64 cities in Mexico, Indonesia, India, the Philippines and South Africa. Due to the length of the project, and the breadth of the scope of activities, an evaluation was undertaken at the end of the seven year project. Because of time and financial constraints, the evaluation was undertaken over the course of a three month time period and was done from Washington rather than in the field.

The key evaluation questions the evaluation analyzed included:

- Was the USAID/ICLEI partnership successful in advancing the objectives of both USAID and ICLEI?
- How effective was the cooperative agreement and how well did ICLEI perform?
- How and why were intended results achieved or not achieved? Were there other results that were not easily measured or quantified?
- Are activities and program results sustainable and replicable?
- Should the USAID/ICLEI partnership continue and if so, under what arrangements?

The evaluation methodology included a review of program documentation (the original scope of work, as well as the four amendments to the original SOW), along with quarterly progress reports. The next step was to analyze the reports and other data to identify key questions and issues to examine, such as:

- Has the partnership successfully advanced the objectives of both USAID and ICLEI? What has worked best and what has not? Why? Any need for a change in the partnership?
- What have been the lessons learned from the Cities for Climate Protection (CCP) implementation approach? What elements have been most successful? Why? Are changes needed in the approach?
- What has been learned about the types of activities that CCP has promoted (e.g., street lighting, water pumping, methane recovery)? Which have been most successful and why?
- Are cities able to go on by themselves? Is USAID needed? Is ICLEI needed?
- Should new country and city programs be started? Why? Where? How?
- Should there be a new cooperative agreement or contract between USAID and ICLEI?

These and other questions were then organized into a data collection interview protocol for USAID and ICLEI staff and another protocol for those in the field, working on local level activities supported by the cooperative agreement. To assess program operations and results, many evaluations collect field data by interviewing 20-50 key participants in each country, collecting data on local programs, and checking on program results through site visits. In this case that would have been an expensive and time-consuming approach - particularly since the cooperative agreement covered 64 cities in five countries. Instead, a different approach of interviewing participants outside of Washington by telephone was used, along with a few in person interviews in Washington DC. There are of course drawbacks to this approach. Only three to five people were interviewed in each country, which is a limited sample, and it was not possible to physically confirm whether investments and claimed benefits actually occurred. The 18 overseas interviewees provide a wide range of perspectives reflecting differing country conditions, but there is a high degree of agreement on key issues. The use of a standard questionnaire allows a process of "triangulation," by posing the same set of questions to USAID, ICLEI and participants from a number of different cities. In most cases, similar patterns and experiences are identified for an issue though there are differences in the type of projects that different cities thought to be most important and the way local political concerns affected city programs.

Some of the main lessons learned from the ICLEI Evaluation included:

- All participants agreed that the technical approach that ICLEI used was excellent and ICLEI had done a superb job of getting all stakeholders in each city to buy into the program. The claimed benefits are real and it was not difficult for cities to achieve the benefits.
- CCP offers low cost investments that generate quick payback through energy savings. It is a win-win approach of saving money and reducing greenhouse gas emissions and local pollution. The five milestones are a logical approach that provides a clear roadmap on how to proceed.
- The cities like the idea of saving money while reducing pollution and greenhouse gases. The program will likely be sustained in most of the 64 cities. But will it be replicated in other cities? The ICLEI approach requires salesmanship and capacity building. Local leaders have to be educated and consensus must be created. Local engineers need to be trained in the new technology. It is a small scale, labor intensive approach that works fine, but in most countries it can only reach a small number of new cities each year. There are several hundred to several thousand cities in each developing country.
- A future program might consider a more extensive approach, working with national and provincial governments, rather than just municipalities. It could include developing local capacity by training trainers. A large group of local nationals would then work with the cities on the CCP program. To help cities finance their investments, it would be useful to work with the private sector, government finance offices, government development banks and other donors.
- There is a broader issue that goes beyond this program. Over many years USAID has launched a number of pilot projects in almost every development sector. They demonstrate new technology and approaches which usually generate good benefits. However, all too many of the demonstration programs just end. They are not replicated or scaled-up. In the future, when USAID designs a pilot program it should address that issue.

*For more information on evaluations, see:*

**Preparing an Evaluation Scope of Work**

[http://www.usaid.gov/pubs/usaid\\_eval/pdf\\_docs/pnaby207.pdf](http://www.usaid.gov/pubs/usaid_eval/pdf_docs/pnaby207.pdf)

**Conducting a Participatory Evaluation**

[http://www.usaid.gov/pubs/usaid\\_eval/pdf\\_docs/pnabs539.pdf](http://www.usaid.gov/pubs/usaid_eval/pdf_docs/pnabs539.pdf)

**Constructing an Evaluation Report**

[http://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf\\_docs/PNADI500.pdf](http://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/PNADI500.pdf)

**Conducting Key Informant Interviews**

[http://www.usaid.gov/pubs/usaid\\_eval/pdf\\_docs/pnabs541.pdf](http://www.usaid.gov/pubs/usaid_eval/pdf_docs/pnabs541.pdf)

PAPER NO. 6: URUGUAY

**Capacity Building for developing countries under the Convention**

Information on Parties experiences with monitoring and evaluation of capacity building at the national level

Submission from Uruguay

Following the invitation of the SBI, contained in the document FCCC/SBI/2008/L.4 paragraph 3, Uruguay would like to present its views and recommendations on the issue of the importance of the availability of funds for capacity building in developing countries.

In this regard, Uruguay believes that to effectively monitor and evaluate capacity building at the national level, this capacity building should be a continuous process.

In Uruguay, as well as in many developing countries, the process of elaboration of National Communications contributes to capacity building under the Convention at the national level. In addition to that, governmental units/offices in charge of the elaboration of the National Communications and capacity building under the Convention, very much depend on the availability of funds to this purposes.

Uruguay's Third National Communication is under preparation and shall be submitted to the COP on 2009. Thus, to maintain the momentum of the National Climate Change Program and to assure the continuity of the national communications process (Dec. 8/CP.11), it was necessary to allocate funds from the GEF Resources Allocation Framework (RAF) for the Fourth National Communication, considering that the 5th replenishment of the GEF will not be available at that time. This aspect is against of what was established about not including enabling activities in RAF.

In addition to that, Uruguay considers that this fact is rather unfair for a country that has been allocated with scarcely 3 million dollars and that has made all the efforts to fulfill with its commitments under the Convention and the Kyoto Protocol.

In this regard, Uruguay made on August 24, 2007 an specific submission on Additional guidance to the GEF, Views and recommendations from Parties on the funding available to them in the climate change focal area.

In conclusion, Uruguay considers that for the next replenishment of the GEF, additional resources shall be committed to support all enabling activities identified by the developing countries. This shall also be in time so as to avoid that the countries with limited resources under the RAF have to make use of part of them for these enabling activities. Finally, these resources shall not be included or linked with the RAF.

-----