



Ministry of Ecology and Natural Resources Management of the Republic of Moldova

Capacity assessment for environmental management in Moldova: Case Study

Tatiana Plesco, Senior Adviser,
Department for Policy Analysis

23-24 October 2008, Astana



Ministry of Ecology and Natural Resources Management of the Republic of Moldova

Background

- High costs of environmental degradation
 - Land degradation: some USD 250 million (2005 data)
 - Water pollution: up to USD 115 million (1995 data)
 - Floods: in 2008, damages amounted USD 120 million
- Six environmental targets in the National Development Strategy of 2007 (NDS II)



Ministry of Ecology and Natural Resources Management of the Republic of Moldova

National Development Strategy II: priorities for 2008-2011

- Promoting democracy and the rule of law
- Territorial reintegration
- Establishing a competitive economy
- Human resources development and social inclusion
- Territorial development, incl. environment protection:
 - Water supply and sanitation infrastructure
 - Forest rehabilitation
 - Development of a Waste Management Strategy
 - Upgrading ambient monitoring systems
- Monitoring and evaluation



Ministry of Ecology and Natural Resources Management of the Republic of Moldova

Institutional Development Plans

- Introduced in 2008 as a tool for NDS II implementation
- Mandatory for all ministries (sectors)
- Standard structure: mission, vision, priorities, programmes
- IPD drafting was preceded by a capacity assessment exercise, that was conducted in all ministries by external consultants
- Linked to the Medium-Term Expenditure Framework



IDP and MTEF drafting timelines

- IDP drafting
 - April: Capacity assessment report available
 - June: Draft IDP available for comments
 - July: IDP approved
- MTEF
 - February: MTEF figures made available by the Ministry of Finance
 - March: the description of budgetary programmes provided to the Ministry of Finance
 - July: MTEF approved



Capacity Assessment Report

- Contains information on human resources and results of self-assessments by Ministry staff
- Only 33 staff members took part in the survey out of over 800 people working in the Ministry and its sub-units
- Focused on individual and organisational capacity, lacks a sector-specific perspective
- Capacity gap not identified
 - Lack of comparison of capacity with other Ministries
 - Lack of comparison with international benchmarks
- Conclusions disconnected from assessment criteria
- Capacity development priorities identified very vaguely
- No resource estimates for capacity development



Key indicators of capacity

- **Individual competence**
 - Number of staff, their age structure, educational background, and work experience
 - Attendance of training courses in 2007 (days)
 - Knowledge of English (based on self-assessment)
 - Computer skills
 - Frequency of browsing the “public administration reform” web page
- **Organisational capacity**
 - Transparency of staff hiring (1 – opaque; 5 – totally transparent)
 - Stakeholder cooperation (1 – effective; 5 – totally ineffective)
 - Usefulness of events organised by the Ministry (1 – useless ; 3 – useful)
 - Capacity to develop and implement policies (1 – poor; 5 – excellent)
 - Capacity to plan strategically (idem)
 - Finance management (idem)
 - Human resources management capacity (idem)



Process Organisation

- Methodology and survey questions not discussed with staff
- Absence of incentives to embark in open discussions and admit capacity problems;
- Perception by people as an “abstract exercise” and “business as usual” under another tag (today, some 95% of staff time spent of planning and reporting);
- Lack of feedback to staff
- Unrealistic deadlines
- Results of assessment “overly optimistic”
- Poor connection with MTEF development



The resulting Draft IDP

- Identified some useful actions regarding the development of organisational capacity
- Poorly linked to the NDS and the 2008-2011 plan, being almost reduced to the “development of a waste management strategy” ; many functions left out
- Did not reflect the diversity of functions, areas and policy instruments and was not aligned to existing strategies
- Did not match the MTEF and budgetary programmes



Key lessons learned

- Link capacity assessment and national development strategies is not an easy or short process
- Reference framework for conducting such assessments would permit to enhance the effectiveness and efficiency
- Incentives and training should be provided to staff to embark in capacity assessments and planning
- Process organisation needs to be carefully considered



EAP Task Force Project

- Assess capacity in all sub-divisions
- Help update the IDP
- Help develop a monitoring framework



Thank you for attention