

14 April 2009

ENGLISH ONLY

UNITED NATIONS FRAMEWORK CONVENTION ON CLIMATE CHANGE

SUBSIDIARY BODY FOR IMPLEMENTATION

Thirtieth session

Bonn, 1–10 June 2009

Item 8 of the provisional agenda

Capacity-building under the Convention

Item 9 of the provisional agenda

Capacity-building under the Kyoto Protocol

Information on experiences and lessons learned in the use of performance indicators for monitoring and evaluating capacity-building at the national and global levels

Submissions from Parties and intergovernmental organizations

1. The Subsidiary Body for Implementation, at its twenty-ninth session, invited Parties, intergovernmental organizations and non-governmental organizations to submit to the secretariat, by 16 February 2009, information on their experiences and lessons learned on, in particular, the use of performance indicators for monitoring and evaluating capacity-building at the national and global levels (FCCC/SBI/2008/19, paras. 88 and 101).
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.

FCCC/SBI/2009/MISC.1

GE.09-60632

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
1. CZECH REPUBLIC ON BEHALF OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITY AND ITS MEMBER STATES* (Submission received 9 February 2009)	3
2. JAPAN (Submission received 17 February 2009)	6
3. UNITED REPUBLIC OF TANZANIA ON BEHALF OF LEAST DEVELOPED COUNTRIES UNDER THE UNFCCC (Submission received 17 February 2009)	7
4. GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY EVALUATION OFFICE (Submission received 11 February 2009)	9
5. ORGANISATION FOR ECONOMIC CO-OPERATION AND DEVELOPMENT (Submission received 17 February 2009)	11
6. UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME (Submission received 18 February 2009)	13

* This submission is supported by Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Montenegro, Serbia and Turkey.

PAPER NO. 1: CZECH REPUBLIC ON BEHALF OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITY
AND ITS MEMBER STATES

**SUBMISSION BY THE CZECH REPUBLIC ON BEHALF OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITY
AND ITS MEMBER STATES**

**This submission is supported by Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Montenegro, Serbia and
Turkey**

**Subject: Information on experiences and lessons learned on, in particular, the use of performance
indicators for monitoring and evaluating capacity building at the national and global
levels**

INTRODUCTION

At SBI 29 in Poznan, in December 2008, Parties together with IGOs and NGOs have been requested to submit to the Secretariat, by 16 February 2009, information on their experiences and lessons learned on, in particular, the use of performance indicators for monitoring and evaluating of capacity building at the national and global levels. In this context the Czech Republic on behalf of the European Community and its Member States would like to make the following input, particularly as to its experience on the matter. This is the main topic of this submission that covers both the UNFCCC and the Kyoto Protocol.

Pour mémoire the EU, following the request issued at COP-13 did not provide any information in relation to its experience with monitoring and evaluation of capacity building at the national level for consideration by SBI-29.

The EU did not make a submission on this theme previously as research showed that little work has been undertaken specifically on monitoring and evaluation for capacity building. Instead capacity building tends to be one part of projects or programmes aimed at addressing broader development or climate change objectives. The research also revealed a preference for strengthening M&E systems at the local and national levels rather than on developing generic methodologies at the global level. After reflecting on the outcomes of this research the EU is now in a position to share its views on monitoring and evaluating capacity building at the global and national levels.

**EU EXPERIENCE IN MONITORING AND EVALUATION OF CAPACITY BUILDING AT NATIONAL AND
GLOBAL LEVEL**

The EU believes that capacity building should be integrated as an element of global, national, sectoral and thematic development efforts. We recognize that capacity development is critical for sustainable development and for climate change in particular. It should be a country-driven process responding to the specific priorities and needs of Parties. For this reason a global approach to monitoring and evaluation may not prove to be appropriate. The EU further sees capacity development as a fundamental change process requiring that developing countries commit to the capacity development of individual, institutional and systemic levels.

Moreover the EU would like to emphasise the important role of developing countries (DCs) in evaluation and monitoring activities. DCs should take the lead in evaluation and monitoring and ensure that monitoring and evaluation is an integral part of the management cycle. Developed and developing countries have committed to mutual accountability (in line with the Paris and Accra principles) whereby developed countries align their monitoring and evaluation to developing countries' own systems. The EU believes therefore that all parties should work together in a participatory approach to strengthen country capacities and require results based management. This information can be provided to the SBI via National Communications and/or by submission of the information on the activities undertaken pursuant

to decisions 2/CP.7 and 2/CP.10, which should include, inter alia, such elements as needs and gaps, experiences and lessons learned as decided by 4/CP.12.

The EU is presently supporting capacity development with its cooperation partners. Such support is provided to these countries to address priorities that they have defined. The EU underlines the need to ensure country/national ownership over all capacity building processes and activities, including the process of monitoring and evaluation. In this regard, the monitoring and evaluation of programmes and activities to support capacity development is thus defined and fully integrated in the context of the specific programmes/projects supported in order to respond effectively to the needs and priorities of the country where the activities are implemented.

In this respect it is important to ensure that monitoring and evaluation approaches are kept simple, practical and cost effective, focusing on a manageable number of context specific indicators for which data are effectively available. Such approaches should not distract from the focus and goals of the capacity building activity. This can only be planned to a limited extent since capacity development is a highly complex process. As a consequence monitoring and evaluation at national level would rather focus on the achievement of set goals than on capacity building itself. The EU believes that evaluations should therefore focus on outcomes, rather than on inputs and outputs.

There is limited experience with evaluation approaches on capacity building at the national level or even at the organisational level. This is because capacity building is usually part of a development project or programme rather than a separate initiative. Evaluation is carried out for the programme / project as a whole and not just for the capacity building elements. Most evaluations gathered during the extensive search carried out by the EU relate predominantly to projects not programmes which address the systemic level. As the extent of the challenges posed by climate change will require a comprehensive approach including programmes – new and emerging techniques for evaluation will inform our discussions under the UNFCCC.

CONCLUSIONS

The EU believes that the complexities described in the foregoing section also apply to building capacity in countries to participate in the Convention and the Kyoto Protocol and in general for developing countries to build capacity in the 15 areas mentioned in the Annex to the Capacity Building Framework included in decision 2/CP.10.

The EU believes that an effective approach to monitoring and evaluation of capacity building experiences under the Convention and the Kyoto protocol should be guided by the following elements:

- They should take an integrated approach, focusing on multiple aspects of a project or programme including the various levels at which capacity is being developed.
- They should be context specific, taking relevant individual country circumstances into account to formulate indicators. For this reason a global approach to monitoring and evaluation may not prove to be appropriate.
- They should be centred on impact and effectiveness of the activities undertaken.
- Developing countries should take the lead in evaluation and monitoring and ensure that monitoring and evaluation is an integral part of the management cycle.
- Annex II countries, multilateral agencies and other relevant stakeholders supporting capacity development in Developing Countries should align their monitoring and evaluation to the developing countries' own systems.

The EU is fully aware that an intensive learning process to improve capacity building, including evaluation and monitoring is currently ongoing and it involves international organisations and UN agencies such as OECD/DAC, GEF, World Bank, UNITAR. The EU believes that the outcomes of such a process should be beneficial also to the UNFCCC, informing our discussions on this topic during SBI 30 and up to COP 15. The EU is also very keen to learn from the experience of other Parties, in particular from developing country Parties, NGOs and IGOs in evaluating capacity building activities at the national level and looks forward to a constructive discussion on the matter at SBI 30.

PAPER NO. 2: JAPAN

Capacity-building for developing countries under the Convention and the Kyoto Protocol

SUBMISSION BY JAPAN

Subject: Information on experience and lessons on, in particular, the use of performance indicators for monitoring and evaluating capacity-building at the national and global levels

Japan welcomes the opportunity to submit its view pursuant to FCCC/SBI/2008/L.25, paragraph 10 and FCCC/SBI/2008/L.26, paragraph 8. As one of major countries supporting capacity-building in developing countries, Japan would like to share its experiences and lessons learned on monitoring and evaluating capacity-building and the use of performance indicators.

1. Methodologies for monitoring and evaluating capacity-building

In its operation of international cooperation, Japan has made serious efforts in capacity-building in developing countries, at individual, institutional and society levels. In efforts to review and better contribute to such efforts, methodologies were developed and used to monitor and evaluate results of cooperation activities. Performance indicators are developed and selected always in connection with such methodologies and substantive contents of cooperation activities.¹

2. Monitoring and evaluating at national and global level

While Japan's cooperation in capacity-building includes activities at many different levels as mentioned above, and the recent trend is that it endeavors to take a comprehensive approach for promoting positive impacts at larger scale, the methodologies such as logical framework for project cycle management (PCM) are used for planning, monitoring and evaluation of technical cooperation basically at all levels with necessary adjustment, since these methodologies, with many improvement, have been tested with its usefulness in actual use and through the long time history.

However, it must be acknowledged that such methodologies usually serve at project or programme levels in clearer way, since accuracy of information to be used at lower levels are better. For this reason, Japan does not have any fixed methodology for monitoring and evaluation of its international cooperation at global level, and accordingly there are no performance indicators suitable for monitoring and evaluation for this purpose. In case of national level, we also do not conduct any monitoring and evaluation for the same reason, though such efforts could be made by developing countries themselves only if methodologies and indicators are well tested according to internationally accepted standards.

3. Monitoring and evaluation as part of a larger picture for capacity-building efforts

From its experience, Japan regards monitoring and evaluation as important processes of keeping efforts on a right track. However, at the same time, it concerns, if these processes are introduced in a wrong manner, it sometimes has a destructive effect on capacity-building efforts themselves. Also, we draw attention that during the expert meeting in Rio de Janeiro, some developing country representatives raised concerns that heavy burden of monitoring and evaluation could reduce important resources to be used for capacity-building itself. Bearing this significant point in mind, Japan hopes that the discussion in the Subsidiary Body for Implementation will reflect the reality of developing countries at practical level in considering this issue.

¹ See Japan's presentation at UNFCCC Expert Workshop on monitoring and Evaluating Capacity-Building in Developing Countries, Rio de Janeiro, 6 - 7 November, 2008.

PAPER NO. 3: UNITED REPUBLIC OF TANZANIA ON BEHALF OF
LEAST DEVELOPED COUNTRIES UNDER THE UNFCCC

**DRAFT TEXT FOR SUBMISSION BY THE UNITED REPUBLIC OF TANZANIA ON BEHALF
OF LEAST DEVELOPED COUNTRIES UNDER THE UNFCCC**

CAPACITY-BUILDING UNDER THE CONVENTION AND KYOTO PROTOCOL:-views on development of performance indicators for monitoring and evaluation of implementation of capacity-building framework consistent decision 2/CP7

The United Republic of Tanzania on behalf of the Least Developed Countries (LDCs) welcomes the opportunity to submit its views on the possibility of development of performance indicators for monitoring and evaluation of implementation of capacity-building framework in developing countries consistent with decision 2/CP7.

Cognizant of the fact that climate is one of the biggest global problems posing challenges to the livelihood and economic development, particularly for least developed countries like Tanzania. Since there are still no agreed performance indicators for monitoring and evaluation of capacity-building framework, progress in implementation of the scope of framework is still low.

While there is general agreement that capacity-building activities need to be country driven, there is need to develop and agree on performance indicators to be used to assess the implementation of the agreed Capacity-building framework. Common performance indicators can assist Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change to assess the progress made in the agreed capacity-building framework.

Even though there might some diverging views on how such indicators can be operationalised, national experience in the implementation of the Global Millennium Development Goals (MDG) provides an opportunity for the lessons learned by individual countries in meeting the global set and agreed development targets. In the same context, development needs are a country driven process, but global targets that are being implemented at national/country level form good basis for comparison and reporting of the progress made not only at individual country level but also at international level. At the World Summit on Sustainable Development, many governments reported the lack of access to water and energy, being guided by the global set targets on the thematic areas.

The United Republic of Tanzania, like many other developing countries, reported that there was still inadequate access to safe water drinking water and energy by most rural poor communities, about 70% of the rural poor still face the same problem since the inception of the MDG.

Furthermore, performance indicators have been applied by the World Health Organization which has employed global standard for reduction of various diseases such as Malaria, HIV/AIDS, TB, Child Mortality, Cancer, etc.

For implementation of capacity-building, performance indicators can be set to indicate how the institutions such as climate change secretariat or national focal points have been assisted or supported by developed countries for the specific period, eg. by 2012; percent of meteorological, hydrological and climatological services established and functioning, database established, etc. How many or percent of immediate needs for LDCs were supported during a specific period for example 2012.

In view of the above, the LDC group believes that development and application of performance indicators in monitoring and evaluation of implementation of the CB framework consistent with decision 2.CP7, 4.CP 9 and 2.CP 10 can help to build the capacity of developing countries by assessing the gaps and corner stone areas. Moreover, development and application of performance indicators in monitoring and evaluation of CB is consistent with Bali Action Plan which, among others, emphasises on enabling the developing with measurable, reportable and verifiable support from developed country Parties.

PAPER NO. 4: GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY EVALUATION OFFICE

Introduction

The Global Environment Facility Evaluation Office (GEF EO) welcomes the opportunity to submit its experiences and views on monitoring and evaluating capacity building at the national and global levels to the Subsidiary Body for Implementation.

Together with partners and donors, the GEF EO is working to support an emerging community of practice for evaluators, practitioners, and researchers developing M&E systems, best practices, guidelines and indicators on evaluating climate change and development. This initiative, and supporting outputs outlined below, is particularly focused on the needs of developing countries, and improving the capacity of these countries in addressing climate change.

International Conference on Climate Change and Development

While capacity-building and improved knowledge-sharing is recognized as crucial to attaining development objectives, there is increasing evidence specifically in the significance of evaluative information in informing decision-making. In light of this, and with the support of several key partners and sponsors, the GEF EO organized the International Conference on Climate Change and Development, hosted by the Bibliotheca Alexandrina, from May 10-13, 2008.

The Conference gathered over two hundred participants, one third of which were from developing countries and economies in transition, and over 40 attendees were fully sponsored. These evaluators and practitioners shared their respective research and experience in the evaluation of mitigation, adaptation, and vulnerability, highlighting the needs of developing countries. Keynote speeches and notable papers from each conference session will be published in spring 2009 in a volume titled "Evaluating Climate Change and Development."

The initiative to develop the international community of practice to improve capacity building at the national and global levels, to improve the practice of evaluation in addressing the climate change, is a direct result of the high level of interest expressed in these activities at the International Conference. The GEF EO will act as moderator, organizer and initiator for this community of practice, and provide a basis for funding and for studies and meta-evaluations to be undertaken, and the community will be supported through the efforts of several partner organizations and evaluation associations, such as the International Development Evaluators Association (IDEAS).

Key Initiatives

The virtual community of practice will create, validate and disseminate evaluation information and knowledge, and aims to identify dynamic demands by focusing on a member-based management system of relevant resources, with three primary initiatives:

- a. Electronic Repository of Climate Change Evaluations
- b. Online Forum (wiki) for the Community of Practice
- c. Four Studies on Mitigation and Adaptation:
 - Meta-Evaluation of Mitigation Evaluations
 - Preparation of Guidelines for Mitigation Evaluation
 - Study of Frameworks for Adaptation
 - Preparation of Indicators for Adaptation

Purpose

The **purpose** of the initiative is deliver high quality monitoring and evaluation products – best practices, guidelines, frameworks and indicators – validated by a virtual global community of practice, which will through these products and through the validation process develop capacity on climate change and development in developing countries and countries with economies in transition.

Outputs and Outcomes

The **expected outputs** of the initiative include the delivery of the following:

- A common framework and guidelines for evaluating mitigation efforts in climate change and development.
- Publication of best practices in evaluating mitigation and adaptation efforts in climate change and development.
- Improved concepts and frameworks for evaluating adaptation efforts in climate change and development.
- Indicators for monitoring and evaluating adaptation interventions.

Expected outcomes are improved evaluations using these frameworks, guidelines, best practices, concepts and indicators, through an improved capacity to undertake these evaluations. Although the community of practice is global in nature, it is expected that evaluators from developing countries and countries with economies in transition, in particular, will benefit from participation in the community through professional development and active involvement in the international evaluation community.

Potential Impact

Although difficult to establish, the **impact** of these products and increased capacity through improved evaluations would be increased awareness of issues related to climate change and development amongst a broad range of stakeholders including national governments, international agencies and the academic sector, as well as improved policies, strategies and interventions.

Value Added

The **value added** of the community of practice project is to ensure a validation of innovative, established, and potential best evaluation practices related to climate change and development. Existing information in this area is both fragmented and nascent. The peer-review mechanism of the community of practice would contribute to mainstreaming climate change and evaluation in the sector, which is currently a missing gap. A focus on both **climate change adaptation** and **climate change mitigation** aspects ensures the relevance of this initiative to a range of participants.

Closing

The GEFEO is very pleased to have this opportunity to collaborate with the UNFCCC and looks forward to discussing these issues with potential partners.

PAPER NO. 5: ORGANISATION FOR ECONOMIC
CO-OPERATION AND DEVELOPMENT

Submission by Organisation For Economic Co-Operation And Development

FCCC/SBI/2008/L.25 paragraph 10 “*The SBI invited Parties, IGOs and NGOs to submit to the secretariat, by 16 February 2009, information on their experiences and lessons learned on, in particular, the use of performance indicators for monitoring and evaluating capacity-building at the national and global levels.*”

The OECD Secretariat can provide the following information and inputs on this matter, based on experiences in the OECD Development Assistance Committee.

Climate change requires cross-cutting multidisciplinary responses which in turn point to a need to develop cross-cutting multidisciplinary capacity. This will require a diverse range of capacity building initiatives and associated monitoring and evaluation. Given the diversity of contexts in which capacity building must take place, performance indicators for monitoring and evaluating capacity building will ultimately need to be adjusted to particular situations.

In accordance with the principles of the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness¹ and the Accra Agenda for Action² capacity development must be an endogenous process owned by partner countries and aligned with partner country systems and with harmonized approaches. Given the diversity of national contexts in which capacity building for climate change must take place, performance indicators for monitoring and evaluating capacity building are usually developed at the national level by national authorities. Achieving consensus on global performance indicators and monitoring parameters for capacity building for climate change is likely to be difficult and ultimately such indicators and monitoring parameters will need to be tailored to national contexts.

In terms of qualitative work on Capacity Development for Climate Change, the OECD is undertaking a range of activities related to monitoring capacity building including some related to capacity development for the environment, but none are currently specifically targeted to climate change. Some of these activities include:

- Monitoring capacity development (broadly defined) activities through the Survey on Monitoring the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness. The focus of this monitoring is qualitative and on country level on assessing the extent to which capacity development support from donors is aligned with developing country partners’ priorities and provided through co-ordinated programmes consistent with partners’ national development strategies. The information for this survey is collected at country-level in line with the “ownership” principle of the Paris Declaration. This principle implies that Partner countries exercise leadership over their development policies and strategies and co-ordinate development actions.

¹ The Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness expresses the international community’s consensus on the direction for reforming aid delivery and management to achieve improved effectiveness and results. Progress towards meeting the commitments of the declaration is monitored by the Working Party on Aid Effectiveness (www.oecd.org/dac/effectiveness).

² The Accra Agenda for Action was agreed by Ministers and agency heads at the Third High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness in Accra, attended by 1700 participants including more than 100 ministers and heads of agency. (<http://www.accrahlhf.net/>).

- Developing indicators and benchmarks for developing country environmental Ministries and Agencies to assess their capacity to develop, comply with and enforce environmental legislation. (This work is to be conducted over 2009-2010).
- Updating guidance on capacity development for environment. (This work is to be conducted over 2009-2010).

The DAC publishes statistics and reports on aid and other resource flows. These statistics published in the Creditor Reporting System Aid Activity database concern developing countries and countries in transition and are based principally on reporting by DAC members. The CRS provides a set of readily available basic data that enables analysis on a comparable basis for all DAC Members of where aid goes, what purposes it serves and what policies it supports or aims to implement. CRS has “Rio Markers”, which allow the tracking aid towards the Rio Conventions - Climate Change Mitigation, Desertification and Biodiversity Conventions. However, there is currently no way to distinguish capacity development activities within efforts related to these Rio Markers.

PAPER NO. 6: UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME

United Nations Development Programme
Submission on indicators for monitoring and evaluating capacity development

The Subsidiary Body for Implementation (SBI), at its twenty-ninth session, invited Parties, IGOs, and NGOs to submit information on their experiences and lessons learned on, in particular, the use of performance indicators for monitoring and evaluating capacity building at the national and global levels in the Convention (FCCC/SBI/2008/L.25, paragraph 10) and the Kyoto Protocol (FCCC/SBI/2008/L.26, paragraph 8). In response to this invitation, the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) submits the following information on its activities relating to indicators for monitoring and evaluating capacity building.

As the United Nations' global development network, UNDP's goal is to align human development and climate change management efforts by promoting mitigation and adaptation activities that do not slow down but rather accelerate socio-economic progress. The nature of UNDP's work leads the agency to take a holistic view of capacity building. UNDP uses the term "capacity development," as it reflects its comprehensive approach, which uses the existing base of capabilities as its starting point and then supports national efforts to enhance and retain them. This is a process of transformation from the inside, based on national determined priorities, policies, and desired results. It encompasses areas where new capabilities have to be introduced and hence, the building of new capacity is also supported. A document providing more detail on how UNDP conceives a framework for capacity development, including monitoring and evaluation, is being produced and should be available in Spring 2009. For more information, please contact Cassie Flynn (cassie.flynn@undp.org).

The UNDP Strategic Plan 2008–2011 positions capacity development as the organization's overarching service to programme countries. This is mainly implemented by UNDP Capacity Development Group. Some elements of capacity development monitoring, evaluation and indicators can be found on the website of UNDP's Capacity Development Group:
<http://www.undp.org/capacity/index.shtml>.

UNDP also addresses capacity development as part of its work with the Global Environment Facility (GEF). The portfolio of biodiversity projects, for example, focuses on removing barriers to capacity development. This is measured across systemic, institutional, individual, market, and investment levels. Further, in support of the National Capacity Self-Assessment Programme, UNDP developed a framework to monitor capacity development initiatives, *Monitoring Capacity Development GEF Operations* (for a copy of this document, please contact Tom Twining-Ward, tom.twining-ward@undp.org). This approach is in line with the GEF Strategic Approach to Enhance Capacity Building and the GEF Results-Based Management Framework and provides a structure for indicators to establish baselines and monitor progress. Indicators were developed with five capacity results in mind:

- Capacity for engagement;
- Capacity to generate, access and use information and knowledge;
- Capacities for strategy, policy and legislation development;
- Capacity for management and implementation; and
- Capacity to monitor and evaluate.

Using a scorecard approach by ranking each indicator from zero to three, the indicators provide an opportunity to quantify the qualitative process of capacity development. A set of indicators is identified in the framework but the tool is flexible enough to add indicators specific to each focal area. For the *GEF Results-Based Management Framework*, please see:
www.thegef.org/uploadedFiles/Documents/Council_Documents_PDF_DOC/GEF_31/C.31.11%20Results%20Based%20Management%20Framework.pdf.