Generic Aspects of Institutional Capacity Development in Developing Countries

M. R. Bhagavan and I. Virgin

SEI STOCKHOLM ENVIRONMENT INSTITUTE

Generic Aspects of Institutional Capacity Development in Developing Countries

M.R. Bhagavan and I. Virgin

SEI STOCKHOLM ENVIRONMENT INSTITUTE

Stockholm Environment Institute
Lilla Nygatan 1
Box 2142
SE-103 14 Stockholm
Tel: +46 8 412 1400
Fax: +46 8 723 0348
E-mail: postmaster@sei.se
Web: www.sei.se

Communications Director: Arno Rosemarin
Publications Manager: Erik Willis
Layout: Lisetta Tripodi
Web Access: Howard Cambridge
Cover photograph: Harry May

ISBN 91 88714 88 8

Contents

Acknowledgements

This study was conducted within the framework of SEI's ongoing research programme on "Poverty and Vulnerability", funded by the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (Sida). The support by Sida is gratefully acknowledged.

In writing this study, we have drawn substantially from IDEM Consult (1995), Morgan and Qualman (1996), Morgan (1997), Lessik and Michener (2000) and Sida (2001). It is a pleasure to acknowledge our indebtedness to them. We have benefited by the discussions we have had at Sida with Tomas Andersson, Ingemar Gustafsson, Maria Schultz, Mats Segnestam and Ulrika Åkesson that initiated this work, and by the comments of our SEI colleague Måns Nilsson.

1 Introduction and Framework

"Capacity building" began to emerge in the late 1980s and early 1990s as one of the main objectives of the donor community's assistance to developing countries. It has since become the predominant goal of donor involvement. Its current form is a result of a slow process that has evolved since the 1950s. As Morgan and Qualman (1996) point out in detail, the donors' journey along the capacity building route has taken them through the three stations of "traditional institutional development", "governance", and the "micro-economics of institutions". As conceptualised and practised currently, "capacity building" encompasses the principal features of these three stages, but goes beyond them to a wider perspective that enables involvement based on a deeper systemic "cause and effect" analysis rather than being content with tackling the proximate reasons for poor performance.

According to Morgan and Qualman (*op cit*), "traditional institutional development" focuses on what an organisation has in terms of resources and structure, and on how it performs its various functions. It has the character of "organisational engineering" that concentrates on improving administrative procedures through the "*supply"* of training, technical assistance and some "systems development".

Whereas traditional institutional development is primarily concerned with government institutions and public sector organisations, "governance" broadens out to include the judicial and legal system, the electoral and parliamentary system, political parties, the media, the private sector and civil society organisations (CSOs, which include non-governmental organisations/NGOs and community based organisations/CBOs). In contrast to the "*supply"* nature of traditional institutional development, the intention of the governance approach is to respond to the "*demand*" by the above-mentioned stakeholders. Its aim is to promote and strengthen accountability, transparency, legitimacy, pluralism and participation. This in turn compels one to address the question of the "enabling environment" in which these values can take root and flourish, i.e. the political, economic, social and cultural contexts in which the "governance" initiatives are attempted.

The application of classical micro-economic criteria and techniques to institutional analysis and development was championed by the World Bank in the mid 1990s under the (optimistic) heading of "new institutional economics". Its main thrust is to re-direct the self-interested behaviour of individuals within given institutions (and relevant outside ones) "away from purely redistributive activities and into well-coordinated socially productive ones" (Morgan and Qualman, *op cit*). Incentives and sanctions are accorded key roles. Organisational performance is regarded as being strongly influenced by how well the institutional arrangements of ownership and operation are matched with institutional "outputs" in the context in which the institutions are embedded. The intention of the micro-economic approach is to bring market forces and competition to bear on donor programmes and projects, which are seen as "contracts and agreements linking principals and agents, i.e. owners, contractors, consultants, participants and beneficiaries" (Morgan and Qualman, *op cit*).

As indicated earlier, "capacity building", or "capacity development (CD)" as it is more broadly and dynamically conceived, integrates many of the main features of traditional capacity development, governance and institutional micro-economics. It generally involves a cluster of institutions in either a single sector, or across several sectors. It embraces therefore both the micro-institutional approach dictated by the commitment to individual institutions and the macro-institutional one called for by a cluster of institutions. Clusters and networks call for analyses of, and changes in, the structures and modalities of interaction between institutions, which are exercises of a different category than dealing with hierarchies in individual institutions. In designing and implementing CD initiatives, much more attention is devoted to the context (political, economic and social), the "enabling environment" and the actual manifestations and limitations of local "ownership and commitment". It is recognised that CD is essentially an ongoing process of change rather than creating and "handing over" a "product".

A central problem that is generally encountered is the inability of local "actors" to preserve, strengthen and make proper use of existing institutional capacity. One needs to trace and understand the underlying causes behind this malaise and find ways of motivating and facilitating the relevant "actors" to deal with them. For efforts at CD to succeed, the "ownership" of the process and its outcome has to be really vested in the rank and file personnel who are expected to implement the change. But all too often, the "ownership", and with it the resources, the power and the privilege that accompany donor-funded programmes, are "captured" by leadership strata, who tend to be adept at paying convincing lip service commitment to the process. There is not much point in embarking on CD initiatives without putting in place mechanisms that effectively prevent such "capture".

CD is meant to be driven by the demands expressed by local actors and stakeholders who either actively participate in the process or are significantly affected by it. Identification of the demands by these groups ought to precede the initiation of the CD process and ways should be found of responding to changing demands as the process proceeds. The strata that tend to "capture the ownership" will have strong vested interests in concentrating the demand to the supply of resources and services, rather than to improving capacity.

The "sustainability" of institutions and their capacities depends upon a host of dynamic factors, not all of which can be foreseen, let alone "managed". Those who actually implement the process (in particular, the "hands-on" rank and file) would be the best judges of the more decisive factors to concentrate on and the strategies for tackling them. Nevertheless, donors need to ensure that the following preconditions are in place, so that one is at least setting forth in the right direction: relevance and legitimacy beyond the confines of the institution, gearing the institution's "output" to its "starting point capacity" as well as to some demand by the key stakeholders external to the institution, and assured partial financing by local sources over the foreseeable future.

Our purpose in writing this paper is threefold:

1. To identify from the literature those aspects that are *generic* in nature to capacity development in a cluster of institutions.

2. To selectively combine important features of several approaches that exist in the literature to the operationalisation of the generic aspects, in the context of a given sector in a developing country or region, keeping "sustainability" in mind.

3. To highlight "capacity development areas and indicators" of a generic kind, in particular those that permit one to monitor the progress in capacity development.

2 Types of Institutions Considered and the Content of Institutional Capacity: "Capacity Components"

Unlike some analysts, we use the terms "institution" and "organisation" interchangeably[1]. They encompass, on the one hand, the designations, hierarchies, relations, responsibilities and modes of interaction that make up a structured grouping of individuals, and on the other hand, the rules, values and behaviour that obtain within the given structure. The latter is categorised by some as a subset of a larger set that constitutes the "institutional framework" (e.g. Sida 2001), a concept we will return to below.

Notwithstanding the very wide net cast by the above two terms, we restrict their scope to the following three categories of institutions and organisations, anticipating the application of the method and analysis of this paper to certain sectors, within the boundaries set by some specific contexts, where the three categories would be the ones of primary relevance to us:

Knowledge-generating institutions: University departments, research laboratories/ institutes/ centres within and outside the university system, etc.

Government entities: Ministerial departments, policy-making authorities, regulatory authorities, environment protection agencies, science and technology commissions, national research councils, etc.

Civil society organisations (which include non-governmental and community-based organisations): Environmental organisations, consumers' organisations, producers' associations (including farmers' associations), professional associations, chambers of commerce, etc.

Our definition of "*institutional capacity*" thus encompasses, on the one hand, the *functions (tasks)* that institutions should have the *competence (ability)* to perform, and, on the other, the *resources* (human, technical and financial) and *structures* they need to that end. *For ease of analysis, we subsume relations, rules, values, behaviour, etc. within the concept of "structure"*.

It will become apparent as we proceed that these defining "capacity components" contain a number of elements that belong to "traditional institutional development", "governance" and "micro-economics of institutions".

We regard the "*development of institutional capacity* " as the s*ecuring of the resources and structures* that are appropriate and essential for satisfactorily performing the functions (tasks) that the institution is mandated to. Since "competence (ability)" refers to the knowledge and skills embodied in individuals, it is subsumed under "resources" as "human resources". We will use the term "*institutional capacity development*" to mean not only the building of fresh capacity, but also the strengthening, mobilising and changing of existing capacity.

One needs to understand, and be constantly aware of, the *institutional framework* that sets the initial boundaries within which the capacity-building effort can take place. An institution's framework is made up, on the one hand, of formal and explicit rules, regulations, policies, etc., and on the other, of informal and implicit norms and values, that govern the working of the institution. An institution may well want to incorporate into its capacity-building effort the objective of securing certain changes in its initially given framework. This would involve mutually reinforcing changes to an institution's structure and its functional competence (see below).

[1] For instance, Morgan and Qualman (1996) differentiate between the two. To them, the term 'Institution' refers to "an informal set of values, behaviours and relationships ---- that persist over time in support of collectively valued purposes", and 'organisations' refer to "formal structures with designated roles and purposes".

2.1 Functions (tasks) and competence

The functions (tasks) that knowledge-generating institutions, government entities and civil society organisations are commonly expected to perform, and the corresponding competence required, can be classified into broad groups as follows:

- Research training, research work, innovation of products and processes (R&D), methodological and institutional innovation, setting of standards, etc.
- Policy analysis, policy research and policy advocacy
- Formulation and implementation of (i) institutional frameworks consisting of procedures, rules, regulations and legislation, and (ii) policies and strategies
- Technical and programme functions comprising the delivery of services, programme planning, monitoring and evaluation, and the application of technical knowledge and skills
- Administrative and support functions
- Management functions, which include the management of financial resources (fund-raising, budgeting, spending, accounting and auditing), human resources (personnel recruitment, placement and support) and infrastructural resources (equipment, filing and archive systems and information technology)
- External communication functions: raising public awareness, public scrutiny and challenge, lobbying, campaigns to promote specific interests, etc.
- External cooperation and networking functions: ways of working with key institutions active in the same or very similar areas

2.2 Institutional structure: organisational and contextual analysis, and structural change

An institution's structure is a system whose parts are made up of relations of work, hierarchies and lines of command, division of labour and responsibilities, and channels of communication and information sharing. The development of an institution's capacity almost invariably involves changes to some of these parts, usually referred to as "organisational change". Institutions often resort to *ad hoc* changes to solve pressing organisational problems. Because they tend to be short-term in their perspective, such solutions do not necessarily have the onus of contributing to more durable changes in capacity.

To result in capacity development, structural changes have to be strategic in character. But they do not have to be unduly complex or proceed on several fronts simultaneously. They can very well start off with modest and tentative efforts, which can be altered and expanded as one proceeds, as long as one does not depart from the overall direction, approach and objectives that have been arrived at through strategic thinking. How modest or how ambitious depends upon the context in which the institution is embedded. A contextual analysis will uncover the constraints to the scope and speed of the changes attempted.

Organisational and contextual analyses of the given institution ought to *precede* efforts at capacity building, to ensure the relevance and appropriateness of the design of any proposed initiative. The analyses should try and cover the following aspects:

- The recent "development history" of the institution, including an understanding of the key constraints faced and how they were addressed, including "capture of ownership and resources" by the institution's past and present leadership

- The present organisational structure and its relevance to the institution's present mandate
- Quality of leadership: continuity, level of delegation, motivational capacity
- Innovative ability: willingness to change at different levels of the institution, learning ability
- Information: availability and accessibility
- Implementation modalities: allocation of responsibilities, procedures
- Monitoring of implementation
- Financing: ability to mobilise
- Financial management tools: availability and effectiveness
- Human resources: available knowledge and skills, recruitment procedures, training

3 The Process of Institutional Capacity Development

The first stage in the process would be to collect and analyse *baseline information* about the existing capacity in a given institution. In addition to the information about the three parts that make up the "capacity system", i.e. functions, resources and structures, several important questions have to be addressed. Who are the main "actors" and "stakeholders" in the capacity system, what "ownership" and commitment do they actually feel for it and what are their *real* priorities as manifested in their decisions and the actions they undertake? Are there mechanisms in place to prevent "capture of ownership and resources" by institutional leadership? What are the factors extraneous to the system that strongly inhibit its workings?

The effort to develop an institution's capacity is usually driven by two needs: firstly, to improve the performance of the current set of tasks and thus increase the degree to which current objectives can be met; secondly, to acquire new capability, i.e. the capability for performing new tasks and fulfilling new objectives.

On the basis of a list of performance indicators (quantitative and qualitative), the main features of the gap between current and expected (desirable) levels of performance should be analysed. Through the resulting information, understanding and insights, one ought to be able to pinpoint the shortfalls and shortcomings in current capacity that lie behind the performance gap. Measures would then have to be devised for redressing the deficiencies, including changes in work organisation and work relations between individuals (see below).

Acquiring new capability is an iterative process that starts off with a picture of desirable capacity a few years down the road and a way of getting there, both of which will change through feedbacks as the process proceeds. Both the process and its outcome will be affected by the differing perceptions of the main "actors" and "stakeholders" on the following issues and the compromises they are prepared to make in tackling them:

- the content of the new capability and the timeframe for achieving it
- the relative emphases on short-term operational requirements vis-à-vis longer term strategic ones
- "ownership" of resources
- competition and accountability

- quality of the institution's output
- targeted standards of performance: timeliness, responsiveness, accuracy, efficiency and effectiveness

4 Sustainability of Capacity and its Continued Development

While, obviously, the property of "sustainability" cannot be open-ended in time, it is usually understood to be meaningful only over a longish term. An institution's capacity can be regarded as being sustainable if, within a longish timeframe, internal and external conditions persist that make it possible for the institution to carry out its critical functions reasonably well.

Among the internal conditions that would apply to most institutions are the functional appropriateness of internal structures, tangible and intangible incentives and rewards to employees that ensure involvement and commitment, and penalties for non-performance that are seen as being transparent, fair, impartial and consistent. The creation and maintenance of these internal conditions depend on the structure and character of the institution's management and its actions.

External conditions relate principally to the accessibility of financial and technical resources, which in turn means maintaining one's relevance and importance for key stakeholders in state and civil society. Conducive external conditions are contingent on the institution's capability to deliver the expected "outputs" to specified requirements, as well as to identify and meet the demand for "new outputs" that it has the capacity to generate.

Some overarching issues that will decisively affect sustainability are an institution's legal foundation, internal governance, social legitimacy, financial and social accountability, stability[2] and degree of dependence on foreign donors and organisations. Of particular importance will be the proven ability of the institution's leadership to secure substantial resources (financial and technical) from within the country and the region. An institution or programme that remains almost entirely dependent on foreign donors for a long period of time is very unlikely to become sustainable. Equally crucial would be the leadership's drive to systematically follow-up and monitor the capacity development efforts.

5 Some Issues Concerning Strategies for Capacity Development

Several issues and questions will confront those who participate in formulating and implementing a strategy for capacity development:

- The assumptions that lie behind the identification of the elements of the strategy and on how the changes should be brought about
- The degree to which a shared view of, and a consensus about, the strategy is attainable
- In the likely event of only a partial consensus being attainable, the identification of those actors and stakeholders whose commitment will be decisive, e.g. whose "non-cooperation" will

[2] By "stability" in the context of capacity development we mean the absence of syndromes like rapid turnover in professionally qualified staff, *ad hoc* changes in designated tasks of key individuals, etc.

effectively block the process, and the creation of coalitions involving them to translate that commitment into supportive action

- How to integrate self-sustaining mechanisms for "organisational learning" into the structures of the institution?
- How to "translate" the various elements that make up the strategy into capacity development indicators (CDIs)?
- Whose responsibility will it be to implement the strategy and monitor its progress (e.g. keeping track of which CDI are being attained and to what degree), including an assessment of the credibility and support that the strategy is generating inside and outside the institution?

6 Generic "Capacity Areas"

As pointed out earlier, we use the terms "organisation" and "institution" interchangeably. They denote, on the one hand, systematised collection of individuals and the relations between them, and on the other, the policies, processes, procedures, mechanisms, rules, regulations, values, etc. that are associated with and/or arise from such systems. We recall, further, that we choose to work with a broad definition of institutional capacity that comprises competence (ability), resources and structures. Accordingly, the "areas" that make up the "capacity" of an institution should be differentiated enough to capture the variety of the concepts we are dealing with. Keeping this in mind, we adopt from the literature the following groupings of "capacity areas" (the list is by no means comprehensive):

6.1 Information and knowledge

- State of the institution's mandated fields (e.g. "state of rural health care", "state of urban sanitation", etc.)
- Response strategies in mandated fields and efficacy of previous responses
- Objects of (i.e. fields chosen for) surveys, studies and research, and priorities thereof
- Stocks: databases, libraries, archives and documentation centres
- Own output and modes of dissemination thereof
- Outreach activities

6.2 Competence and ability (so-called "human resources development")

- Quantitative and qualitative levels of in-house expertise and skills (academic, research, administrative, financial, managerial and diverse technical, non-technical and infrastructural) that are essential for performing the institution's mandated tasks
- Institutional memory (in-house as well as externalised)
- Magnitudes and rates of turnover in personnel of critical importance
- Conducting training and education courses (both in-house and external) in the institution's mandated fields
- "Backstopping" competence in centrally placed "upstream" instances to provide information and advice to "downstream" implementing actors and agencies

- Role of technical assistance: In the context of the *least developed countries*, donor-financed and -mediated technical assistance (TA) for developing institutional capacity is likely to continue into the foreseeable future. The usual forms that TA takes are training courses for selected personnel conducted within and outside the country, study tours, infrastructural support (e.g. equipment) and access to national and international expertise.

Ad-hoc interventions seldom result in durable impact. To obtain the most out of TA, it should be designed to enhance institutional competence systematically over a certain length of time, to facilitate the incorporation of "best practices" from other settings of relevance, to increase the ability to absorb the risks attendant on structural change and to nurture new leadership committed to the envisaged changes.

In-house training of staff and interns by temporarily appointed or seconded international experts is often a relatively fast and efficient way of upgrading institutional competence.

6.3 Governance, institutional economy and institutional finance

- Efficiency
- Solvency and vulnerability
- Transparency and accountability
- Sustainability

6.4 Technical and infrastructural resources

Essential equipment and expendable supplies, servicing, repair and maintenance

6.5 Policy arena

- Types and fields of policy responsibilities
- Structures, procedures and modalities involved in policy formulation and implementation
- Intra- and inter-institutional communication, coordination and cooperation that may facilitate policy formulation and implementation

6.6 Policy instruments

- Legislative and regulatory instruments: laws and directives, standards and litigation procedures (Some prefer to refer to these as "institutional framework", see for instance Sida 2001)
- Economic instruments: pricing, taxation, subsidies and incentives
- Planning tools: profiles of mandated areas and impact assessment procedures
- Communicative instruments: public hearings, use of media, public panels and fora, websites

7 Generic "Capacity Development Indicators"

Capacity development indicators (CDIs) are less amenable to generic analysis than "capacity areas". An attempt to conceptualise them usually drives the analysis on to the path of specificities that mark out sectors, institutions and corresponding capacity areas. There are, nevertheless, some CDIs (both quantitative and qualitative) that would qualify to being generic, in the sense that several of them are likely to crop up in the context of a variety of sectors and institutions. We provide some examples of generic CDIs below. A few illustrative examples of country-, sector- and institution-specific capacity areas and CDIs are presented in matrix from in Section 9 below.

- Intra- and inter-institutional consensus achieved on matters at hand
- Policies, strategies and regulatory regimes developed and implemented
- Decisions taken and implemented to achieve specific aims, objectives and targets
- Decisions made and implemented in a "participatory" manner
- Actions coordinated involving relevant institutions, actors and stakeholders
- Actions and results monitored, and infringement of agreements dealt with
- Lessons learnt from past efforts and experience, and learned lessons implemented
- Institutions' personnel motivated and mobilised to perform tasks to agreed standards
- Resources mobilised (internal and external to the institution)
- Audits conducted to given deadlines (audits can be on a variety of things, e.g. levels of outputs or outcomes or impacts, efficiency, performance, costs, benefits, inventories, finance, etc.)
- Surveys, studies and research carried out
- Reports produced, disseminated and published, including articles in peer reviewed professional journals
- Channels of communication established and utilised between relevant institutions, actors and stakeholders

8 Monitoring the Process of Capacity Development

Lessik and Michener (2000) present several approaches developed by various agencies for assessing institutional capacity and monitoring its development over time. They cater to different situations, depending upon whether one is dealing with a single organisation or a cohort of organisations, and whether the assessment is carried out by an external facilitator, or by the organisation's members themselves in a participatory manner. Based on an analysis of these approaches, we find that two are of particular relevance to our purpose: the Institutional Development Framework (IDF) and the Organisational Capacity Assessment Tool (OCAT). They lean, respectively, towards "external facilitator/evaluator" and "participatory" approaches, but can accommodate both if need be. OCAT enables comparison across institutions, whereas IDF can be tailored to fit the specific needs of a given organisation.

8.1 The IDF approach

Each capacity indicator is rated at one of four stages:

1=Start up; 2=Development; 3= Expansion/Consolidation; 4=Sustainability.

Criteria, which are institution- and indicator-specific, are identified to describe each of the four scores. On the basis of these criteria, the rating (1 to 4) of each capacity indicator is decided. The resulting graph constitutes the Institutional Development Profile (IDP). The IDP uses either bars or crosses to show the ratings. It forms the basis for discussing which areas of the institution's capacity need attention and for setting priorities for improvement and action accordingly. *Changes over a period of time in the ratings enables IDP to be used as a tool for monitoring the process of capacity development.*

The ratings of the capacity indicators in any given capacity area, at any given time, can be averaged to obtain a summary score for each area. The resulting table of areas and scores, which is called the Institutional Development Calculation Sheet (IDCS), enables one to keep track of the relative development of an institution's capacity areas. Besides its value as a monitoring tool, IDF has the added advantage of providing a basis for setting priorities for improvement.

The usual practice in the IDF approach is for an external evaluator/facilitator to set up the framework, i.e. the indicators and the criteria, on the basis of the information she collects from as many members of the institution as possible. Selected members of the institution are then asked to rate the indicators through discussions among themselves, on the basis of their own perceptions without recourse to other information. The participants are allowed to modify the framework, but are advised against making very radical changes that would alter the original beyond recognition. Further, the external expert facilitates discussions among the participants in determining which areas are most important to the institution and which need priority attention.

8.2 The OCAT approach

In this approach, one assigns a score to a capacity indicator on a scale of 1 to 6:

1= Needs urgent attention and improvement; 2= Needs attention; 3= Needs improvement; 4=Needs improvement in limited aspects, but not major or urgent; 5=Room for some improvement; 6=No need for immediate improvement.

As with the PDF approach, one has to identify criteria for deciding what score to assign to any given indicator. All the scores are displayed on a *rating sheet*.

Besides providing a comparative picture of the state of the development of each indicator, the rating sheet also helps one to decide the relative urgency of attention that needs to be given to improve the capacities that the indicators stand for.

The ratings of the indicators in any given capacity area can be averaged to provide a score for the capacity area as a whole. On the basis of these average scores, one can decide to place a given capacity area along a scale of 1 to 4 as follows:

1=Nascent; 2=Emerging; 3= Expanding; 4= Mature.

The average scores constitute a qualitative assessment of the stages and characteristics of an institution's capacity at each stage of its development. The state of the capacity is presented in the form of graphs or narratives entitled "Organisational Development: Stages and Characteristics". *OCAT makes it possible to track the changes in the strengths and weaknesses of an institution over time.*

OCAT is intended primarily as an exercise in participatory self-assessment, but may bring in external expertise. As assessment team is set up comprising selected members of the institution, who represent the various functions (tasks) that the institution performs. The team itself sets up the assessment framework (indicators and criteria). The assignment of scores combines individual perceptions with the evidence collected through systematic information gathering. Scores are given on the basis of consensus achieved through discussions within the group. The evidence is gathered by the team itself, an exercise that includes the identification of the sources of information and the division of the information-gathering tasks among the team members.

9 Some Country-, Sector- and Institution-specific Examples of Capacity Areas and Capacity Development Indicators

We present below, in matrix from, some illustrative examples of capacity areas and capacity development indicators (CDIs) drawn from four development projects, one each from Tanzania, the Philippines, Mozambique and Madagascar. The last column on 'monitoring', although left empty, has been retained to indicate that the corresponding capacity areas and/or CDIs are amenable to monitoring.

- Tanzania: A soil and water conservation project in Iringa district. DANIDA supported project (Boesen and Lafontaine, 1998)
- The Philippines: The Pasig River Rehabilitation Programme (PRRP), which involves sewerage, effluent treatment and cleaning up the river. DANIDA supported project (Boesen and Lafontaine, 1998)
- Mozambique: Increased democratic governance within civil society organisations. USAID supported project (Lessik and Michener, 2000)
- Madagascar: Communication and extension to customers by twenty-one partner institutions (including the Ministry of Health) implementing reproductive health programs. USAID supported project (Lessik and Michener, 2000)

Institution	Capacity Component	Capacity Area	Method used for developing capacity	Capacity Development Indicator (CDI)	Monitoring capacity development: Ratings according to some preferred approach
Tanzania Example					
Iringa District Office, Ministry of Water	Functional Competence	Soil and water conservation methods and techniques	Formal training at an agricultural institution	Retrained extension staff servicing village communities	
-ditto-	-ditto-	Protecting water catchment areas	International advisers imparting on-the-job training to district officers	District officers take over part of the activities performed by international advisers	
-ditto-	-ditto-	Soil and water conservation methods and techniques	Villagers teach district officers and extension staff	District officers and extension staff learn some improved local techniques	
Village community	Functional Competence	-ditto-	Extension staff teach villagers	Villagers learn some improved techniques	
-ditto-	-ditto-	Preparing and implementing plans for improved cultivation	Self-learning by village community with advice from district officers and extension staff	Community-wide activity plans prepared and implemented by villagers	

Institution	Capacity Component	Capacity Area	Method used for developing capacity	Capacity Development Indicator (CDI)	Monitoring capacity development: Ratings according to some preferred approach
Philippines Example					
Secretariat of PRRP	Structure	Integration into an appropriate government department	Philippine government directive	Secretariat's activities integrated into the Environment Management Bureau (EMB); Secretariat's outputs listed under EMB	
-ditto-	-ditto-	Coordination and planning	Communication and meetings	Regular meetings of PRRP's working groups	
-ditto-	Resources	Staffing and operational budget	Philippine government directive	Secretariat's staff positions and operational budget funded by the government	
Mozambique Example					
CSOs	Structure	Setting up the leadership (e.g. board members, directors)	Secret ballot	Elected leadership	
-ditto-	Structure	Status of the leadership	Decision by the general assembly comprising all the members of the institution	Elected leadership are barred from being or becoming paid employees of the institution	
-ditto-	Resource/ Structure	Budget approval process	-ditto-	General assembly assumes responsibility for approving the annual budget	
Madagascar Example					
Health clinic run by partner institution	Resource	Staff trained Staff competent in counseling all customers/ patients	Formal and on-the-job training	Number of trained staff	
-ditto-	Structure	Key messages developed for use in extension work among potential customers/ patients	Consultations and discussions among the institution's staff	Content of messages	
-ditto-	Structure	Supervision of extension workers and monitoring their effectiveness	Ideas generated by institution's leadership, in consultation with external expertise	Content of schemes and methods	

10 References and Select Bibliography

Jannik **Boesen** and Alain **Lafontaine**, 1998, *The Planning and Monitoring of Capacity Development in Environment (CDE) Initiatives.* DANIDA, Copenhagen

Mary E. **Hildebrand** and Merilee S. **Grindle**, 1994, *Building Sustainable Capacity: Challenges for the Public Sector*. UNDP (BPPS), New York

IDEM Consult, The Netherlands, 1995, *Indicators for Capacity Development in the Environment: Background paper prepared for the OECD/DAC Working Party on Environment and Development.* OECD, Paris

Alan **Lessik** and Victoria **Michener**, 2000, *Measuring Institutional Capacity: Recent Practices in Monitoring and Evaluation.* Report Number TIPS-15, USAID (Center for Development Information and Evaluation), Washington DC

Yemile **Mizrahi**, 2003, *Capacity Enhancement Indicators: Review of the Literature.* World Bank Institute Evaluation Studies No. EG03-72, The World Bank, Washington, D.C.

Peter **Morgan**, 1997, The Design and Use of Capacity Development Indicators. CIDA (Policy Branch), Ottawa

Peter **Morgan** and Ann **Qualman**, 1996, *Institutional and Capacity Development: Results-Based Management and Organizational Performance.* CIDA (Policy Branch), Ottawa

Roberto **Mosse**, Leigh Ellen **Sontheimer** and Patricia **Rogers**, 1996, *Performance Monitoring Indicators: A Handbook for Task Managers.* World Bank (Operation Policy Department), Washington DC

OECD, 1997, *Capacity Development in Environment: Principles in Practice.* Paris

Sida (Methods Development Unit), 2001, *Sida's Policy for Capacity Development as a Strategic Question in Development Cooperation.* Stockholm

UNDP (BPPS/MDGD), 1997, *Capacity Development. Technical Advisory Paper 2.* New York

UNDP (BPPS/MDGD), 1997, *A Synopsis of General Guidelines for Capacity Assessment and Development.* New York

The Stockholm Environment Institute (SEI)

SEI is an independent, international research institute specializing in sustainable development and environment issues. It works at local, national, regional and global policy levels. The SEI research programmes aim to clarify the requirements, strategies and policies for a transition to sustainability. These goals are linked to the principles advocated in Agenda 21 and the Conventions such as Climate Change, Ozone Layer Protection and Biological Diversity. SEI along with its predecessor, the Beijer Institute, has been engaged in major environment and development issues for a quarter of a century.

Mission

SEI's mission is to support decision-making and induce change towards sustainable development around the world by providing integrative knowledge that bridges science and policy in the field of environment and development.

The SEI mission developed from the insights gained at the 1972 UN Conference on the Human Environment in Stockholm (after which the Institute derives its name), the work of the (Brundtland) World Commission for Environment and Development and the 1992 UN Conference on Environment and Development. The Institute was established in 1989 following an initiative by the Swedish Government to develop an international environment/development research organisation.

Risk and Vulnerability Programme

This programme conducts research on environmental and technological hazards and global environmental change. Expanding on ongoing and previous work on risk analysis, risk perception, and risk management, research now also focuses on the differential vulnerability of people, places, and ecosystems. The hallmark of this programme is integrated analyses that seek to bridge the best of the social and ecological sciences. A major priority is the development of policies and initiatives that hold promise for enhancing human security, adaptive capacities, social equity, and resilient societies.

Stockholm Environment Institute

SEI-HQ
Director: R. Kasperson
Box 2142
S-103 14 Stockholm
Sweden
Tel+46 8 412 1400
Fax+46 8 723 0348
E-mail postmaster@sei.se
www.sei.se

SEI-Boston
Director: P. Raskin
11 Arlington Street
Boston, MA 02116-3411
USA
Tel+1 617 266 8090
Fax+1 617 266 8303
E-mail seib@tellus.org
www.seib.org

SEI-Tallinn
Acting Director: K. Peterson
Lai 34, Box 160
EE-10502, Tallinn
Estonia
Tel+372 6 276 100
Fax+372 6 276 101
E-mail postmaster@seit.ee
www.seit.ee

SEI-York
Director: J.C.I. Kuylenstierna
Biol. Dept. Univ. of York
PO Box 373, York YO10 5YW
UK
Tel+44 1904 43 2897
Fax+44 1904 43 2898
E-mail seiy@york.ac.uk
www.seiy.org

ISBN 91 88714 88 8