Introduction

- OECD/EAP Task Force role and approaches:
  - Support to, and monitoring of, progress vis-à-vis policy and institutional reforms
  - Guidelines and analytical reports
- New demands due to a changing context:
  - Measuring capacity – “quantifying the unquantifiable”
  - Providing incentives for institutional development
  - Guidance for self-assessment
- The need to adjust work approaches to new demands and a decreasing resource base
Advice received from countries

- Increase the frequency of assessments (Russia)
- Use quantitative indicators (Kazakhstan)
- Link capacity with outcomes (Georgia)
- Identify the sequence of reforms (Belarus)
- Involve other stakeholders (Kyrgyzstan)
- Help to attract resources (Moldova)
- Ensure objectivity (Eco-Forum)
- …and keep it short (Norway)

To quote just some suggestions received over the last few years

---

What could be done at the (sub)regional level?

- Establish a system of annual review of trends in environmental capacity [and performance] – focus on key objectives of capacity development!
- Combine country-specific contextual information with assessments vis-à-vis a common framework
- Use a rating system to quantify “capacity”
- Adopt a limited number of quantitative indicators and present them graphically
- Involve and provide feedback to stakeholders
What could be done at the national level?

- Continued policy dialogues on institutional strengthening
  - In support to efforts to identify capacity development needs and strategies
  - Driven and led by in-country actors
  - Based on methodological support from the Secretariat
- Methodology for self-assessment of capacity
  - Content description
  - Process description

Main elements of annual reviews: Country profiles

- Page 1
  - Major socio-economic indicators
  - Environmental targets specified in National Development Strategies
- Page 2
  - Policy matrix
- Page 3
  - Stakeholder matrix
- Page 4
  - Self-rating results
- Pages 5-6
  - Charts reflecting the evolution of up to 12 indicators
Policy matrix

• Changes in the enabling environment (new strategic papers, laws, and policy instruments) in key areas, e.g.:
  – Water resources management
  – Waste management
  – Energy savings and alternative sources of energy
  – Industrial pollution control
  – Agricultural pollution control
  – Biodiversity protection
  – Forestry

Stakeholder matrix

• Main authorities involved in environmental management
  – National level
  – Sub-national level
• Staff number and budgets dedicated to this task in various organisations
• NGO networks
• Business associations
Self-rating by countries

• Based on the existing rating scheme
  – Developed to meet demands for an integrated assessment of progress made by countries in achieving targets established under Objective 1 of the EECCA Environmental Strategy
  – Common assessment framework: twenty criteria, five levels of capacity
  – Assessment criteria agreed with REPIN members
  – Used in conjunction with the Belgrade Report “Policies for a Better Environment”

• Update the list and description of criteria
• Start using spider charts to identify most problematic areas

“Where to focus reform efforts?”

Armenia’s example
Using graphs to tell a story:
Possible quantitative measures

- **Individual capacity**
  - Staff turnover (national and sub-national level)
  - Salaries in comparison with subsistence level (managers and field staff)
- **Organisational capacity**
  - Ratio between activity and staff-related budgets
  - Ratio between the number of monitored parameters and international recommendations
- **Stakeholder interaction**
  - Rate of regulatory documents discussed with business
  - Rate of public hearings of EIAs
- **Enabling environment**
  - Environmental expenditure
  - Donor assistance
- **Outcomes**
  - Rate of non-compliance
  - Decoupling: air pollution
  - Decoupling: water pollution
  - Energy efficiency

Benefits of the proposed approach

- Peer learning and pressure
- Information presented in an optimised form for decision-makers
- Identification of problematic areas
- Input to capacity development strategies
- Arguments in support to claims for resource allocation
- Increased transparency and public scrutiny
- **Need to take account of a dynamic context!**
**Proposed division of responsibilities**

**Countries**
- Contribution to the development of methodology
- Data collection and validation according to agreed deadlines
- Feedback on the draft version
- Discussing policy conclusions at the TF meetings

**Secretariat, and possibly EECCA RECs**
- Methodology development
- Compilation of data
- Preparing a short summary to highlight trends
- Publication
- Dissemination

---

**In sum:**

- Two streams of work on institutional development
  - Cross-country comparisons
  - Support to identification of capacity development needs at the national level
- A common framework for assessment
  - Combination of contextual information, rating approach, policy and stakeholder matrixes, and quantitative indicators of capacity and performance
- In-country actors to play the main role
- The Secretariat could support countries by developing the approach and providing an information exchange and learning platform
Questions for discussion

• How could benchmarking be enhanced?

• How should the EAP Task Force’s role in capacity monitoring and development be adjusted in line with latest changes in aid architecture?