

**Donor Support for  
Institutional  
Capacity  
Development in  
Environment:  
Lessons Learned**



DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE COMMITTEE

O E C D

## Foreword

In 1992 -- in the wake of the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development -- the OECD Working Party on Development Co-operation and Environment established a Task Force on Capacity Development in Environment (CDE). The CDE Task Force published *i.a.* the proceedings of workshops conducted in Costa Rica (1993) and Rome (1996) and key guidelines on CDE, notably *Donor Assistance to Capacity Development in Environment* (1995) and *Capacity Development in Environment: Principles in Practice* (1997).

In 1996, the OECD Development Assistance Committee published a new strategy – *Shaping the 21<sup>st</sup> Century* – which endorses the environmental dimension of sustainable development “so as to ensure that current trends in the loss of environmental resources are effectively reversed at both global and national levels by 2015”.

In order to take knowledge and understanding in the field of institutional capacity development yet another step forward, the Working Party on Aid Evaluation subsequently commissioned a study: *Donor Support for Institutional Capacity Development in Environment: Lessons Learned*. The CDE study was initiated as part of the Committee’s attempts to improve the effectiveness of donor strategies in certain goal areas of *Shaping the 21<sup>st</sup> Century* and recognised that Members’ evaluation reports continue to highlight the fact that institutional capacity remains one of the most common bottlenecks in the development process.

This report was sponsored and guided by the evaluation departments of the Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Danida and the Department for International Development (DfID), UK. It was conducted by PEMconsult, Copenhagen.

This study acknowledges the considerable progress made in terms of the growing mainstreaming of environmental issues and recognises the need for additional efforts in the context of widespread institutional capacity development. As such, this report shall be considered as a complement to the Committee’s earlier publications and guidelines on CDE. These should guide both programme-level and specific project-level CDE assessments and serve as a source of general information for policy-makers as well as practitioners in donor agencies and developing countries.

Niels Dabelstein  
Chairman, DAC Working Party on Aid Evaluation

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY: DONOR SUPPORT FOR INSTITUTIONAL CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT IN ENVIRONMENT: LESSONS LEARNED .....	7
Background.....	7
Scope of the Study .....	8
Main Findings .....	8
Conclusions.....	18
SYNTHÈSE LES ENSEIGNEMENTS QUI SE DEGAGENT DE L'AIDE DES DONNEURS EN FAVEUR DU DEVELOPPEMENT DES CAPACITES INSTITUTIONNELLES DANS LE DOMAINE DE L'ENVIRONNEMENT .....	20
Contexte .....	20
Cadre de l'étude .....	21
Principales observations .....	22
Conclusions.....	34
1. INTRODUCTION .....	35
1.1 Background .....	35
1.2 Scope and Limitations of the Study .....	36
1.3 Acknowledgements .....	38
2. GENERAL FINDINGS.....	39
2.1 Renewed Donor Agency Interest in Institutional Capacity Development .....	39
2.2 Factors which Influence Institutional Change and Performance .....	40
2.3 The "Capacity Development in Environment" Initiative .....	41
2.4 Present Status of the CDE Concept and Approach .....	43
2.5 Capacity Development in Environment: Constraints and Future Challenges .....	44
3. DONOR AGENCY CAPACITIES TO DESIGN AND MANAGE CDE PROJECTS, PROGRAMMES AND PROCESSES.....	47
3.1 Key Findings .....	47
3.2 Funding for "Environment" .....	54
3.3 Institutional Reforms of Donor Agencies .....	56
3.4 Key Constraints and Mitigating Factors .....	58

4. RECIPIENT COUNTRY INSTITUTIONS' CAPACITIES TO DESIGN AND MANAGE CDE PROJECTS, PROGRAMMES AND PROCESSES .....	75
4.1 Key Findings .....	75
4.2 Generic Capacity Constraints.....	83
4.3 Specific Environmental Capacity Constraints .....	85
4.4 Organisational Successes .....	86
5. CONCLUSIONS .....	106
ANNEX 1 OVERVIEW OF DAC MEMBERS WHO PARTICIPATED IN THE CDE STUDY .....	109
ANNEX 2 OVERVIEW OF DAC MEMBERS' RESPONSES TO THE CDE QUESTIONNAIRE .....	110
ANNEX 3 OVERVIEW OF DAC MEMBERS' GENERIC AND ENVIRONMENT CAPACITY CONSTRAINTS .....	113
ANNEX 4 HISTORICAL BACKGROUND TO ENVIRONMENT AND DEVELOPMENT.....	114
ANNEX 5 THE CDE FRAMEWORK AND CDE GUIDELINES.....	123
ANNEX 6 LIST OF PERSONS CONSULTED.....	135
ANNEX 7 BIBLIOGRAPHY .....	137
ANNEX 8 DATASHEETS. LESSONS OF DONOR SUPPORT FOR CDE .....	172
ANNEX 9 SUMMARISED OVERVIEW OF GENERIC CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT: LESSONS LEARNED.....	185
ANNEX 10 LESSONS LEARNED FROM DEVELOPING AND IMPLEMENTING AN "INTEGRATED CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT" (ICAD) APPROACH.....	188

## LIST OF BOXES

3.1	GEF-UNDP support to the <i>Lak Integrated Conservation and Development Project</i> , New Ireland Province, Papua New Guinea	64
3.2	UNIDO support to the <i>Ecotoxicology Institute</i> , Pakistan	65
3.3	Danced support to the <i>Ministry of Science, Technology and Environment</i> , Thailand	66
3.4	Support to the development of <i>Environmental Impact Assessment</i> , Tanzania	67
3.5	Danida support to the <i>School Maintenance Project</i> , Tanzania	68
3.6	GEF-World Bank support to the <i>Lake Malawi Biodiversity Conservation Project</i> , Malawi, Tanzania and Mozambique	71
3.7	Sida support to the <i>Soil and Water Conservation Branch</i> , Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock Development and Marketing, Kenya	73
3.8	Sida support to the <i>Centre for Science and Environment</i> , India	75
4.1	Netherlands support for <i>Rural Energy Planning and Environmental Management</i> , Agriculture, Energy and Environmental Management Division, Eastern and Southern African Management Institute	89
4.2	Multi-donor support to the <i>Thailand Development Research Institute</i> , Thailand	91
4.3	Multi-donor support to the <i>Ministry for the Coordination of Environmental Affairs</i> , Mozambique	93
4.4	Multi-donor support to the <i>National Watershed Development Programme for Rainfed Areas</i> , Ministry of Agriculture, Government of India	96
4.5	Sida support to the <i>Division of Biodiversity Information Dissemination</i> , National Biodiversity Institute, Costa Rica	98
4.6	Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation support to the <i>Sarhad Provincial Conservation Strategy</i> , Pakistan	101
4.7	Multi-donor Small Grants Programme implemented by the <i>Environmental Defence League (LIDEMA)</i> , Bolivia	104
4.8	World Bank support for <i>Grassroots Organisations for Resource Management</i> in the Philippines	107

## ABBREVIATIONS

ADC	Austrian Development Cooperation
ADB	Asian Development Bank
AfDB	African Development Bank
AusAID	Australian Agency for International Development
BMZ	Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development Germany)
CBD	Convention on Biological Diversity
CBO	Community Based Organisation
CCD	Convention to Combat Desertification
CD	Capacity Development
CDE	Capacity Development in Environment
CEC	Commission of the European Communities
CIDA	Canadian International Development Agency
CILSS	Permanent Inter-State Commission for Drought Control in the Sahel
CSD	Commission for Sustainable Development
DAC	Development Assistance Committee
Danced	Danish Cooperation for Environment and Development
Danida	Danish International Development Agency
DEAP	District Environment Action Plan
DSE	German Foundation for International Development
DfID	Department for International Development (formerly ODA)
EA	Environmental Assessment
EBRD	European Bank for Reconstruction and Development
EC	European Commission
ECDPM	European Centre for Development Policy Management
EEV	Environmental Economic Valuation
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
EIS	Environmental Impact Statement
FCCC	Framework Convention on Climate Change
Finnida	Finnish Department for International Development Cooperation
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GIS	Geographic Information System
GNP	Gross National Product
GTZ	Deutsche Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit
HIID	Harvard Institute for International Development
IADB	Inter-American Development Bank
ICADP	Integrated Conservation and Development Project
IDA	International Development Association
IIED	International Institute for Environment and Development
IMF	International Monetary Fund
IPM	Integrated Pest Management
IRDp	Integrated Rural Development Programme

ITTO	International Tropical Timber Organisation
IUCN	The World Conservation Union
JACSES	Japan Centre for a Sustainable Environment and Society
JICA	Japanese International Cooperation Agency
KfW	Kreditanstalt für Wiederaufbau
MAECEC	Ministère des Affaires Étrangères du Commerce Extérieur et de la Coopération, Grand Duchy de Luxembourg
MoFA	Ministry of Foreign Affairs
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
NCS	National Conservation Strategy
NEAP	National Environment Action Plan
NGO	Non Governmental Organisation
NORAD	Norwegian Development Agency
NREM	Natural Resources and Environmental Management
ODA	Official Development Assistance
OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
OECF	Overseas Economic Cooperation Fund (Japan)
OED	Operations Evaluation Department (World Bank)
PRA	Participatory Rural Appraisal
RRA	Rapid Rural Appraisal
SADC	Southern African Development Community
SAL	Structural Adjustment Lending
SAP	Structural Adjustment Programme
SDC	Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation
SGP	Small Grants Programme (GEF)
Sida	Swedish International Development Co-operation Agency
SP	Sector Programme
TA	Technical Assistance
ToR	Terms of Reference
UNCED	United Nations Conference on Environment and Development
UNCSD	United Nations Commission on Sustainable Development
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
UNIDO	United Nations Industrial Development Organisation
UNFPA	United Nations Population Fund
UNSO	United Nations Sudano-Sahelian Office
USAID	United States of America Agency for International Development
WB	World Bank
WCED	World Commission of Environment and Development
WP-EV	DAC Working Party on Aid Evaluation
WP/ENV	DAC Working Party on Development Assistance and Environment
WRI	World Resources Institute
WWF	World Wide Fund for Nature

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:**

**DONOR SUPPORT FOR INSTITUTIONAL CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT IN  
ENVIRONMENT: LESSONS LEARNED**

**Background**

In 1987 – in the wake of the publication of *Our Common Future* – the Development Assistance Committee (DAC) conducted a seminar in Paris entitled “Strengthening Environmental Co-operation with Developing Countries”. A review was subsequently carried out of DAC Members’ capacity to address environmental concerns in their Official Development Assistance (ODA) activities. The report concluded that nearly all DAC Members accorded a high priority to environmental issues, but that active work was still required to better integrate environmental considerations, coherently and systematically, in aid policy, planning and implementation (OECD-DAC, 1989).

In 1992 – in the wake of the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED) – the DAC Working Party on Development Co-operation and Environment (WPDCE) established a Task Force on Capacity Development in Environment (CDE). The work of the CDE Task Force resulted in the publication of the proceedings of two CDE Workshops conducted in Costa Rica (1993) and Rome (1996) <sup>1</sup>.

Between 1995 and 1996 the WPDCE also prepared an Updated Survey of DAC Members’ Activities in Support of Environmental Goals (OECD-DAC, 1997b). The results of this survey were subsequently used as a basis for preparing a draft Compendium of Good Practices for Operationalising Sustainable Development in Development Co-operation Management (OECD-DAC, 1998a).

In 1997 the DAC Working Party on Aid Evaluation (WP-EV) commissioned a desk study “Lessons of Donor Support for Institutional Capacity Development in Environment”. The CDE study was initiated as part of the DAC’s attempts to improve the effectiveness of donor assistance strategies in certain goal areas of *Shaping the 21<sup>st</sup> Century* <sup>2</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup>. Other titles are available as: *Developing Environmental Capacity. A Framework for Donor Involvement* (OECD-DAC, 1995a), *Donor Assistance to Capacity Development in Environment* (OECD-DAC, 1995b) and *Capacity Development in Environment: Principles in Practice* (OECD-DAC, 1996a p. 2).

<sup>2</sup>. *Shaping the 21st Century: The Contribution of Development Co-operation* endorses the environmental dimension of sustainable development “so as to ensure that current trends in the loss of environmental resources are effectively reversed at both global and national levels by 2015” (OECD-DAC, 1996a p. 2).



## Scope of the Study

The Terms of Reference for the CDE study call for a detailed and systematic assessment of DAC members' capacities to support two key processes implicit in the concept of CDE, viz., integrating environment and development concerns and promoting "ownership" at national and local levels by strengthening institutional pluralism.

This Summary document is based on an assessment of a sample of approximately 70 evaluation and review reports provided by the DAC Members, the publications cited in 2. and 3. above and other relevant literature, analysis of 13 responses to a structured CDE questionnaire and selected DAC Member and institutional visits and interviews [notably the Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs, DfID, Danida, BMZ, GTZ, KfW, UNDP and the Harvard Institute for International Development (HIID)]. A peer review of draft documents was undertaken by the International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED). The Summary and attendant Main Report constitute revisions of "Work in Progress" documents presented at earlier WP-EV meetings. Overviews of DAC Members who participated in the CDE study and the responses to the CDE questionnaire are presented in Annexes 1 and 2 respectively.

The study has examined the functional objectives of CDE processes as a basis for prioritising areas where further efforts are required to improve DAC Members' environmental performance. The study had, of necessity, to simplify an extremely complex set of issues and concepts. There are, in addition, numerous difficulties in assessing outcomes in relation to themes such as "environment" or "capacity development", particularly in the contexts of the widespread policy and institutional reforms of both DAC Members and recipient governments during the 1990s.

An important limitation of the study is that it relies disproportionately on donor agency documentation. The relative paucity of information regarding CDE published by recipient country institutions or individuals has heightened this asymmetry<sup>3</sup>. The sample of reports provided by the DAC Members did not include any evaluations of private sector organisations. The study has not attempted to make a detailed assessment of DAC Members' financial appropriation in support of "environment" or CDE projects and programmes due to the current limitations of the OECD-DAC classification of aid. The study presents the views, findings and conclusions of the consultant which do not necessarily correspond to the views of the DAC members or recipient governments.

## Main Findings

### A. *Definition and present status of the CDE concept and approach*

Capacity in the environment represents the ability of individuals, groups, organisations and institutions in a given setting to address environmental issues as part of a range of efforts to achieve sustainable development. The concept of CDE describes the process by which capacity in the environment and appropriate institutional structures are enhanced. The key underlying principles of the CDE concept are that it integrates environment and development concerns at all levels, aims to strengthen institutional pluralism, belongs to, and is driven by, the community in which it is based and involves a

---

<sup>3</sup>. Notable exceptions include some of the papers presented at the CDE Workshop in Rome (OECD-DAC, 1997e) and, for example, CDE as a National Endogenous Process – the Role of External Assistance (Kikula, I.S., 1998). Paper presented at the International Workshop on Danish Assistance to Capacity Development in Environment. Snekersten, Denmark 12-14 May 1998.

variety of management techniques, analytical tools, incentives and organisational structures in order to achieve a given policy objective<sup>4</sup>.

CDE is a key element for the management of environmental problems. The development of the CDE approach has been an ambitious and important step forward in dealing with development and environment. The 1996 CDE Workshop in Rome placed CDE firmly on the international agenda amongst “environmental” specialists. The Rome Workshop, nonetheless recognised that “there is much to do to urge the process forward at all levels in donor and partner communities”<sup>5</sup>. It ascertained that active work is *still* required to ensure greater awareness and understanding of the CDE approach amongst *i.a.* senior management and operational departments within donor agencies as well as public sector aid-accountability and other relevant organisations in donor countries (e.g. national audit offices, consulting firms, NGOs, etc.).

This study recognises that CDE constitutes a valid, realistic and relevant approach to the issues entailed in the management of development and environment. The DAC Task Force has successfully collated several aid principles - notably the principles of integration, ownership and subsidiarity - into a coherent CDE framework<sup>6</sup>. This has provided donor organisations with both a conceptual and, potentially, an operational framework to ensure greater compliance with the DAC’s established *Principles for New Orientations in Technical Co-operation*.

Furthermore, the CDE Framework underlined the importance of strengthening operational approaches and providing a “detailed planning guide” to meet the requirements of individual donors. The CDE questionnaire used in this study has revealed that few DAC members have developed specific CDE guidelines *per se* (cf. Appendix 2) although several have successfully carried the CDE process forward in other guises. The study has also identified a considerable number of successful donor-supported CDE initiatives in Latin America, Africa and Asia. These are outlined on pages 18 and 19.

## ***B. Developing capacity: constraints and future challenges***

### ***Limited capacity to build capacity<sup>7</sup>***

Many low- and middle-income countries continue to be confronted with a complex of serious economic, social and environmental challenges and long-standing generic capacity constraints. DAC

---

<sup>4</sup>. Further background information regarding CDE is provided in *i.a.* Developing Environmental Capacity: A Framework for Donor Involvement (OECD-DAC, 1995a); Donor Assistance to Capacity Development in Environment (OECD-DAC, 1995b); Capacity Development in Environment: Principles in Practice (OECD-DAC, 1997f).

<sup>5</sup>. Report of the Main Rapporteur. Capacity Development in Environment. Proceedings of a Workshop held in Rome 4-6 December 1996 (OECD-DAC, 1997e. p.14).

<sup>6</sup>. For example, the principle of ‘integration’ and addressing environmental concerns pro-actively was already established in 1982 by the Joint Nordic Working Group for Environment in Aid (Miljö og Bistand Nu 1982:9). The principle of ‘ownership’ was already established in 1991 (OECD-DAC Principles for New Orientations in Technical Co-operation). The principle of ‘subsidiarity’ was enshrined in the Copenhagen Report – the Nordic Freshwater Initiative prepared in 1991.

<sup>7</sup>. Thomson, K. (1998) State of the Art Thinking in CDE: Key Issues, Newest Developments and Challenges. Paper presented at the International Workshop on Danish Assistance to Capacity Development in Environment. Snekersten, Denmark 12-14 May 1998. pp. 27-37.

Members' evaluation reports published throughout the period 1992-98 have continued to highlight the fact that institutional capacity remains one of the most common bottlenecks in the development process. Institutional capacity development in ODA programmes has been, at best, partially successful<sup>8</sup>.

Most developing countries now have in place some form of agency or ministry (sometimes both) with overall responsibility for "environment" and one or more national environmental non-governmental organisations (NGOs). However, "environment" ministries are often characterised by:

- being relatively young, poorly staffed and, hence, weak organisations with limited political influence or fiscal support;
- being centralised i.e. institutional monopolies, with limited representation at the local level;
- having mandates which frequently overlap with other sectoral and non-sectoral line ministries resulting in institutional "turf battles" and, thus, often being limited by their own institutional setting;
- limited capacities to commission, review and use Environmental Impact Assessments (EIAs) in national planning;
- limited capacities to enforce mitigation measures prescribed in EIAs and/or the enforcement of the "polluter pays" principle;
- being ill-equipped to routinely and systematically assess the environmental costs of development projects as a precondition for approval.

Thus, there is a clear need for reforms to improve the efficiency, effectiveness and responsiveness of many environmental organisations in developing countries.

### *Constraints*

Although DAC Members' continue to accord a high priority to environmental issues, the continued under-performance in translating policy into practice can be attributed to:

- the gap between the relative priorities accorded to environmental issues by the donor community and by recipient governments<sup>9</sup>;

---

<sup>8</sup>. See, for example, Institutional Development - Incentives to Performance (Israel, 1987); The Process of Change. A Synthesis Study of Institutional Capacity Development projects for the Overseas Development Administration (ODA, 1994); Capacity Building Requirements for Global Environmental Protection (Ohiorhenuan and Wunker, 1995); Building Sustainable Capacity: Challenges for the Public Sector (UNDP, 1996); Environmental Assessments and National Action Plans (OED, World Bank, 1996) and Evaluation of the Environmental Performance of EC Programmes in Developing Countries (European Commission, 1998).

<sup>9</sup>. Three recent reports have highlighted the fundamental dilemma in promoting "ownership" of environmental projects and programmes:

"73% of 'environmental' projects were identified in accordance with the availability of funds and only 27% were demand-driven requests from national institutions" (Environmental Programmes in Latin America and the Caribbean: an Assessment of UNDP Experience. UNDP, 1997g);

- significant generic and specific environmental capacity constraints in both donor organisations and recipient institutions and;
- aid delivery mechanisms (and the modalities for planning and implementation within most donor organisations) which have not evolved at the same pace, or to the same extent, as their own conceptual and policy-making structures.

DAC Members' environment units typically remain small, over-worked and have not yet succeeded in mainstreaming environmental knowledge or the transfer of basic environmental skills amongst generalist staff. A summarised overview of the key generic and specific capacity constraints in the area of environment of the DAC Members is presented in Annex 3.

Five additional factors would also appear to have limited the mainstreaming of the CDE concept within both donor agencies and recipient country institutions. These are:

- the confusion resulting from the fusion of two poorly-defined concepts – “environment” and “capacity development”;
- the organisational cultures and characteristics of many donor agencies mitigate against effective learning and supporting “process” rather than “output” oriented approaches used in conventional project management cycles <sup>10</sup>;
- the slow integration of environmental policy with economic development concerns at all levels of government and civil society in many developing countries;
- the organisational and financial demands resulting from the substantial broadening of the scope of environmental challenges to be addressed to include “global” environmental issues;
- the absence of any coherent core set of internationally-agreed environmental indicators, particularly when compared to economic and social indicators.

### *Challenges for the future*

A major operational challenge regarding CDE is the need to simplify and enhance existing programming efforts. This will require greater clarity notably in terms of:

- specifying the environmental problem to be addressed;
- identifying and targeting the organisations which are most capable of addressing the problem;

---

“...une faible demande de projets en faveur de l’environnement de la part des partenaires gouvernementaux” (Evaluation des Actions de la CE en faveur de l’Environnement dans le cadre de sa coopération avec les pays en voie de développement. Commission Européenne, 1998);

“Indeed, few if any substantive environmental projects would ever materialise if all ODA were based only on aid requests.” (Japan’s ODA Annual Report 1997. Economic Cooperation Bureau, Ministry of Foreign Affairs. February 1998).

<sup>10</sup>. See, for example, Criteria for Donor Agencies’ Self-Assessment in Capacity Development (OECD-DAC 1997d) and Management of Capacity Development for the Environment Programmes and Projects. Experiences and Challenges in the Dutch Development Cooperation (Huizenga, 1997).

- specifying the types of environmental capacity to be developed within each organisation including targets to be achieved;
- mainstreaming the operational implications of support to CDE *processes*.

### C. *Donor agency capacities*

#### *Integration of Environmental Concerns*

The principle of integrating environment and development concerns is well established in the Brundtland Report (1987), the formal commitments in the *Declaration of Rio de Janeiro on Environment and Development* (1992), *Shaping the 21<sup>st</sup> Century* (1996) and *CDE Principles in Practice* (1997). During the period 1989-1998 DAC Members have consistently emphasized the importance of environmental concerns. Donor agencies have successfully integrated environmental concerns in overall policy statements, sector policies and strategies, in several cases, in regional and country strategies and, to a lesser extent, in local area strategies. Donors have addressed some aspects of capacity to address environmental issues and CDE concerns in ODA through *i.a.* the establishment, expansion or strengthening of specialised environment technical and/or policy units, initiating special environment programmes and funding frameworks and internal training programmes.

There are still, nevertheless, important differences between policy and practice. In practice, donor agencies have not managed to secure a systematic and coherent integration of environmental concerns in all sectors, at all stages of the project cycle and in all forms of ODA. Environmental guidelines are still not systematically applied or are not used at all. This finding has been repeatedly endorsed in the DAC members' own thematic "environment and development" evaluations conducted throughout the period 1994-1998<sup>11</sup> and was aptly summarised in a recent study which found:

"Development assistance agencies, including the United Nations, multilateral and bilateral organisations frequently fail to undertake environmental assessment of projects that they support. Furthermore, when they do so, they often fall short of applying their own guidelines to an adequate standard. Quite simply, development assistance agencies fail to set the examples of good practice that they advocate in wider policy circles" (IIED, London, 1997).

Moreover, the principle of integrating environment and development concerns has, in practice, been weakened by:

- the growing "sectoralisation" of environment due to the widespread introduction of "Environmental Protection Agency-Environmental Impact Assessment" models;
- the increasing "globalisation" of environmental issues;
- the establishment and management of separate funds to be used only for specific environmental programmes and projects;
- the frequent neglect of socio-economic concerns in "environmental" projects;

---

<sup>11</sup>. See, for example, Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs (1994); AusAID (1994); Baser (1994); World Bank/UNDP/UNEP (1994); Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs (1995); Danida (1996); JACSES (1996); Ministère de la Coopération (1996); Sida (1996); USAID/HIID (1997); UNDP (1997); DfID (1997); Commission of the European Community (1998) and Finnida (1998).

- the frequent add-on nature of separate environmental plans and planning systems.

There would appear to be need, therefore, for a policy reminder to all DAC members regarding the principle of integrating environment and development concerns in ODA.

Funding of “environment” has increased during the post-UNCED era but falls far short of the original UNCED Secretariat targets. The most significant growth in funding has been donor agencies’ support for the international environment conventions, core fund contributions to the Global Environment Facility (GEF) and support for urban environmental management issues. It remains unclear in most cases, however, whether this growth constitutes new and additional financial resources or reallocations and/or recategorizations of existing ODA.

### *Decentralisation*

The major strategic challenge confronting donor organisations and recipient governments alike is to target and support CDE processes at the lowest appropriate organisational level. “Environment” agencies are too centralised and remote to address local environmental issues. The principle of institutional pluralism implies and is widely understood as a “diversification” of institutional partners. The promotion of this principle, *stricto sensu*, i.e. to strengthen local-level institutions by breaking the monopoly of central control will, however, require a significant increase in efforts to decentralise human and ODA and local financial resources. Although there are discernible trends in the administrative decentralisation of CDE initiatives, only one DAC Member would appear to have an *explicit* environmental policy guideline to support sub-national structures.

A key issue of concern is whether the general and significant shift from project assistance to sector programming will reinforce -- or not -- institutional monopolies by re-concentrating support through national environmental organisations.

### *Specifying types of environmental capacity to be developed*

Donor-supported CDE projects and programmes have frequently implied that:

- institutional capacity and institutional change can be induced;
- institutional capacities in developing countries are weaker than those in donor agency countries;
- institutional capacities in developing countries can be developed on the basis of organisational and management models and environmental instruments developed and applied in donor countries.

The lessons learned from this study suggest that these underlying tenets do not universally hold true and certainly cannot be uniformly applied in a prescriptive manner. The lessons learned have also indicated that the:

- causes of successful organisational performance lie in diverse factors and often unexpected combinations of actors and events or the degree of public and private sector intervention;
- political, economic and social setting in which environmental organisations are expected to perform their tasks is of critical importance to their sustained performance;

- development of environmental capacity is not necessarily (or desirably) permanent and does not necessarily follow a linear or incremental pattern;
- identification of partner organisations is critical at an early stage in the project or sector programme cycle;
- functions for which environmental capacity is needed must be specified and assessed for its appropriateness within a given setting;
- many tasks which contribute to promoting environmentally sustainable development require the concerted action of several organisations and are dependent, accordingly, on their ability to network effectively.

In several cases, CDE projects and programmes have been poorly and hastily designed. As a consequence, they are frequently over-ambitious and characterised by inadequate timeframes. These weaknesses are principally the result of the:

- limited assessments of the political, economic, social and institutional settings;
- limited organisational assessments, degree of consultation with other stakeholders and assessment or analysis of organisational options;
- inadequate specificity of environmental activities to be undertaken;
- preoccupation with short-term environmental “solutions” at the expense of longer term CDE; insufficient attention in following-up on institutional and/or environmental assessments.

### *Organisational Entry Points*

Furthermore, many environmental and CDE projects and programmes would appear to have been prepared on the basis of two underlying, and implicit, premises, viz.,

- address environmental problems through environmental projects and programmes and
- channel environmental projects and programmes through environmental organisations.

This study has shown that donor agencies *may* have lost opportunities to identify alternative and viable organisational partners in implementing their environmental strategies and programmes. Environmental challenges can (also) be addressed through non-environmental projects and programmes and non-environmental organisations <sup>12</sup>.

Paradoxically, non-environmental organisations are commonly better placed to co-ordinate cross-sectoral environmental issues than are environmental agencies. In addition, a number of evaluation reports clearly indicate that political commitment and support is a key prerequisite for improving environmental performance. This *can* have a strong bearing on the appropriate choice between many potential organisational entry points. The findings of this study indicate that:

---

<sup>12</sup>. A Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs evaluation found that “environmental problems cannot be solved by means of specific environmental projects... if they do not or cannot address the underlying factors involved” and that “environmental interventions do not necessarily bring environmental benefits while projects not labelled environmental sometimes do much to improve environmental management”. (Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 1994a).

- national public sector “environment” institutions typically remain weak and their influence, as critical focal points, limited;
- non-environmental planning institutions can frequently provide more effective policy and planning champions;
- national policy research institutes can improve environmental policy dialogue processes and are better placed to suggest policy reforms than external change agents.

### *Socio-Economic Considerations*

Many donor agencies’ “environmental” and CDE projects and programmes continue to focus on the biophysical or technical aspects at the expense of the economic and social. Although biological and technical criteria are necessary to identify broad areas of interest for environmental programmes, political, socio-economic and institutional criteria should dictate the actual choice of project site or partner. In some areas, the combination of political and socio-economic factors *may* make some environmental projects simply untenable. For example, a recent evaluation report highlighted the dilemma confronting a villager in New Ireland Province, Papua New Guinea when he was required to choose between a lucrative short-term option and the less attractive environmentally sustainable option:

“I think the Integrated Conservation and Development (ICAD) Project has some really good ideas. I am happy they are considering our children’s future. Why can’t we have logging now and then have the ICAD later” (GEF-UNDP, 1997, p. 67).

The ICAD project was terminated prematurely after three years due to its incompatibility with an active logging concession and local community factionalism. The lessons learned from the project were, however, successfully mainstreamed in the design of a separate ICAD initiative in the Bismarck Mountains and Ramu flood-plain (GEF, 1997).

### *CDE indicators and monitoring*

Monitoring systems in most donor-supported environmental projects and programmes continue to focus on monitoring activities and outputs due, in part, to operating in an “indicator vacuum”. CDE projects still frequently lack adequate indicators. This is often due to the limited definition of baseline conditions of either environmental or institutional parameters, the limited analysis and assessment of the setting and its influence on project performance and the absence of environmental impact monitoring. In spite of a multitude of indicator initiatives, no coherent core set of environmental indicators is either recognised or applied by the international community. It is not clear what specific follow-up has occurred in relation to the CDE indicator framework commissioned by the Task Force on CDE in 1995 (DANIDA, 1998 and Boesen J. and Lafontaine A. 1998).



#### **D. Recipient country capacities**

Many recipient country governments have higher priorities than CDE. The over-riding concerns of many recipient governments have remained:

- overall macroeconomic performance through the promotion of economic efficiency (with relatively limited emphasis placed on distributional considerations); and
- the maintenance (or improvement) of basic social services.

These priorities have often been inextricably linked with measures aimed at “down-sizing” government, decentralising government services and facilitating greater private sector and civil society involvement in a broad range of developmental efforts. Adjusted economic growth models still underpin development policy in many developing countries. A significant shift in emphasis towards environmentally sustainable development has occurred in only a few countries.

The integration of environmental concerns in national economic (and sectoral) planning and decision-making processes remains weak in many developing countries. This often reflects the overriding economic growth priority. The situation is also frequently compounded by the institutional segregation of key economic and key environmental boards, councils or commissions. A number of countries have attempted to establish “super” or new structures to signal greater political commitment to, and support for, environmentally sustainable development. In practice, however, such super structures do not function effectively and remain isolated in relation to solving localised environmental problems. Regional co-operation on environmental issues *may* have helped to galvanise such institutional responses from national governments.

In the context of the *generic* capacity constraints which have confronted developing country governments throughout the 1980s and 1990s, it is perhaps not surprising that most “environment” organisations have not been able to cope with their significantly broadened mandates. The availability of adequate human and financial resources has not kept pace with the increased environmental demands. This problem is particularly acute at the decentralised level. Mobilising sources of local funding to sustain “environmental” organisations and programmes remains a fundamental constraint in many countries. Innovative financing arrangements have, however, been successfully developed in a few countries. Managerial (and “commercial”) capacity development is frequently absent or lags behind technical capacity *per se* in many organisational types. “Zero” financing options (policy reforms, the removal of subsidies and market distortions and the application of other economic instruments) to promote environmentally sustainable development have often proved difficult to implement for political, economic and social reasons.

With the support of donors, many types of “environmental” organisations *have* successfully initiated processes of preparing environmental policies, environmental plans (National Environmental Action Plans, National Conservation Strategies, etc.), framework environmental laws, EIA guidelines and procedures and environmental standards, environmental databases and numerous environmental publications. This enabling work has not, however, been matched by the resources deployed during subsequent implementation. Environmental conditions have continued to deteriorate in several countries with predictable socio-economic consequences.

The capacity constraints of national public sector “environment” institutions may have been further exacerbated by the growing donor agency support for global environmental issues. A recent consultative meeting found that:

“Experience in many countries has shown that the overlapping and sometimes duplicative commitments under multiple (global) instruments can produce tremendous challenges. Commitments to prepare inventories, reports, plans and public information programmes, can lead to in-country conflicts, confusion and wastage of resources, particularly for countries with limited financial, human and institutional capacity.”<sup>13</sup>

Donor agencies and recipient countries are increasingly confronted with a real dilemma in terms of the trade-offs in addressing and providing resources in support of local, national and global environmental issues.

Recipient countries are encountering considerable difficulties using environmental information in developing and using operational CDE indicators which will:

- allow environmental resource users (the primary stakeholders) to set objectives and monitor progress at the local level;
- facilitate aggregation at the national level;
- be compatible with performance-based accountability systems increasingly required by donor agencies without compromising the principles of “ownership” and “participation”.

On the other hand, many different forms of effective institutional networking have been developed to promote environmental policy dialogue including *i.a.* regional training programmes, national policy research institutes, national networks of focal persons, national environmental programmes involving several organisational types and NGO alliances (USAID, 1997).

### ***E. Successful CDE performance***

A number of organisations *have* performed relatively well even in the context of overall poor public sector performance. Examples of eight organisational types that have performed relatively well in enabling settings and with enabling donor agency assistance have been identified during the study. These include *i.a.* the examples provided in the following section.

*Regional Organisations* can improve inter-governmental policy making, institutional networking, collective action and assistance for capacity development in environment but *may* have exacerbated national capacity constraints (e.g. Rural Energy Planning and Environmental Management, Eastern and Southern Africa Management Institute, Mekong River Commission and the Latin American and Caribbean Commission on Development and Environment).

*National Policy Research Institutes* can improve policy dialogue processes based on rigorous analysis and are better placed to achieve policy reforms than external change agents (e.g. Thailand Development Research Institute, Bolivian Social Policy Analysis Unit (UDAPSO) and the Centre for Social Research, Malawi).

---

<sup>13</sup>. Synergies in National Implementation. The Rio Agreements Proceedings of the Expert Meeting on Synergies among the Conventions on Climate Change, Biological Diversity, Desertification and the ‘Forest Principles’. Israel, 17-20 March 1997.

*National Ministries of Environment* are over-stretched and under-resourced but can improve networking and co-ordination of a broad range of organisational types (e.g. the Ministry for the Co-ordination of Environmental Affairs, Mozambique, the Ministry of Sustainable Development and Environment, Bolivia and the Ministry of Environment and Parliamentary Affairs, Sri Lanka).

*Other Sectoral Ministries* can effectively address environmental issues and can (often) provide a more influential "critical focus" amongst government agencies (e.g. the National Watershed Development Programme for Rainfed Areas, Ministry of Agriculture (MOA), India, the Land Use Planning Section, MOA, Royal Government of Bhutan and the Soil and Water Conservation Branch, MOA, Kenya).

*Specialised National Environment Institutes* can effectively provide useful services to the public and private sectors and to civil society (e.g. the National Biodiversity Institute, Costa Rica, the Centre de Suivi Ecologique, Sénégal, the National Wetlands Steering Committee, Sri Lanka and the Environmental Protection and Training Institute, India).

*Sub-National Organisations* provide the most appropriate (public sector) institutional entry point to facilitate the translation of environmental policy and CDE principles into practice but are often characterised by severe generic capacity constraints (e.g. the Sarhad Provincial Conservation Strategy, Pakistan, the District Environmental Action Planning in pilot Rural District Councils in Zimbabwe, some Changwats in Thailand and some of the State-level departments in India).

*Non-Governmental Organisations'* strengths lie in their participatory, training, networking and public information skills which can be effectively harnessed to serve as a critical bridge between public sector institutions and local communities. Their critical weaknesses lie in management capacity, "founders" syndrome (dependency on one charismatic person) and weak funding bases (e.g. the Centre for Science and Environment, India; the alliance of SAFIRE, BUN and ENDA, Zimbabwe and the Environmental Defence League, Bolivia).

*Community-Based Organisations* are increasingly emerging in good governance settings and often require substantial complementary assistance to address constraints associated with underlying economic and social conditions (e.g. the Doi Sam Muen Watershed Network Organisation, Mae Taeng Watershed Management Unit, Chiang Mai Province, Thailand; the Orangi slum dwellers' sewage and sanitation initiative, Karachi, Pakistan; small-scale farmers' associations in Ecuador, Peru and Bolivia).

## **Conclusions**

Although donor organisations would still appear to be less effective at CDE than at other types of ODA, considerable progress has been made notably in terms of the growing importance of environment in general and the growing mainstreaming of environmental issues. CDE presents a profound challenge to donor organisations and recipient country institutions because of the complex interplay of socio-cultural, political, economic and environmental interests. A lucid cautionary note raised in the CDE Framework in 1995 is still relevant:

"Raising the environmental performance of organisations and people in any society is a daunting task even for its own citizens. Assuming this can be done easily by outside interveners may be the first mistake in any capacity development programme. Recognition of the need to experiment, listen and learn may be the first step to some sort of progress."

Three functional objectives of CDE processes require particular attention if the *Shaping the 21st Century* goal of reversing current trends in the loss of environmental resources is to be effectively addressed at local and national levels by the year 2015. These are:

- further strengthening of capacities to plan and implement at the lowest appropriate institutional level;
- further strengthening of capacities to effectively utilise and apply existing environmental tools and instruments and to monitor environmental impacts with, by, and for environmental resource users;
- further strengthening of capacities to mobilise additional and sustainable sources of funding.

Improvements in CDE performance could also be gained by:

- strengthening the planning and preparation of CDE interventions particularly in terms of undertaking more thorough *ex-ante* organisational analyses and assessments of the institutional setting and management capacities;
- matching policy objectives with realistic timeframes for implementation and longer term commitments;
- integrating environmental, social and economic aspects at all levels;
- revising environmental procedures and environmental guidelines with a clear view of capacity constraints;
- adopting more flexible programming approaches which espouse a willingness to experiment and to learn from “failure”;
- adopting more flexible approaches to funding and reporting.

## SYNTHÈSE

### **LES ENSEIGNEMENTS QUI SE DEGAGENT DE L'AIDE DES DONNEURS EN FAVEUR DU DEVELOPPEMENT DES CAPACITES INSTITUTIONNELLES DANS LE DOMAINE DE L'ENVIRONNEMENT**

#### **Contexte**

En 1987, à la suite de la publication de *Notre avenir à tous*, le Comité d'aide au développement (CAD) a organisé, à Paris, un séminaire sur le renforcement de la coopération en matière d'environnement avec les pays en développement. Après cette réunion, un examen a été effectué sur les moyens dont disposent les Membres du CAD de faire face aux préoccupations relatives à l'environnement dans le cadre de leurs activités d'aide publique au développement (APD). Il est ressorti de ces travaux que la quasi-totalité des Membres du CAD faisaient une place importante aux problèmes d'environnement, mais que des efforts soutenus s'imposaient encore pour assurer une prise en compte plus cohérente et plus systématique des considérations touchant à l'environnement dans la politique d'aide, ainsi que dans la planification et la mise en œuvre des activités d'aide (OCDE-CAD, 1989).

Après la Conférence des Nations unies sur l'environnement et le développement (CNUED), le Groupe de travail du CAD sur la coopération pour le développement et l'environnement a mis en place, en 1992, un Groupe d'étude sur le développement des capacités dans le domaine de l'environnement (DCE). Les travaux de ce Groupe d'étude ont abouti à la publication des débats des deux ateliers qu'il a organisés respectivement au Costa Rica (1993) et à Rome (1996) sur le DCE.<sup>14</sup>

Au cours de la période 1995-1996, le Groupe de travail sur la coopération pour le développement et l'environnement a également préparé une Etude mise à jour sur les activités menées par les Membres du CAD à l'appui de la réalisation d'objectifs de protection de l'environnement (OCDE-CAD, 1996c), dont les résultats ont servi de point de départ à l'élaboration d'un projet de Recueil de pratiques exemplaires pour la prise en compte concrète du développement durable dans la gestion de la coopération pour le développement (OCDE-CAD, 1998a).

En 1997, le Groupe de travail du CAD sur l'évaluation de l'aide a demandé la réalisation d'une étude théorique intitulée "Leçons à tirer de l'aide des donneurs en faveur du développement des capacités

---

<sup>14</sup>.

Les ouvrages suivants sont également disponibles : *Le développement des capacités dans le domaine de l'environnement. Un cadre pour la participation des donneurs d'aide* (OCDE-CAD, 1995a), *L'aide des donneurs en faveur du développement des capacités dans le domaine de l'environnement* (OCDE-CAD, 1995b) et *Capacity Development in Environment: Principles in Practice* (OECD-DAC, 1997f).

institutionnelles dans le domaine de l'environnement"<sup>15</sup> Ces travaux ont été entrepris dans le cadre des efforts déployés par le CAD pour améliorer l'efficacité des stratégies d'aide des pays donateurs concernant certains des objectifs énoncés dans *Le rôle de la coopération pour le développement à l'aube du XXIe siècle*.<sup>16</sup>

## Cadre de l'étude

Selon le mandat défini pour l'étude du développement des capacités dans le domaine de l'environnement (DCE), celle-ci doit comporter une évaluation approfondie et systématique des moyens dont disposent les Membres du CAD de faciliter la concrétisation de deux principes essentiels qui découlent implicitement de la notion de DCE, à savoir l'intégration des préoccupations relatives à l'environnement et au développement, et l'encouragement de la prise en main des projets par les pays bénéficiaires aux échelons national et local en renforçant le pluralisme institutionnel.

La présente synthèse s'appuie sur l'étude d'un échantillon de quelque 70 rapports d'évaluation et d'examen communiqués par les Membres du CAD, ainsi que sur les publications citées ci-dessus et d'autres documents pertinents, sur l'analyse des réponses de 13 pays et organisations à un questionnaire structuré sur le DCE, et sur les résultats d'entretiens et de visites réalisés auprès de certains Membres du CAD et organismes (notamment le Ministère néerlandais des affaires étrangères, le DfID, la Danida, le BMZ, la GTZ, la KfW, le PNUD et le Harvard Institute for International Development (HIID). Les projets de documents ont été soumis à un examen critique par l'Institut international pour l'environnement et le développement (IIED). La synthèse et le rapport de base auxquels elle se rapporte sont des versions révisées des documents présentés à de précédentes réunions du Groupe de travail sur l'évaluation de l'aide dans le cadre de l'examen des travaux en cours. Dans les annexes 1 et 2 figurent respectivement une vue d'ensemble de la participation des Membres du CAD à l'étude sur le DCE et un résumé de leurs réponses au questionnaire.

Les objectifs fonctionnels du processus de DCE ont été étudiés en vue de déterminer les domaines dans lesquels les efforts doivent en priorité être poursuivis afin d'améliorer les résultats obtenus par les Membres du CAD en matière d'environnement. Il a fallu, pour les besoins de l'étude, réduire à l'essentiel un ensemble très complexe de problèmes et de concepts. En outre, bien des difficultés se sont posées lorsqu'il s'est agi d'évaluer les résultats relatifs à des notions comme celle d'"environnement" ou de "développement des capacités", en particulier dans le contexte de la réforme stratégique et institutionnelle générale qui a été entreprise aussi bien par les Membres du CAD que par les gouvernements des pays bénéficiaires au cours des années 90.

L'étude présente une lacune importante du fait qu'elle s'est appuyée de façon disproportionnée sur des documents provenant des organismes donateurs. Ce déséquilibre a été d'autant plus grand que les informations sur le DCE publiées par des organisations ou des individus des pays bénéficiaires sont relativement peu nombreuses<sup>17</sup>. L'échantillon de rapports fourni par les Membres du CAD ne

---

<sup>15</sup>. Voir la note intitulée "Actions possibles du Groupe sur l'évaluation en faveur de la Stratégie du CAD pour le XXIe siècle", en particulier l'Action III (document interne).

<sup>16</sup>. La stratégie définie dans ce rapport intègre la dimension environnementale du développement durable, "afin de véritablement inverser avant 2015, aussi bien au niveau mondial qu'au niveau national, la tendance actuelle à la déperdition des ressources environnementales" (OCDE-CAD, mai 1996, p. 2).

<sup>17</sup>. Citons néanmoins certaines des communications présentées à l'atelier sur le DCE qui s'est tenu à Rome (OCDE-CAD, 1996), ainsi que, par exemple, l'exposé intitulé *CDE as a National Endogenous Process – the Role of External Assistance* (Kikula, 1998), qui a été présenté au Séminaire international

contenait aucune évaluation provenant d'organismes du secteur privé. Il n'a pas été effectué d'examen approfondi des crédits affectés par les Membres du CAD à l'"environnement" ou aux projets et programmes de DCE en raison des limites que présente actuellement la classification du CAD relative à l'aide. Les opinions, constatations et conclusions présentées dans cette étude n'engagent que le consultant qui en est l'auteur et ne reflètent pas nécessairement le point de vue des Membres du CAD ou des gouvernements des pays bénéficiaires.

## Principales observations

### A. *Définition et importance actuelle de la notion de développement des capacités dans le domaine de l'environnement*

On entend par capacités dans le domaine de l'environnement les moyens dont disposent les individus, les groupes, les organismes et les institutions dans un contexte donné pour s'attaquer aux problèmes d'environnement dans le cadre des efforts déployés en vue de parvenir à un développement durable. L'expression "développement des capacités dans le domaine de l'environnement" désigne le processus qui permet de renforcer ces mêmes capacités et les structures institutionnelles correspondantes. Selon les principes fondamentaux qui découlent implicitement de cette notion, le DCE se traduit par l'intégration des préoccupations relatives à l'environnement et au développement à tous les niveaux, vise à accroître le pluralisme institutionnel, relève de la communauté au sein de laquelle il a lieu et est guidé par elle, et fait appel à tout un éventail de techniques de gestion, d'outils analytiques, d'incitations et de structures organiques en vue d'atteindre un objectif d'action donné<sup>18</sup>.

Le DCE constitue un moyen essentiel de faire face aux problèmes d'environnement. La définition de cette approche, projet ambitieux, a constitué un progrès important pour la prise en charge des préoccupations relatives au développement et à l'environnement. Avec l'atelier qui s'est tenu à Rome en 1996 sur ce thème, le DCE a été résolument inscrit parmi les préoccupations d'ordre international des spécialistes de l'environnement. La réunion de Rome a néanmoins reconnu qu'il y avait beaucoup à faire pour accélérer ce processus à tous les niveaux dans la communauté des donateurs et celle des partenaires (voir OCDE-CAD, 1997e, p.14). Elle a constaté que des efforts soutenus s'imposaient *encore* en vue de mieux faire connaître et comprendre l'approche du DCE, notamment au sein des organes supérieurs de direction et des services opérationnels des organismes donateurs, ainsi que des organismes du secteur public chargés du contrôle de l'aide et d'autres organisations concernées dans les pays donateurs (comme les services nationaux de vérification des comptes, les sociétés de conseil, les ONG, etc.).

---

sur l'aide danoise en faveur du développement des capacités dans le domaine de l'environnement (tenu à Snekkersten, Danemark, 12-14 mai 1998).

<sup>18</sup>. On trouvera d'autres informations de caractère général concernant le DCE notamment dans *Le développement des capacités dans le domaine de l'environnement : Un cadre pour la participation des donateurs d'aide* (OCDE-CAD, 1995a) ; *L'aide des donateurs en faveur du développement des capacités dans le domaine de l'environnement* (OCDE-CAD, 1995b) ; *Capacity Development in environment : Principles in Practice* (OECD-DAC, 1997f).

Dans la présente étude, le DCE est considéré comme une approche solide, réaliste et pertinente des problèmes que pose la gestion du développement et de l'environnement. Le Groupe d'étude du CAD a regroupé plusieurs principes concernant l'aide -- notamment les principes d'intégration, d'appropriation et de subsidiarité -- et a réussi à former un cadre cohérent aux fins du DCE <sup>19</sup> Il a ainsi permis aux organismes donateurs de disposer d'un système de référence à la fois théorique et, potentiellement, pratique pour mieux faire appliquer les *Principes relatifs aux orientations nouvelles de la coopération technique* définis par le CAD.

En outre, le cadre relatif au DCE montre bien qu'il est important de renforcer les approches pratiques et de définir des principes directeurs détaillés pour la planification de manière à répondre aux exigences des différents donateurs. D'après les réponses au questionnaire sur le DCE qui a été utilisé aux fins de la présente étude, les Membres du CAD sont peu nombreux à avoir élaboré des lignes directrices concernant expressément le DCE (voir annexe 2), encore que plusieurs d'entre eux aient réussi à faire avancer le processus de DCE en empruntant d'autres voies. L'étude a également permis de recenser un grand nombre d'actions fructueuses en faveur du DCE qui ont été engagées avec le soutien des donateurs en Amérique latine, en Afrique et en Asie. Un aperçu en est présenté dans la section E.

## **B. Le développement des capacités : contraintes actuelles et défis futurs**

### ***Des moyens limités de créer des capacités***<sup>20</sup>

De nombreux pays à revenu intermédiaire et à faible revenu demeurent confrontés à la fois à de graves problèmes économiques, sociaux et environnementaux, et à des contraintes tenaces dans le domaine des capacités génériques. Les rapports d'évaluation que les Membres du CAD ont publiés tout au long de la période 1992-1998 n'ont cessé de souligner le fait que l'état des capacités institutionnelles reste l'un des freins les plus fréquents au processus de développement. Le renforcement de ces capacités dans le cadre des programmes de l'APD n'a réussi, dans le meilleur des cas, que de façon partielle<sup>21</sup>.

Dans la plupart des pays en développement, il existe aujourd'hui un ministère ou un autre type d'administration (parfois les deux) qui assume l'ensemble des responsabilités relatives à "l'environnement", ainsi qu'une ou plusieurs organisations non gouvernementales (ONG) nationales spécialisées dans le domaine de l'environnement. Cependant, les ministères de l'environnement présentent souvent les caractéristiques suivantes :

- Ils sont relativement peu expérimentés du fait de leur création récente, ont des effectifs insuffisants et sont par conséquent des organismes peu dynamiques sans grande influence sur le plan politique ou ne bénéficiant que d'un soutien budgétaire minime.

---

<sup>19</sup>. Par exemple, le principe d'"intégration" et de prise en charge des problèmes d'environnement selon une démarche anticipative a été défini dès 1982 par le Groupe de travail nordique mixte sur l'environnement et l'aide. Le principe d'"appropriation" était déjà institué en 1991 (*Principes relatifs aux orientations nouvelles de la coopération technique*, OCDE-CAD). Quant au principe de "subsidiarité", il a été consacré par le rapport de Copenhague sur l'Initiative nordique Freshwater, datant de 1991.

<sup>20</sup>. Voir Thomson (1998), pp. 27-37.

<sup>21</sup>. Voir, par exemple ODA (1994), PNUD, HIID (1996), Banque mondiale (1996f), Commission européenne (1998).



- Leurs services sont centralisés, formant en quelque sorte un monopole institutionnel, d'où une représentation limitée à l'échelon local.
- La mission qui leur est confiée déborde souvent sur celle d'autres ministères sectoriels et non sectoriels, ce qui entraîne des conflits de compétence ; et ils sont donc souvent bornés dans leur action par le cadre institutionnel dont ils font partie.
- Ils disposent de moyens restreints de demander la réalisation d'études d'impact sur l'environnement (EIE), d'analyser les résultats de ce type de travaux et de les exploiter aux fins de la planification nationale.
- Ils n'ont que des moyens limités de faire appliquer les mesures préventives prescrites à l'issue des EIE et/ou le principe pollueur-payeur.
- Ils ne sont pas suffisamment bien armés pour pouvoir évaluer de façon systématique le coût des projets de développement du point de vue de l'environnement avant de décider de les approuver ou non.

Il est donc de toute évidence nécessaire de mettre en œuvre des réformes pour améliorer l'efficacité, l'efficacité et l'adaptabilité d'une grande part des organismes qui s'occupent de l'environnement dans les pays en développement.

### *Contraintes actuelles*

Si les Membres du CAD attachent toujours beaucoup d'importance aux problèmes d'environnement, les efforts déployés pour mettre en pratique la politique définie demeurent peu efficaces, ce qui tient aux raisons suivantes :

- Le décalage entre la communauté des donateurs et les gouvernements des pays bénéficiaires quant au rang de priorité respectivement accordé aux divers problèmes d'environnement<sup>22</sup>.
- L'existence de contraintes importantes sur le plan des capacités génériques et des capacités spécifiques intéressant l'environnement aussi bien dans les organismes donateurs que dans les institutions des pays bénéficiaires.
- Le fait que les mécanismes d'acheminement de l'aide (et les modalités de planification et de mise en œuvre de l'aide au sein de la plupart des organismes donateurs) n'aient pas évolué autant ou au même rythme que le système de conception et de décision dont ils relèvent.

---

<sup>22</sup>. Trois rapports récents ont mis en lumière le profond dilemme auquel se heurte la volonté de promouvoir la prise en main des projets et programmes concernant l'environnement par la population locale :

“73% des projets relatifs à l'environnement correspondaient à des ressources financières disponibles, et seulement 27% à des demandes émanant d'institutions nationales” (PNUD, 1997d).

“Une faible demande de projets en faveur de l'environnement de la part des partenaires gouvernementaux” (Commission européenne, 1998).

“Il n'y aurait en fait guère de projets importants concernant l'environnement qui se concrétiseraient si l'APD était entièrement déterminée par les demandes d'aide” (Japan's ODA Annual Report, 1997, Economic Cooperation Bureau, ministère des Affaires étrangères, février 1998).

En règle générale, les organismes auxquels les Membres du CAD ont confié les questions d'environnement demeurent peu importants, sont surchargés de travail et ne sont pas encore parvenus à assurer l'intégration des connaissances en matière d'environnement ou l'acquisition de compétences de base dans ce domaine par le personnel généraliste. L'annexe 3 donne un aperçu des principales contraintes qui affectent les capacités génériques et spécifiques des Membres du CAD dans le domaine de l'environnement.

Il semblerait que l'intégration de la notion de DCE dans l'activité aussi bien des organismes donneurs que des institutions des pays bénéficiaires ait été limitée par cinq autres facteurs :

- La confusion créée par l'association de deux notions mal définies, celles d'"environnement" et de "développement des capacités".
- Les pratiques institutionnelles et les caractéristiques de bon nombre d'organismes donneurs nuisent à l'efficacité de l'apprentissage et constituent un frein à l'adoption d'approches fondées sur les "processus", au lieu des approches reposant sur les "résultats" qui sont appliquées dans la gestion classique du cycle des projets<sup>23</sup>.
- L'intégration trop lente des mesures concernant l'environnement et des préoccupations touchant au développement économique à tous les niveaux de l'administration et de la société civile dans nombre de pays en développement.
- La pression qui s'exerce sur le plan organisationnel et financier du fait de l'ampleur que prennent les problèmes d'environnement à traiter avec la prise en compte de ceux qui revêtent un caractère mondial.
- L'absence d'un ensemble cohérent d'indicateurs de base de l'état de l'environnement acceptés au niveau international, absence particulièrement marquée en regard des indicateurs économiques et sociaux.

### **Défis futurs**

L'un des grands problèmes qui se posent sur le plan pratique à propos du DCE est celui de répondre à la nécessité de simplifier et de renforcer les activités existantes d'élaboration des programmes. A cette fin, il faudra faire preuve d'un plus grand souci de clarté, notamment :

- En indiquant précisément le problème d'environnement à traiter.
- En recensant et en visant expressément les organismes qui sont les plus aptes à s'attaquer à ce problème.
- En déterminant exactement le type de capacités concernant l'environnement à développer au sein de chaque organisme, y compris les objectifs à atteindre.
- En assurant la prise en compte des conséquences pratiques du soutien au *processus* de DCE.

---

<sup>23</sup>. Voir, par exemple, Critères d'auto-évaluation des agences d'aide en matière de développement des capacités (OCDE-CAD, 1997d et *Management of Capacity Development for the Environment Programmes and Projects. Experiences and Challenges in the Dutch Development Cooperation* (Huizenga, 1997).

### C. Les capacités des organismes donneurs

#### *Intégration des préoccupations relatives à l'environnement*

Le principe de l'intégration des préoccupations concernant l'environnement et le développement a été nettement affirmé dans le rapport Brundtland (*Our Common Future*, 1987), les engagements officiels qui ont été formulés dans la *Déclaration de Rio de Janeiro sur l'environnement et le développement* (1992), *Le rôle de la coopération pour le développement à l'aube du XXI<sup>e</sup> siècle* (1996) et *Capacity Development in Environment: Principles in Practice* (1997). Au cours de la période 1989-1998, les Membres du CAD n'ont cessé de souligner l'importance des problèmes d'environnement. Les organismes donneurs ont assuré avec succès la prise en compte de ces problèmes dans les déclarations d'orientation, les politiques et stratégies sectorielles, les stratégies régionales et nationales dans plusieurs cas et, dans une moindre mesure, les stratégies d'intérêt local. Les donneurs ont tenté d'améliorer à certains égards les moyens de faire face aux problèmes d'environnement et aux préoccupations touchant au DCE dans le cadre des activités d'APD à travers, entre autres, la création, l'extension ou le renforcement d'unités techniques et/ou stratégiques spécialisées en matière d'environnement, la mise en place de programmes et de dispositifs de financement spéciaux en faveur de l'environnement, ainsi que de programmes de formation interne dans ce domaine.

Il existe toutefois un décalage important entre la politique affichée et la réalité. Dans les faits, les organismes donneurs ne sont pas parvenus à assurer de façon systématique et cohérente la prise en compte des problèmes d'environnement dans tous les secteurs, à tous les stades du cycle des projets et pour toutes les formes d'APD. Les lignes directrices relatives à l'environnement ne sont toujours pas appliquées de manière rigoureuse, quand elles ne sont pas complètement ignorées. Cette constatation a été faite à maintes reprises lors des évaluations thématiques que les Membres du CAD ont eux-mêmes consacrées à l'environnement et au développement tout au long de la période 1994-1998<sup>24</sup>. Elle a été confirmée en termes concis et pertinents dans une récente étude selon laquelle :

*...les organismes d'aide au développement, y compris ceux des Nations unies, ainsi que les organisations multilatérales et bilatérales, omettent dans bien des cas de soumettre les projets qu'ils soutiennent à une évaluation environnementale. En outre, lorsqu'ils le font, ils sont souvent loin d'appliquer leurs propres lignes directrices de façon satisfaisante. Selon les auteurs de l'étude, les organismes d'aide au développement négligent purement et simplement de donner l'exemple en observant les bonnes pratiques qu'ils préconisent dans les grands cercles de décideurs<sup>25</sup>.*

Par ailleurs, le principe de l'intégration des préoccupations relatives à l'environnement et au développement a, dans les faits, perdu de sa force pour les raisons suivantes :

- La "sectorisation" croissante de l'environnement par suite de l'adoption généralisée de modèles du type "Agence pour la protection de l'environnement" ou "Etude d'impact sur l'environnement".

---

<sup>24</sup>. Voir, par exemple, le Ministère néerlandais des affaires étrangères (1994a) ; AusAID (1995b) ; Baser (1994) ; Banque mondiale/PNUD/PNUF (1994) ; ministère norvégien des Affaires étrangères (1995) ; Danida (1996) ; JACSES (1996) ; ministère de la Coopération (1996) ; Asdi (1996c) ; USAID (1997) ; PNUD (1997) ; Department for International Development (1997) ; Commission européenne (1998) et Finnida (1998).

<sup>25</sup>. *The Performance of EIA in Tanzania: An Assessment*. 95 pp. IRA Research paper No. 41/IIED Environmental Planning Issues No. 14. Institute of Resource Assessment, University of Dar es Salaam et IIED, Londres.

- La “mondialisation” grandissante des problèmes d’environnement.
- La création et la gestion séparée de fonds distincts exclusivement réservés à certains projets et programmes de protection de l’environnement.
- La méconnaissance fréquente des considérations socio-économiques dans les projets relatifs à l’environnement.
- Le caractère souvent surajouté des plans de protection de l’environnement et des systèmes de planification écologique indépendants.

Par conséquent, il semblerait nécessaire de rappeler de façon systématique à tous les Membres du CAD la conduite à tenir en ce qui concerne le principe de l’intégration des préoccupations relatives à l’environnement et au développement dans le cadre de l’APD.

Les ressources financières consacrées aux problèmes d’environnement ont augmenté au cours de la période qui a suivi la CNUED, mais elles sont loin de correspondre aux objectifs initiaux du Secrétariat de la Conférence. L’augmentation la plus importante de ces ressources a été due au soutien apporté par les organismes donateurs aux conventions internationales sur l’environnement, à leurs contributions au fonds central du Fonds pour l’environnement mondial (FEM) et à leur action en faveur de la gestion du milieu urbain. Toutefois, dans la majorité des cas, on ignore toujours si cet accroissement correspond à un apport supplémentaire de ressources financières ou s’il tient à une redistribution et/ou une nouvelle classification de l’APD existante.

### ***Décentralisation***

Le principal problème stratégique auquel sont confrontés aussi bien les organismes donateurs que les gouvernements des pays bénéficiaires est d’orienter précisément le processus de DCE vers l’échelon organique compétent le plus bas et de le soutenir à ce niveau. Les organismes chargés de l’environnement sont trop centralisés et trop isolés pour pouvoir se pencher sur les problèmes d’environnement locaux. Le principe du pluralisme institutionnel sous-entend une “diversification” des partenaires institutionnels et est largement compris dans ce sens. Toutefois, la promotion de ce principe, qui revient à proprement parler à renforcer les institutions locales en défaisant le monopole des organes centraux de contrôle, nécessitera des efforts beaucoup plus grands de décentralisation des ressources humaines, ainsi que des ressources affectées à l’APD et des ressources financières locales. Si l’on observe une nette tendance à la décentralisation administrative des initiatives en faveur du DCE, il semblerait qu’un seul Membre du CAD ait défini des orientations pour l’action en matière d’environnement qui visent *expressément* à soutenir les organismes infranationaux.

Une question fondamentale se pose : le mouvement général et marqué d’abandon de l’aide-projet au profit de la programmation sectorielle va-t-il -- ou non -- renforcer les monopoles institutionnels en entraînant une “reconcentration” du soutien par l’intermédiaire des organismes nationaux qui s’occupent de l’environnement.

### ***Définition des capacités à développer dans le domaine de l’environnement***

Les projets et programmes de DCE soutenus par les donateurs reposent souvent implicitement sur l’idée que :

- Il est possible de stimuler le développement des capacités institutionnelles et le changement institutionnel.

- Les capacités institutionnelles des pays en développement sont plus faibles que celles des pays donateurs.
- La formation des capacités institutionnelles des pays en développement peut s'appuyer sur des modèles d'organisation et de gestion et des instruments de protection de l'environnement élaborés et appliqués dans les pays donateurs.

La présente étude tend à montrer que ces postulats de base ne se vérifient pas de façon universelle et ne peuvent en tout cas être appliqués uniformément de manière impérative. Elle a en outre permis de faire les constatations suivantes :

- L'efficacité des organismes qui s'occupent de l'environnement tient à divers facteurs et à la présence souvent inattendue de certains acteurs dans certaines circonstances ou à l'importance des interventions des secteurs public et privé.
- Le contexte politique, économique et social dans lequel les organismes qui s'occupent de l'environnement doivent accomplir leur mission est déterminant pour une efficacité durable de leur action.
- Le développement des capacités dans le domaine de l'environnement n'est pas obligatoirement un processus permanent (et il n'est pas souhaitable qu'il le soit) et ne correspond pas nécessairement à un mouvement linéaire ou graduel.
- Il est indispensable de rechercher des organismes partenaires dès le début du cycle des projets ou des programmes sectoriels.
- Les fonctions pour lesquelles des capacités en matière d'environnement sont requises doivent être définies avec précision et évaluées en vue de déterminer si elles sont pertinentes dans un contexte donné.
- Nombre d'activités propres à favoriser l'instauration d'un développement respectueux de l'environnement exigent une action concertée de la part de plusieurs organismes et dépendent par conséquent de l'aptitude de ces derniers à se constituer en un réseau efficace.

On a constaté dans plusieurs cas que les projets et programmes de DCE avaient été mal conçus et élaborés à la hâte. Par conséquent, ils étaient souvent trop ambitieux et généralement assortis de calendriers inadaptés. Ces insuffisances tiennent principalement aux motifs suivants :

- Une évaluation insuffisante du contexte politique, économique, social et institutionnel.
- Le caractère limité de l'évaluation des organismes concernés, de la consultation avec les autres parties prenantes et de l'étude ou de l'analyse des diverses possibilités qui s'offrent pour le choix des organismes.
- Une définition imprécise des activités à entreprendre dans le domaine de l'environnement.
- Une préférence pour les "solutions" à court terme en matière d'environnement au détriment d'un DCE à plus long terme ; une prise en compte insuffisante des résultats des évaluations institutionnelles et/ou environnementales.

### ***Organismes susceptibles de servir de points d'appui***

Par ailleurs, il semblerait que bon nombre de projets et programmes concernant l'environnement et le DCE aient été élaborés implicitement sur la base des deux principes fondamentaux suivants :

- Les problèmes d'environnement doivent être pris en main dans le cadre de projets et de programmes consacrés à l'environnement.
- Les projets et programmes consacrés à l'environnement doivent être confiés à des organismes qui s'occupent de l'environnement.

D'après notre étude, les organismes donneurs ont *sans doute* manqué des occasions de trouver d'autres organismes susceptibles de faire des partenaires efficaces pour la mise en oeuvre de leurs stratégies et programmes concernant l'environnement. Les problèmes d'environnement peuvent en effet également être pris en main dans le cadre de projets et programmes non environnementaux et par des organismes qui ne s'occupent pas de l'environnement<sup>26</sup>.

Paradoxalement, les organismes qui s'occupent d'autres questions que celle de l'environnement sont généralement mieux placés pour coordonner la prise en charge des problèmes d'environnement communs à plusieurs secteurs. En outre, un certain nombre de rapports d'évaluation montrent clairement que l'engagement et le soutien du pouvoir politique sont une condition *sine qua non* d'une meilleure efficacité en matière d'environnement. C'est un fait qui *peut* être déterminant lorsqu'il s'agit de faire un choix entre de nombreux organismes susceptibles de servir de point d'appui. L'étude a permis de faire à cet égard les constatations suivantes :

- En règle générale, les organismes nationaux du secteur public qui s'occupent de l'environnement sont peu dynamiques et l'influence qu'ils exercent en tant que principaux points de focalisation reste limitée.
- Les organismes de planification chargés d'autres domaines que l'environnement peuvent souvent être des acteurs plus efficaces en matière de politique et de planification.
- Les organismes nationaux de recherche sur les politiques peuvent améliorer les mécanismes du dialogue sur les mesures à prendre dans le domaine de l'environnement et sont mieux placés que les agents extérieurs du changement pour proposer des réformes.

### ***Considérations socio-économiques***

Bon nombre de projets et programmes que les organismes donneurs consacrent l'environnement et le DCE continuent de privilégier les aspects biophysiques ou techniques des problèmes au détriment des considérations économiques et sociales. Il est certes nécessaire de disposer de critères biologiques et techniques pour pouvoir cerner les grands domaines auxquels consacrer les programmes relatifs à l'environnement, mais ce sont les considérations d'ordre politique, socio-économique et institutionnel

---

<sup>26</sup>. Il ressort d'une évaluation réalisée par le ministère néerlandais des Affaires étrangères que les problèmes d'environnement ne peuvent être résolus à l'aide de projets spécialement consacrés à l'environnement si ces derniers ne tiennent pas compte ou ne permettent pas de tenir compte des facteurs sous-jacents qui entrent en jeu, et que les actions en faveur de l'environnement n'ont pas nécessairement des effets positifs sur celui-ci, alors que les projets qui ne portent pas expressément sur l'environnement contribuent parfois largement à améliorer la gestion de l'environnement. (Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 1994e).

qui devraient servir à déterminer effectivement le site ou le partenaire d'un projet. Dans certains cas, la conjonction de facteurs politiques et socio-économiques *peut* rendre certains projets de protection de l'environnement absolument indéfendables. Par exemple, un récent rapport d'évaluation cite le dilemme devant lequel s'est trouvé un villageois de la province de Nouvelle-Irlande (Papouasie-Nouvelle-Guinée) qui s'est vu contraint de choisir entre une solution lucrative à court terme et une formule viable du point de vue de l'environnement, mais moins intéressante pour lui :

*Je pense que le projet de conservation et de développement intégré (ICAD) contient de vraiment bonnes idées. Je suis heureux de voir qu'ils pensent à l'avenir de nos enfants. Mais pourquoi ne pas exploiter la forêt maintenant et entreprendre le projet plus tard?*<sup>27</sup>

Il a été mis fin au projet ICAD de façon prématurée au bout de trois ans car il était incompatible avec l'utilisation active d'une concession d'exploitation forestière et soulevait des dissensions au sein de la communauté concernée. Les enseignements qui en ont été dégagés ont néanmoins pu être mis à profit pour la conception d'une autre initiative ICAD destinée à être réalisée dans les Monts Bismarck et la plaine d'inondation du Ramu<sup>28</sup>.

### **Indicateurs et suivi du DCE**

Les systèmes de suivi utilisés pour la plupart des projets et programmes de protection de l'environnement soutenus par les donateurs servent encore essentiellement à l'observation continue des activités et des résultats, en partie à cause de l'absence d'indicateurs. Dans bien des cas, on manque toujours d'indicateurs satisfaisants pour les projets de DCE. Cette situation tient souvent à une définition insuffisante des critères de référence ou des paramètres environnementaux ou institutionnels, au caractère limité de l'analyse et de l'évaluation du contexte et de l'incidence qu'il peut avoir sur les résultats du projet, ainsi qu'à l'absence de surveillance des effets du projet sur l'environnement. Bien qu'une multitude d'initiatives aient été prises dans le domaine des indicateurs, il n'existe aucun ensemble cohérent d'indicateurs de base sur l'environnement qui soit reconnu ou appliqué par la communauté internationale. On ne sait pas au juste quelle suite a été donnée à l'élaboration du système d'indicateurs du DCE demandé par le Groupe d'étude sur le développement des capacités dans le domaine de l'environnement en 1995<sup>29</sup>.

### **D. Les capacités des pays bénéficiaires**

Pour les gouvernements de bon nombre de pays bénéficiaires, il y a des problèmes plus importants que le DCE. Leurs préoccupations premières sont restées les suivantes :

- L'amélioration des résultats macro-économiques globaux par la promotion de l'efficacité économique (une place relativement limitée étant faite aux considérations touchant à la répartition des revenus).
- Le maintien (ou l'amélioration) des services sociaux de base.

---

<sup>27</sup>. FEM-PNUD, 1997 p. 67.

<sup>28</sup>. *Lessons from an Integrated Conservation and Development "Experiment" in Papua New Guinea.* GEF Lessons Notes 3 juillet 1998.

<sup>29</sup>. Il y a eu toutefois d'autres initiatives concernant les indicateurs du DCE. Voir, par exemple, Boesen et Lafontaine (1998).

La prise en compte de ces priorités est souvent allée de pair de façon indissociable avec l'adoption de mesures visant à réduire les effectifs de la fonction publique, à décentraliser les services publics et à faciliter la participation du secteur privé et des organisations de la société civile à tout un éventail d'activités de développement. Dans beaucoup de pays en développement, la politique de développement est toujours étayée par des modèles de croissance économique ajustés. Seuls quelques-uns de ces pays ont nettement modifié leurs priorités en optant pour un développement respectueux de l'environnement.

Dans nombre de pays en développement, les préoccupations relatives à l'environnement sont toujours très peu prises en compte dans les mécanismes nationaux de planification et de décision en matière économique (et sectorielle), ce qui tient souvent à la primauté donnée à la croissance économique. Cette situation est aussi aggravée dans bien des cas par la ségrégation institutionnelle qui sépare les principaux comités, conseils ou commissions économiques de leurs homologues dans le domaine de l'environnement. Plusieurs pays ont tenté de mettre en place des "superorganismes", ou de nouvelles structures, afin de signifier un engagement et un soutien plus grands de la part du pouvoir politique en faveur d'un développement respectueux de l'environnement. Mais, dans les faits, ces "superorganismes" fonctionnent mal et demeurent trop coupés du monde pour pouvoir résoudre les problèmes d'environnement qui se posent à l'échelon local. La coopération régionale sur les questions d'environnement aurait *peut-être* contribué à donner un autre élan aux initiatives ainsi prises par les gouvernements de ces pays sur le plan institutionnel.

Etant donné les contraintes auxquelles les gouvernements des pays en développement se sont heurtés dans le domaine des capacités *génériques* tout au long des années 80 et 90, il n'est peut-être pas étonnant que la plupart des organismes s'occupant de l'environnement n'aient pas été en mesure d'accomplir la mission beaucoup plus vaste qui leur a été confiée. Les ressources humaines et financières disponibles n'ont pas progressé au même rythme que les exigences en matière d'environnement. Ce problème se pose de façon particulièrement aiguë au niveau décentralisé. La mobilisation de sources de financement en vue de soutenir, à l'échelon local, les organismes et programmes de protection de l'environnement demeure une contrainte fondamentale dans beaucoup de pays. Des dispositifs de financement novateurs ont toutefois été mis en oeuvre avec succès dans quelques-uns d'entre eux. Le développement des capacités de gestion (et des capacités "commerciales") est souvent inexistant ou en retard par rapport à celui des capacités techniques proprement dites au sein de tout un éventail d'organismes. Les formules de financement "zéro" (réforme de l'action, suppression des subventions et des distorsions qui affectent le marché, et application d'autres instruments économiques), destinées à promouvoir un développement écologiquement viable, se sont souvent révélées difficiles à appliquer pour des raisons d'ordre politique, économique et social.

Avec le soutien des donateurs, des types très divers d'organismes s'occupant de l'environnement ont engagé avec succès un processus d'élaboration de politiques de l'environnement, de plans de protection de l'environnement (Plans nationaux d'action pour l'environnement, Stratégies nationales de conservation, etc.), de lois-cadres sur l'environnement, de lignes directrices et de méthodes pour les études d'impact sur l'environnement, ainsi que de normes d'environnement, de bases de données sur l'environnement et de multiples publications sur le sujet. Cependant, l'importance de ces supports de l'action n'a pas été reflétée par le volume des ressources mises en oeuvre par la suite en vue de leur utilisation. Dans plusieurs pays, l'état de l'environnement a continué de se détériorer, ce qui a eu des conséquences prévisibles sur le plan socio-économique.

Les contraintes que connaissent, sur le plan des capacités, les organismes nationaux du secteur public s'occupant de l'environnement ont sans doute encore été aggravées par le soutien croissant des



organismes donneurs à la prise en charge des problèmes d'environnement de portée mondiale. Il est ressorti d'une récente réunion consultative que :

*“d’après les faits observés dans nombre de pays, la prise d’engagements qui se chevauchent et parfois font double emploi au nom de multiples instruments (internationaux) peut engendrer des problèmes terriblement épineux. L’engagement de dresser des inventaires et d’élaborer des rapports, des plans et des programmes d’information du public peut entraîner, au niveau local, des conflits, du désordre et un gaspillage des ressources, en particulier dans les pays dont les capacités financières, humaines et institutionnelles sont limitées”<sup>30</sup>.*

Les organismes donneurs et les pays bénéficiaires sont de plus en plus souvent confrontés à un véritable dilemme lorsqu’il s’agit de choisir entre problèmes d’environnement locaux, nationaux et mondiaux pour l’affectation des ressources destinées à faciliter leur résolution.

Les pays bénéficiaires ont beaucoup de difficulté à exploiter les informations sur l’environnement pour élaborer et utiliser des indicateurs opérationnels du DCE qui :

- Permettront aux utilisateurs des ressources de l’environnement (les principales parties prenantes) de fixer des objectifs et de suivre les progrès accomplis à l’échelon local.
- Faciliteront l’agrégation au niveau national.
- Pourront être conciliés avec les systèmes de contrôle fondés sur les résultats qu’imposent de plus en plus les organismes donneurs, sans porter atteinte aux principes d’“appropriation” et de “participation”.

Toutefois, des réseaux institutionnels de types très divers ont été mis en place en vue de stimuler le dialogue sur les mesures à prendre dans le domaine de l’environnement, permettant par exemple de relier entre eux des programmes de formation régionaux, des établissements nationaux de recherche sur les politiques, des personnalités de premier plan (réseaux nationaux), des programmes nationaux de protection de l’environnement faisant intervenir plusieurs types d’organismes et des associations d’ONG (USAID, 1997).

### ***E. Des efforts fructueux de DCE***

Un certain nombre d’organismes ont obtenu des résultats relativement satisfaisants, même dans le cas où l’efficacité globale du secteur public était médiocre. L’étude a permis d’en recenser huit catégories qui se sont relativement bien acquittées de leur mission dans un contexte favorable et avec une aide suffisante de la part des organismes donneurs. La liste en est présentée ci-dessous, accompagnée d’exemples.

*Les organisations régionales* peuvent améliorer la prise de décision intergouvernementale, la constitution de réseaux institutionnels, ainsi que l’action collective et l’aide en faveur du développement des capacités dans le domaine de l’environnement, mais elles ont *peut-être* aggravé les contraintes qui affectent les capacités au niveau national (par exemple, Planification énergétique et

---

<sup>30</sup>. *Synergies in National Implementation*. The Rio Agreements Proceedings of the Expert Meeting on Synergies among the Conventions on Climate Change, Biological Diversity, Desertification and the “Forest Principles”. Israël, 17-20 mars 1997.

gestion de l'environnement en milieu rural, Institut de gestion d'Afrique orientale et australe ; Commission du Mekong ; Commission latino-américaine et caraïbe sur le développement et l'environnement).

*Les établissements nationaux de recherche sur les politiques* peuvent améliorer les mécanismes du dialogue sur les mesures à prendre grâce à une analyse rigoureuse, et sont mieux placés pour assurer la réalisation de réformes de l'action que les agents extérieurs du changement (par exemple, Institut thaïlandais de recherche sur le développement ; Unité bolivienne d'analyse de la politique sociale (UDAPSO) ; Centre for Social Research, Malawi).

*Les ministères nationaux de l'environnement* travaillent au-delà de leurs possibilités et manquent de ressources, mais ils peuvent améliorer la constitution en réseau et la coordination d'organismes de types très divers (par exemple, le Ministère chargé de la coordination des activités concernant l'environnement au Mozambique, le Ministère chargé du développement durable et de l'environnement en Bolivie et le Ministère de l'environnement et des questions parlementaires au Sri Lanka).

*Les autres ministères sectoriels* peuvent s'attaquer avec efficacité aux problèmes d'environnement et (souvent) exercer une influence plus grande au sein des organismes d'Etat en offrant une analyse ciblée (par exemple, National Watershed Development Programme for Rainfed Areas, ministère de l'Agriculture de l'Inde ; Section de l'aménagement foncier, ministère de l'Agriculture du Royaume du Bhoutan ; Soil and Water Conservation Branch, ministère de l'Agriculture du Kenya).

*Les organismes nationaux spécialisés de protection de l'environnement* peuvent vraiment rendre de précieux services aux secteurs public et privé et à la société civile (par exemple, Institut national de la biodiversité, Costa Rica ; Centre de suivi écologique, Sénégal ; National Wetlands Steering Committee, Sri Lanka ; Environmental Protection and Training Institute, Inde).

*Les organisations infranationales* constituent le point d'appui institutionnel (du secteur public) le mieux placé pour faciliter l'application concrète de la politique de l'environnement et des principes relatifs au DCE, mais elles souffrent dans bien des cas d'un sérieux handicap sur le plan des capacités génériques (par exemple, Stratégie de conservation de la Province de Sarhad, Pakistan ; District Environmental Action Planning dans les Rural District Councils pilotes, Zimbabwe ; certains Changwats en Thaïlande ; certains ministères des États de l'Inde).

La force des *organisations non gouvernementales* tient à leur savoir-faire en matière de participation, de formation, de constitution de réseaux et d'information du public, qui peut être mis à profit pour jeter un pont entre les organismes du secteur public et les populations locales. Leurs principaux points faibles résident dans les capacités de gestion, le "syndrome des fondateurs" (dépendance vis-à-vis d'une personnalité charismatique) et leur base de financement, peu solide (par exemple, Centre for Science and Environment, Inde ; l'alliance formée par le SAFIRE, le BUN et l'ENDA au Zimbabwe ; la Ligue de défense de l'environnement, Bolivie).

*Les organismes d'intérêt local* jouent un rôle croissant dans la gestion des affaires publiques et ont souvent besoin d'une aide complémentaire importante pour faire face aux contraintes liées aux conditions structurelles sur le plan économique et social (par exemple, Doi Sam Muen Watershed Network Organisation, Mae Taeng Watershed Management Unit, Province de Chiang Mai, Thaïlande ; l'initiative pour l'assainissement et l'hygiène des habitants des taudis d'Orangi à Karachi, Pakistan ; les associations de petits exploitants agricoles en Equateur, au Pérou et en Bolivie).

## Conclusions

Même si les organismes donneurs semblent toujours moins efficaces en matière de DCE que pour d'autres formes d'APD, des progrès non négligeables ont été accomplis notamment dans la mesure où l'environnement en général revêt une importance grandissante et où les problèmes d'environnement font l'objet d'une intégration croissante. Le DCE pose un sérieux défi aux organismes donneurs et aux institutions des pays bénéficiaires en raison de l'interaction complexe qui s'exerce entre les intérêts socioculturels, politiques, économiques et environnementaux. Le document consacré en 1995 au cadre relatif au DCE contient à cet égard une mise en garde lucide qui est toujours d'actualité :

*“Il est très difficile, même pour les habitants de tout pays, d'améliorer la performance écologique des organisations et de la population de ce pays ; supposer que cette tâche peut être facilement accomplie par des intervenants extérieurs pourrait être la première erreur à ne pas commettre dans tout programme de développement des capacités. Pour avancer tant soit peu, le premier pas consiste peut-être à reconnaître la nécessité d'expérimenter, d'écouter et d'apprendre.”*

Il importe d'être particulièrement attentif aux trois objectifs fonctionnels du processus de DCE si l'on souhaite assurer, avant l'an 2015, aux niveaux national et local, la réalisation du but énoncé dans *Le rôle de la coopération pour le développement à l'aube du XXIe siècle*. Ces objectifs sont les suivants :

- Inverser la tendance actuelle à la déperdition des ressources environnementales.
- Renforcer encore les capacités en matière de planification et de mise en oeuvre à l'échelon institutionnel compétent le plus bas.
- Renforcer encore les capacités nécessaires pour exploiter et appliquer efficacement les outils et instruments existants en matière d'environnement, et pour observer, avec les utilisateurs des ressources de l'environnement, et dans leur intérêt, l'action exercée par eux.
- Renforcer encore les capacités requises pour mobiliser des sources supplémentaires durables de financement.

Les résultats en matière de DCE pourraient aussi être améliorés par les moyens suivants :

- Le renforcement de la planification et de la préparation des actions de DCE, en particulier au moyen d'analyses et d'évaluations préalables plus approfondies sur le cadre institutionnel et les capacités de gestion des organisations.
- La fixation de calendriers raisonnables pour la réalisation des objectifs d'action et la concrétisation des engagements à moyen terme.
- L'intégration des considérations environnementales, sociales et économiques à tous les niveaux.
- La révision des procédures et des lignes directrices relatives à l'environnement avec une idée claire des contraintes qui affectent les capacités.
- L'adoption de méthodes plus souples en matière de programmation qui reflètent la volonté de recourir à l'expérimentation et de tirer les leçons de "l'échec".
- L'adoption d'approches plus souples en ce qui concerne le financement et la notification.

## 1. INTRODUCTION <sup>31</sup>

### 1.1 Background

In 1987 – in the wake of the publication of *Our Common Future* – the Development Assistance Committee (DAC) conducted a seminar in Paris entitled “Strengthening Environmental Co-operation with Developing Countries”. A review was subsequently carried out of DAC Members’ capacity to address environmental concerns in their Official Development Assistance (ODA) activities. The report concluded that nearly all DAC Members accorded a high priority to environmental issues, but that active work was still required to better integrate environmental considerations, coherently and systematically, in aid policy, planning and implementation (OECD-DAC, 1989).

In 1992 – in the wake of the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED) – the DAC Working Party on Development Co-operation and Environment (WPDCE) established a Task Force on Capacity Development in Environment (CDE). The work of the CDE Task Force resulted in the publication of the proceedings of two CDE Workshops conducted in Costa Rica (1993) and Rome (1996), *Developing Environmental Capacity. A Framework for Donor Involvement* (OECD-DAC, 1995a), *Donor Assistance to Capacity Development in Environment* (OECD-DAC, 1995b) and *Capacity Development in Environment. Principles in Practice* (OECD-DAC, 1997f).

Between 1995 and 1996 the WPDCE also prepared an Updated Survey of DAC Members’ Activities in Support of Environmental Goals (OECD-DAC, 1996c). The results of this survey were subsequently used as a basis for preparing a draft Compendium of Good Practices for Operationalising Sustainable Development in Development Co-operation Management (OECD-DAC, 1998a).

In 1997 the DAC Working Party on Aid Evaluation (WP-EV) commissioned a desk study *Lessons of Donor Support for Institutional Capacity Development in Environment* <sup>32</sup>. The CDE study was initiated as part of the DAC’s attempts to improve the effectiveness of donor assistance strategies in certain goal areas of *Shaping the 21<sup>st</sup> Century* <sup>33</sup>.

An historical overview of “environment and development” and institutional capacity development issues in ODA between 1980 and 1998 is presented in Annex 4. This includes an assessment of the anticipated perseverance of environmental and institutional challenges into the 21<sup>st</sup> century.

---

<sup>31</sup>. When writing the Executive Summary, the author drew in part from the chapters which follow. As a result, some of the evaluation findings will be presented twice in the report.

<sup>32</sup>. See Options for Actions by the Evaluation Group in Support of the DAC’s Strategy *Shaping the 21st Century*, in particular Action III (internal document).

<sup>33</sup>. *Shaping the 21st Century* endorses the environmental dimension of sustainable development “so as to ensure that current trends in the loss of environmental resources are effectively reversed at both global and national levels by 2015” (OECD-DAC, 1996a p. 2).

## 1.2 Scope and Limitations of the Study

The Terms of Reference for the CDE study call for a detailed and systematic assessment of DAC Members' capacities to support two key processes implicit in the concept of CDE, viz., integrating environment and development concerns and promoting "ownership" at national and local levels by strengthening institutional pluralism.

The study is based on an assessment of a sample of approximately 70 evaluation and review reports provided by the DAC Members, the CDE publications cited in 1.1 above and other relevant literature, analysis of 13 responses to a structured CDE questionnaire and selected DAC Member and institutional visits and interviews [notably the Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs, DfID, Danida, BMZ, GTZ and KfW, UNDP, the Harvard Institute for International Development (HIID) and the International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED)]. This document and attendant summaries constitute revisions of "Work in Progress" documents presented at earlier WP-EV meetings which were, subsequently, subject to a peer review undertaken by IIED<sup>34</sup>.

An historical review of the process leading to the development of the CDE concept and an assessment of the scope and limitations of the key CDE documents prepared by the WPDCE Task Force on CDE is presented in Annex 5.

The conceptual framework for the study was largely determined by the work of the WPDCE Task Force on CDE. The study was, furthermore, guided by:

- the overall goal of "environmentally sustainable development", explicitly or implicitly included in all donor agencies' policy statements in the 1990s
- adopting a broad definition of "institution" used by the WPDCE (PEMconsult A/S, 1997, p. 3)
- adopting a definition of "environment" encompassing the *source* (natural resource management) and *sink* (environmental management) functions of the environment<sup>35</sup>
- recognising the fact that "environment" is now increasingly interpreted by donor agencies and recipient governments alike as both a *sector* and as a *cross-sectoral issue*.

---

<sup>34</sup>. Room Document No. 4 and attendant Background Document discussed under Agenda Item No. 6b at the 30th WP-EV Meeting, 27-28 May 1998, Paris.

<sup>35</sup>. The environment as a "source" of natural capital and as a "sink" for the assimilation of (waste) products provides a broad range of goods and services which, if used sustainably, provide a level of income or welfare to their users. If, however, the environment is used in excess or is damaged, this will ultimately affect its ability to continue providing these goods and services.

**Table 1: Summarised Overview of the Sampling Frame for the Desk Study**

<b>Capacity Development in:</b>	<b>Key Source(s) of Information</b>	<b>No. of Evaluation/ Review Reports</b>	<b>Key Tool for Assessment</b>
Bilateral and multilateral donor agencies and international finance institutions “donor agencies”)	Thematic evaluations Specific studies Questionnaires	16 Numerous 13	Datasheet A <i>Cf. Annex 8a</i>
Recipient institutions	Sectoral and synthesis evaluations, thematic evaluations, review and completion reports	Water (8) Energy (9)	Datasheet B <i>Cf. Annex 8b</i>
Recipient institutions	CDE projects and programmes by institutional type, CDE workshops and synthesis institutional evaluations	Regional (6) National (12) Sub-national (5) NGO (5) CBO (5)	Datasheet C <i>Cf. Annex 8c</i>
<b>Total No. of Evaluation and Review Reports:</b>			<b>66</b>
<b>Total No. of other studies, workshop proceedings, etc.:</b>			<b>275+</b>

The study has examined the functional objectives of CDE processes as a basis for prioritising areas where further efforts are required to improve DAC Members’ environmental performance. The study had, of necessity, to simplify an extremely complex set of issues and concepts. There are, in addition, numerous difficulties in assessing outcomes in relation to themes such as “environment” or “capacity development”, particularly in the contexts of the widespread policy and institutional reforms of both DAC Members and recipient governments during the 1990s. The functional objectives of CDE processes were defined as:

- Strengthened capacity to set goals, evaluate options and take decisions which promote environmentally sustainable development
- Strengthened capacity to formulate, implement and monitor coherent natural resources and environmental management projects and programmes making effective use of human and financial resources
- Strengthened capacity to provide reliable environmental information and useful experiences in support of national goal, policy, plan and programme formulation processes
- Strengthened capacity to facilitate public participation in decision-making processes and public access to environmental information
- Strengthened capacity to interact inter-institutionally and to co-ordinate plans and programmes
- Strengthened capacity to adapt to changing national circumstances and client demands, to learn from mistakes and to undertake internal organisational reforms
- Strengthened capacity to mobilise sustainable sources of funding.

Summarised overviews of DAC Members who participated in the CDE study and the responses to the questionnaire are presented in Annexes 1 and 2 respectively.

A list of persons consulted during the study is presented in Annex 6.

A general bibliography, a list of DAC Members' thematic "environment and development" evaluations, generic capacity development and specific CDE studies, the CDE projects and programmes assessed and the water and energy sector studies are presented in Annexes 7a to 7g inclusive.

Examples of the datasheets used to undertake the "capacity assessments" of donor agencies, the integration of environmental concerns at the national and sectoral levels (water and energy sectors) and the promotion of ownership through institutional pluralism in CDE projects are presented in Annexes 8a, 8b and 8c respectively.<sup>36</sup>

An important limitation of the study is that it relies disproportionately on donor agency documentation. The relative paucity of information regarding CDE published by recipient country institutions or individuals has heightened this asymmetry.<sup>37</sup> The sample of reports provided by the DAC Members did not include any evaluations of private sector organisations. The study has not attempted to make a detailed assessment of DAC Members' financial appropriation in support of "environment" or CDE projects due to the current limitations of the OECD-DAC classification of aid.

The study is divided into five chapters. After this introduction, Chapter 2 presents general findings in terms of the present status of the CDE concept and approach and perceived constraints and future challenges. Specific findings in accordance with the functional objectives of CDE processes are presented in Chapters 3 (donor agency capacities) and 4 (recipient country institutional capacities) respectively. Conclusions are presented in Chapter 5.

### **1.3 Acknowledgements**

The Desk Study was prepared by:

D. Andrew Wardell, Team Leader, PEMconsult A/S, Copenhagen, Denmark

Ole Schack Hansen, Research Assistant, PEMconsult A/S.

The team was assisted at different stages of the study by Evaluation and Environment Department personnel of several DAC Members. The study team would like to express its sincere thanks, particularly to all Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Danida, DfID, BMZ, KfW, GTZ and UNDP officials and the staff of HIID and IIED for the kind support and valuable information received and which highly facilitated the work of the team. The study presents the views, findings and conclusions of the team which do not necessarily correspond to the views of the DAC Members or recipient governments.

---

<sup>36</sup>. The rationale for the selection of the "old" CDE principle of integration and the "new" CDE principle of institutional pluralism is discussed in PEMconsult A/S (1997, pp. 18-19).

<sup>37</sup>. Notable exceptions include some of the papers presented at the CDE Workshop in Rome and, for example, the paper by Kikula (1998).

## 2. GENERAL FINDINGS

### 2.1 Renewed Donor Agency Interest in Institutional Capacity Development

*Increasing awareness of the need to address national and local institutional capacity constraints but consistent difficulties in translating generic capacity development principles into routine operational practice*

Many low- and middle-income countries continue to be confronted with a complex of serious economic, social and environmental challenges and long-standing generic capacity constraints. DAC Members' evaluation reports published throughout the period 1992-98 have highlighted the fact that institutional capacity remains one of the most common bottlenecks in the development process. Institutional capacity development in ODA programmes has been, at best, partially successful <sup>38</sup>.

Three recent studies have continued to highlight that the systematic use of institutional capacity assessment tools and techniques in the preparation of many projects and programmes remains limited in both bilateral and multilateral donor agencies, viz.,

“...there were few examples of a comprehensive or systematic approach to capacity development among the projects reviewed” (Baser, 1994).

“Donor agencies have been a source of improvement and innovation at the organisational and human resource levels, they have nevertheless been detrimental to building sustainable public sector capacity when poorly designed, erratically implemented or when they substituted for rather than created capacity. Moreover, some donor interventions created undue dependency and uncertainty, they frequently exacerbated resource and morale problems in programmes that did not receive funding and they contributed to co-ordination and communication problems” (UNDP-HIID, 1996).

“Many (of the institutional strengthening and capacity building projects) still have a great deal of work to do with regard to obtaining information on two topics: the institutions themselves and the extent of the improvement” (UNDP, 1997d, p. x).

The first generation of comprehensive analytical frameworks and guidelines for institutional capacity development did not start to emerge until the mid-1990s. In most cases, they have only been used in pilot or test case programmes and are being revised and updated as a function of these initial experiences (UNDP, 1998).

---

<sup>38</sup>. See, for example, Israel (1987); Overseas Development Administration (1994); Ohiorhenuan and Wunker (1995); Building Sustainable Capacity: Challenges for the Public Sector (UNDP, 1996); World Bank (1996e) and Commission européenne (1998).



## 2.2 Factors which Influence Institutional Change and Performance

The causes of successful organisational performance lie in diverse factors and often unexpected combinations of actors and events or, for example, the degree of public and private sector intervention

The donor agency concepts of capacity development and CDE have frequently implied that:

- institutional capacity and institutional change can be induced;
- institutional capacities in developing countries are significantly weaker than those in donor agency countries and
- institutional capacities in developing countries can be developed on the basis of organisational and management models and environmental instruments (notably the environmental impact assessment process) developed and applied in donor agency countries.

The results of more than thirty years of institutional capacity-building efforts suggest that these underlying tenets do not necessarily hold true and certainly cannot be uniformly applied in a prescriptive manner or with donor agencies continuing to provide standard “organisational strengthening packages”. The historical lessons learned have also indicated that:

- The causes of successful organisational performance lie in diverse factors and often unexpected combinations of actors and events or, for example, the degree of public and private sector intervention <sup>39</sup>. Organisations which have successfully combined both public and private sector functions have often resulted in improved organisational performance, adaptability and vigour.
- The political, economic and social setting in which organisations are expected to perform their tasks has increasingly been recognised as being of critical importance to their sustained performance. The findings of the present study indicate that donor agencies do not still accord sufficient time or attention to the analysis of the setting during the project design stage. As one observer has noted:

“The past 30 years, for all their disappointments, have witnessed extraordinarily dense institutional growth in Sub-Saharan Africa, and growth in capacity to manage... That many of these institutions do not work very well is more a function of their recent creation, their rapid growth, and – most important perhaps – the lack of an adequate enabling environment in the public sector than of any intrinsic failure of technical co-operation” (Berg, 1993).

- The development of organisational capacity is not necessarily permanent and does not necessarily follow a linear or incremental pattern. <sup>40</sup>
- The organisational choice(s) is (are) critical at an early stage in the project or (sector) programme cycle. <sup>41</sup>

---

<sup>39</sup>. The lack of a single uniform model of success was also confirmed in a study by Christensen *et al.* (1993).

<sup>40</sup>. Changes in the setting in Sri Lanka, for example, resulted in a decline in organisational performance in spite of highly qualified human resources in the public sector (UNDP/HIID, 1996 p. 29).

<sup>41</sup>. There is a striking analogy with the *recommended* use of environment assessment procedures by both donor agencies and recipient country institutions.

- The task or tasks for which capacity is needed must be specified and assessed for its appropriateness within a given setting.
- Many tasks which contribute to promoting environmentally sustainable development require the concerted action of several (different types) of organisations, thus predetermining the need for (often) new networking skills and capacities.

The present study has also revealed that several organisational types which have benefited from core funding support from donor agencies have been able to successfully determine the strategy and sequencing of their own capacity development in environment efforts. The most important “ingredients” for a successful (generic) capacity development approach are:

- A high degree of political commitment and leadership consistently sustained over time;
- An intimate knowledge of the macro-institutional context and the way it is evolving through well-structured institutional assessments to understand what is possible in development assistance at the micro level. Involvement of local expertise in conducting institutional assessments is essential;
- Recognition of the need to facilitate “ownership” as a condition for effective and sustainable results. This calls for the involvement of the principal stakeholders right from the start of the planning of a programme or project;
- Recognition of the need to support a slow, gradual and sometimes unpredictable process which is not always commensurate with a blueprint project approach. The process should rely on cycles of experimentation, evaluation, learning and adjustment to achieve its long-term sustainability objectives;
- Objectives of capacity development need to be related to the existing capacities of recipient institutions. This is to eschew overly ambitious designs and to sequence capacity development activities in relation to their political, economic, social and technical feasibility;
- Effective monitoring of capacity development projects and programmes needs to be frequent and continuous. Feedback is required into design of follow-up plans and implementation plans (based on IDEM Consult, 1995b).

A summarised overview of the key factors which promote the development of sustainable generic capacity is presented in Annex 9.

### **2.3 The "Capacity Development in Environment" Initiative**

*Capacity Development in Environment has essentially been a donor-driven process fuelled by the growing "globalisation" and "sectoralisation" of environmental issues*

Capacity Development in Environment (CDE) gained prominence in the wake of the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED) in June 1992. Although the specific interest in CDE has undoubtedly reflected the more generic capacity development concerns outlined in 2.1 and 2.2 above, more importantly, the global “background noise” on environment and development issues throughout the period before and after UNCED have probably sustained the (predominantly) donor interest in environmental issues and the CDE initiative. As the Independent Evaluation of the Pilot Phase of the Global Environment Facility noted:

“The developing countries prefer to attend to more urgent priorities of their own, including poverty alleviation and sustainable environmental development. In this context, some developing countries have voiced concerns that the emphasis on global benefits is beginning to divert scarce local, institutional and financial resources away from national environmental development issues” (UNDP/UNEP/WB, 1994, p. 34).

CDE has, essentially, been a donor-driven initiative fuelled by the increasing "globalisation" and "sectoralisation" of environmental issues throughout this period. In two particular cases, the increased availability of new funding mechanisms has reinforced these trends. These are:

- the Global Environment Facility (GEF) created in 1991 and administered by three existing implementing agencies (World Bank, UNDP and UNEP) and
- the Danish Environment and Disaster Relief Facility (EDRF) created in 1993 and jointly administered by one existing organisation (Danida or the South Group within the Ministry of Foreign Affairs) and one newly created administration, Danish Cooperation on Environment and Development (Danced, within the Ministry of Environment and Energy)<sup>42</sup>.

A variety of “special” environment funds had been established earlier by different bilateral donor agencies, for example, as early as 1984 in the case of Norway, but more commonly in the 1990s as was the case in the Netherlands (1991).

The continued existence of separate environment funds has reinforced the growing “sectoralisation” of environmental issues contrary to the integration of environment and development concerns writ large in *Our Common Future* (1987) and the formal commitments made in the *Declaration of Rio de Janeiro on Environment and Development*. This suggests a fundamental policy inconsistency among donor agencies.

Furthermore, donor-supported CDE initiatives have been undertaken in parallel to other more generic capacity development activities, often within the same donor agency, suggesting that CDE is not integrated or “mainstreamed” in donor agencies’ ODA programmes. This finding would tend to endorse the earlier concerns raised by the Expert Group on Aid Evaluation which identified in 1989 that:

“environmentalists are still somewhat outsiders in these institutions” and “decision-makers are singularly lacking” (OECD-DAC, 1989, p. 5).

Similarly, the Independent Evaluation of the Pilot Phase of the Global Environment Facility noted that:

“The GEF has suffered from being treated as either an add-on or a minor sideline to the World Bank’s regular lending and has suffered from the same preoccupation with rapid project approval” (UNDP/UNEP/WB, 1994, p. 134).

---

<sup>42</sup>. The EDRF is administered jointly in South East Asia and Southern Africa after a directive from the Prime Minister’s Office of 1 September 1995 which gave each organisation specific country responsibilities in each region.

## 2.4 Present Status of the CDE Concept and Approach

Capacity in the environment represents the ability of individuals, groups, organisations and institutions in a given setting to address environmental issues as part of a range of efforts to achieve sustainable development. The concept of CDE describes the process by which capacity in the environment and appropriate institutional structures are enhanced. The key underlying principles of the CDE concept are that it integrates environment and development concerns at all levels, aims to strengthen institutional pluralism, belongs to, and is driven by, the community in which it is based and involves a variety of management techniques, analytical tools, incentives and organisational structures in order to achieve a given policy objective<sup>43</sup>.

CDE is a key element for the management of environmental problems. The development of the CDE approach has been an ambitious and important step forward in dealing with development and environment. The 1996 CDE Workshop in Rome placed CDE firmly on the international agenda among “environmental” specialists. The Rome Workshop nonetheless recognised that “there is much to do to urge the process forward at all levels in donor and partner communities” (OECD-DAC, 1997e, p. 14). It ascertained that active work is *still* required to ensure greater awareness and understanding of the CDE approach among *i.a.* senior management and operational departments within donor agencies as well as public sector aid-accountability and other relevant organisations in donor countries (e.g. national audit offices, consulting firms, NGOs, etc.).

This study recognises that CDE constitutes a valid, realistic and relevant approach to the issues entailed in the management of development and environment. The DAC Task Force has successfully collated several aid principles -- notably the principles of integration, ownership and subsidiarity -- into a coherent CDE framework<sup>44</sup>. This has provided donor organisations with both a conceptual and, potentially, an operational framework to ensure greater compliance with the DAC’s established *Principles for New Orientations in Technical Co-operation*.

Furthermore, the CDE Framework underlined the importance of strengthening operational approaches and providing a “detailed planning guide” to meet the requirements of individual donors. The CDE questionnaire used in this study has revealed that few DAC Members have developed specific CDE guidelines *per se* (cf. Annex 4) although several have successfully carried the CDE process forward in other guises. The study has also identified a considerable number of successful donor-supported CDE initiatives in Latin America, Africa and Asia. These are described in Chapter 4.

---

<sup>43</sup>. Further background information regarding CDE is provided in OECD-DAC (1995a); OECD-DAC (1995b); OECD-DAC (1997f).

<sup>44</sup>. For example, the principle of “integration” and addressing environmental concerns pro-actively was already established in 1982 by the Joint Nordic Working Group for Environment in Aid. The principle of “ownership” was already established in 1991 (OECD-DAC, 1991a). The principle of ‘subsidiarity’ was enshrined in the Copenhagen Report -- the Nordic Freshwater Initiative prepared in 1991 (Danida, 1992b).

## 2.5 Capacity Development in Environment: Constraints and Future Challenges

### *Limited capacity to build capacity*

Most developing countries now have in place some form of agency or ministry (sometimes both) with overall responsibility for “environment” and one or more national environmental non-governmental organisations (NGOs). However, environment ministries are often characterised by:

- being relatively young, poorly staffed and, hence, weak organisations with limited political influence or fiscal support;
- being centralised, i.e. institutional monopolies, with limited representation at the local level;
- having mandates which frequently overlap with other sectoral and non-sectoral line ministries resulting in institutional “turf battles” and, thus, often being limited by their own institutional setting;
- limited capacities to commission, review and use Environmental Impact Assessments (EIAs) in national planning;
- limited capacities to enforce mitigation measures prescribed in EIAs and/or the enforcement of the “polluter pays” principle;
- being ill-equipped to routinely and systematically assess the environmental costs of development projects as a precondition for approval (based on Thomson, 1998).

Thus, there is a clear need for reforms to improve the efficiency, effectiveness and responsiveness of many environmental organisations in developing countries.

Although DAC Members continue to accord a high priority to environmental issues, the continued under-performance in translating policy into practice can be attributed to *i.a.*:

- the gap between the relative priorities accorded to environmental issues by the donor community and by recipient governments<sup>45</sup>;
- significant generic and specific environmental capacity constraints in both donor organisations and recipient institutions;
- aid delivery mechanisms (and the modalities for planning and implementation within most donor organisations) which have not evolved at the same pace, or to the same extent, as their own conceptual and policy-making structures.

---

<sup>45</sup>. Three recent reports have highlighted the fundamental dilemma in promoting “ownership” of environmental projects and programmes:

“73% of ‘environmental’ projects were identified in accordance with the availability of funds and only 27% were demand-driven requests from national institutions” (UNDP, 1997d);

“une faible demande de projets en faveur de l’environnement de la part des partenaires gouvernementaux” (Commission européenne, 1998);

“Indeed, few if any substantive environmental projects would ever materialise if all ODA were based only on aid requests” (Japan’s ODA Annual Report 1997).

DAC Members' environment units typically remain small, over-worked and have not yet succeeded in mainstreaming environmental knowledge or the transfer of basic environmental skills among generalist staff.

A summarised overview of the key generic and specific capacity constraints in the area of environment of the DAC Members is presented in Annex 3.

Five additional factors would also appear to have limited the mainstreaming of the CDE concept within both donor agencies and recipient country institutions. These are:

- the confusion resulting from the fusion of two poorly-defined concepts: "environment" and "capacity development";
- the organisational cultures and characteristics of many donor agencies mitigate against effective learning and supporting "process"- rather than "output"-oriented approaches used in conventional project management cycles <sup>46</sup>;
- the slow integration of environmental policy with economic development concerns at all levels of government and civil society in many developing countries;
- the organisational and financial demands resulting from the substantial broadening of the scope of environmental challenges to be addressed to include "global" environmental issues;
- the absence of any coherent core set of internationally-agreed environmental indicators, particularly when compared to economic and social indicators.

### *Challenges for the future*

A major operational challenge regarding CDE is the need to simplify and enhance existing programming efforts. This will require greater clarity notably in terms of:

- specifying the environmental problem to be addressed;
- identifying and targeting the organisations which are most capable of addressing the problem;
- specifying the types of environmental capacity to be developed within each organisation, including targets to be achieved;
- mainstreaming the operational implications of support to CDE processes.

In several cases the CDE projects and programmes assessed in this study have been poorly (and hastily) designed and resulted in either limited capacity development *per se* or undue dependency. The study has also revealed the phenomenon of "donor clustering" around particular organisational types

---

<sup>46</sup>. OECD-DAC (1997d) and Huizenga (1997).

(notably national ministries of environment and environmental NGOs), which has frequently exacerbated co-ordination and communication problems<sup>47</sup>.

In conclusion, there is a significant “structural gap” between the relative priorities accorded to environmental issues by the donor community and recipient governments. There are clear generic lessons based upon the experience of a large number of donor agencies on what “ingredients” are needed for effective capacity development. The next chapter examines donor capacities in respect to the design and management of CDE projects, programmes and processes.

---

<sup>47</sup>. For example, the Government of Indonesia’s national environmental agency, Bapedal, and provincial Bapedalda have been supported by i.a. USAID, AusAID, the World Bank, the Japanese Environmental Management Centre, JICA, OECF, ADB, GTZ and CIDA. This has resulted in “counterpart resources being stretched and in some cases pulled between donor projects” and “competition between donors for counterpart trainees.” (Coles, 1996 pp. 3-4.) A similar situation has emerged with the Government of Malawi’s Ministry of Forestry, Fisheries and Environmental Affairs which is supported by i.a.USAID, UNDP, Danida, CIDA, The World Bank, GTZ, GEF, DfID, FAO and JICA (Danida, 1998b).

### **3. DONOR AGENCY CAPACITIES TO DESIGN AND MANAGE CDE PROJECTS, PROGRAMMES AND PROCESSES**

#### **3.1 Key Findings**

##### **3.1.1. Introduction**

The assessment of “in-house” donor agencies’ capacities to effectively design and manage CDE projects, programmes and processes was based on the functional objectives of CDE presented in 1.2, namely, strengthened capacity:

- to set goals, evaluate options and take decisions which promote environmentally sustainable development;
- to formulate, implement and monitor coherent natural resources and environmental management projects and programmes making effective use of human and financial resources;
- to provide reliable environmental information and useful experiences in support of national goal, policy, plan and programme formulation processes;
- to facilitate public participation in decision-making processes and public access to environmental information;
- to interact inter-institutionally and to co-ordinate plans and programmes;
- to adapt to changing national circumstances and client demands, to learn from mistakes and to undertake internal organisational reforms;
- to mobilise sustainable sources of funding.

##### **3.1.2 Integration of environmental concerns at the policy level**

During the period 1987-98 donor agencies have successfully integrated and achieved a systematic and sustained expression of environmental concerns in overall policy statements, sector policies and strategies. Furthermore, donor agencies have addressed some aspects of capacity to respond to environmental and capacity development in environment concerns in ODA, notably in terms of:

- The establishment, expansion or strengthening of specialised environment technical and/or policy units;
- The establishment of special environment programmes and funding frameworks, notably in terms of the increased interest in, and support for, “global” and “sink” environment issues and the follow-up to the UNCED/Agenda 21 process;



- The preparation of internal screening procedures, environmental assessment and Environmental Impact Assessment guidelines albeit of variable scope and quality (Lee and Colley, 1992; Roe *et al.*, 1995);
- Conducting environmental training programmes, commonly for “generalist” staff in head offices and occasionally in country offices;
- The increasing role of “in-house” environmental specialists in overall donor agency policy-making;
- The strengthening of linkages with other specialist environmental institutions in donor agency countries;
- The recruitment of institutional development specialists and/or conducting ID training programmes for newly-recruited staff<sup>48</sup>.

In spite of the above-mentioned achievements, there are still widespread deficiencies in in-house policy compliance regarding the systematic and coherent integration of environmental concerns in all sectors, at all stages of the project or programme cycle and in all forms of ODA. The World Bank and Sida remain the only donor agencies that have statutory requirements for environmental assessments. In all other donor agencies, addressing environmental concerns in the formulation of projects and programmes largely remains an *optional* requirement. This option has frequently been ignored.

The international “background noise” on environment and development, the processes of preparing environmental guidelines and profiles and conducting introductory training courses have undoubtedly raised awareness of environmental issues among donor agencies’ generalist staff. However, these initiatives have, in general, not been followed through and have not provided a strong enough foundation for sustained environmental capacity, particularly in the absence of significant changes in donor agencies’ “approval cultures” or staff performance criteria. In many cases, environmental guidelines are still not systematically used, are not used at all, have recently been revised and updated (as in Norway) or plans exist to revise and update them (in Denmark and the Netherlands).

Inconsistencies and contradictions between policies which aim to promote environmentally sustainable development, and decisions on the provision of ODA continue to exist. Some have been well documented by NGOs and other “experts”<sup>49</sup>, while others are less well known<sup>50</sup>.

These key findings are endorsed by all of the thematic Environment and Development evaluation reports published by many DAC Members between 1992 and 1997 and other more recent studies<sup>51</sup>.

---

<sup>48</sup>. For example, the Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs appointed its first Institutional Development advisor in 1993 and published its first Guidelines for Institutional Development in 1995.

<sup>49</sup>. See, for example, Eurostep and ICVS (1996). The proposed Arun III dam in Nepal, the Three Gorges Dam on the Yangtze River in China, the Narmada dam in India, the Flood Action Plan in Bangladesh, the Hidrovia on the Paraguay-Parana watershed and the Planaflores in Brazil are examples of projects which have attracted considerable domestic and international attention regarding their long-term sustainability.

<sup>50</sup>. For example, USAID (1994, p. 13) specifies “reduction in the use of pesticides and in fertiliser and pesticide runoff” although USAID’s 1994 Annual Report includes projects promoting the increased use of fertiliser through the privatisation of its distribution which have resulted in a threefold increase in the use of chemical fertilisers in Bangladesh. Danida support to the energy and water sectors in Burkina Faso endorsed differential subsidies for electricity production and distribution and the provision of urban water supplies throughout the 1980s and early 1990s (Wardell, 1997).

It is anticipated that DfID and Finnida will publish their own thematic Environment and Development evaluations during 1999. The preliminary results of the on-going Environmental Evaluation Synthesis Study (Department for International Development, 1997b) tend to confirm these key findings which are aptly summarised in two recent studies, viz.,

“Development assistance agencies, including the United Nations, multilateral and bilateral organisations, frequently fail to undertake environmental assessment of projects that they support. Furthermore, when they do so, they often fall short of applying their own guidelines to an adequate standard. Quite simply, development assistance agencies fail to set the examples of good practice that they advocate in wider policy circles” (Mwalyosi and Hughes, 1998, p. 90).

“The career incentive for World Bank operations staff are geared to an “approval culture” which militates against both smaller projects and time-consuming activities such as those required to achieve greater in-country consultation, participation and “ownership” of projects. In this tightly constrained environment, it is only the truly dedicated Task Managers who willingly spend the necessary time and effort to generate high quality GEF projects even at a possible cost to their career advancement” (UNDP/UNEP/World Bank, 1994, p. 135).

The manifestation of donor agencies’ strengths and weaknesses in the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of projects and programmes is discussed further in Chapter 4.

### **3.1.3 *Mainstreaming of environmental issues in water sector projects and programmes***

Global water withdrawals doubled between 1940 and 1980. They are expected to double again before the turn of the century. Growth in water withdrawals and use has been three times faster than the increase in the global population. Approximately 70-80% of all water withdrawals are used in agricultural production, 20% in industrial activities while domestic use only accounts for 6% (Lundqvist and Jønch-Clausen, 1994, p. 5).

During the past decade there has been a progressive shift in water sector programmes from “basic needs” to “demand driven” approaches and strategies:

“Over the past thirty years developing countries have allocated an increasing share of their gross domestic product (GDP) to public spending on the provision of water and sanitation services. It would appear that the proportion of public spending on these household services has been too high, for three reasons: First, the low contribution of users has meant that supply agencies are not accountable to consumers; Second, these resources have been used primarily to subsidize services to the middle class and the rich, and; Third, spending on household services has left few public resources available for wastewater treatment and management” and, “...the promising institutional arrangements are ones in which the people who are affected are put in charge of decisions regarding both environmental services and the resources to be spent on them... Consistent with this participatory thrust is the dictum that decision-making responsibility should be moved to the lowest appropriate level” (World Bank, 1994, pp. 1-2).

---

<sup>51</sup>

See, for example, Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs (1994b); AusAID (1994); Baser (1994); UNDP/UNEP/World Bank (1994); Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs (1995); Danida (1996); JACSES (1996); Ministère de la Coopération (1996); Sida (1996); Commission of the European Communities (1997); USAID (1997); UNDP (1997); Huizenga (1997) and Mwalyosi and Hughes (1998).

Donor commitment to the water sector has traditionally been strong. Following the International Drinking Water Supply and Sanitation Decade 1981-1990, the Nordic donors hosted the Copenhagen Informal Consultation on Integrated Water Resources Development and Management in November 1991. One of the outcomes of this initiative was the conclusion that water supply and sanitation projects had been too sectoral, with inadequate attention given to cross-sectoral integration. Similarly, it was considered that insufficient attention had been given to watershed management and to the need for an integrated approach to the management of land and water resources.

Two key principles for water resources management, viz., treating water as an economic good and managing water resources at the lowest appropriate level, were adopted. These principles were endorsed by the International Conference on Water and the Environment (ICWE) in Dublin in January 1992. The Copenhagen and Dublin initiatives subsequently provided the basis for the section on water in *Agenda 21* where an agenda emphasising environmentally sustainable use of water resources was developed. Several post-Rio follow-up initiatives have taken place and include the World Bank Policy Paper on Water Resources Management of 1993, the ministerial conference “*Drinking Water Environmental Sanitation: Implementing Agenda 21*” hosted by the Netherlands in March 1994 and an OECD-DAC meeting in May 1994 on Water Resources Management.

While recognising the limitations of the OECD-DAC classification of aid, the following figures provide some indication of the relative priorities accorded to different aspects of donor-financed water sector programmes. In 1996 OECF allocated 11% to irrigation, flood control, water supply, sewage and sanitation. Sida’s funding support to natural resources and environment constituted 7% of Sida’s total bilateral disbursements in 1995-96. This support included allocations of 1% for water resources management and 18% for water supply and sanitation. Danida allocated 7% of total bilateral disbursements to “Drinking Water and Sanitation” in 1996.

Although none of the projects sampled in this study had environmental objectives, most had environmental components. None were considered to have a neutral or “white” impact on the environment and one was assessed to have a strong negative impact (a “black” project). The rest were considered to be in the “grey” category having some environmental impact. Despite this, not a single EIA was commissioned before initiating any of the projects. This has in certain cases meant that projects being implemented were not complying with national EIA requirements.

Monitoring and baseline studies (especially of social and environmental issues) were likewise generally found to be weak and at times completely absent -- none of the projects included monitoring of environmental parameters. This is of particular concern given the fact that most projects reviewed were long-term and received substantial funding (commonly more than US\$ 10m). For example, a synthesis study of seven evaluations of DfID water supply projects and lessons learned from other key donors on rural water and sanitation found that:

“... environmental concerns were incorporated at a rather late stage in project decision-making” (Department for International Development, 1997a).

None of the projects reviewed included or undertook an assessment of the environmental costs or benefits of the improved water supply schemes -- at any stage of the project/programme cycle.

The sample of water sector projects in the study (*cf.* Annex 7) continue to emphasise water supply and focus primarily on technical, operation and maintenance (O&M) and financial sustainability issues. Relatively limited attention has been accorded to the sustainable management of water resources. Little attention has been given to waste water management. The sustainable and integrated management of water resources and the institutional frameworks to achieve the same continue to

receive limited attention in donor-supported water projects. Most projects can still be characterised by being output-oriented technical assistance involving pipes and wells.

Although institutional capacities have been improved with regard to co-ordination and flexibility in half of the projects assessed, participatory aspects and public access to environmental information have either been addressed insignificantly or not at all. The DfID synthesis study found that:

“A common finding in the evaluation reports was doubt over project sustainability. In most cases communities were reported to have little sense of ownership of schemes, generally attributed to the lack of community involvement in project planning and design”,

and added that

“Donors still need to find an appropriate balance between prescription and choice – between satisfying accountability requirements and allowing communities’ priorities and capabilities to determine the direction and speed of events” (*ibid*, p. 6 and p. 43).

Similar findings were reported in an evaluation of the Netherlands’ Development Programme in Bangladesh, where environmental concerns were more systematically integrated in water projects after 1994-95:

“Institutional sustainability is reduced because, in almost all projects, little attention is given to local-level institutional aspects” and “... the local population is often not consulted during the preparatory phases of projects” (Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 1998, p. 155 and p. 161).

This study found that in two cases there was a formal agreement as a basis for conducting an evaluation. However, in none of the cases had the recipient government been involved in preparing the evaluation Terms of Reference and few, if any, of the evaluation teams included any recipient country environmental specialists. It is also interesting to note that in all but one of the cases did the evaluation team use participatory consultative techniques among the key stakeholders. Finally, the sample of projects included only two cases where the mobilisation of sustainable sources of funding had been successfully addressed.

It should be noted that several projects and programmes strengthened capacity(ies) to set goals, evaluate options and take decisions which promote environmentally sustainable development. However, the overall performance does not suggest significant improvements in or support for *CDE in practice*. Greater attention still needs to be paid to environmental issues at the appraisal and design stage and should include alternatives to projects in terms of the institutional choice(s), location(s) and technical options. Substantial improvements are required *vis à vis* compliance with national EIA requirements *and* donor agency policies. Greater effort is still required in collating social, environmental and technical baseline data. Monitoring could be further enhanced by using environmental and social indicators. More attention is also required in addressing long-term O&M and funding of water supply schemes.

Several donor agencies within the existing or new framework of water sector programmes have increased their efforts in seeking revisions to national water policies and tariff systems. However, a recent World Bank study has highlighted the continuing gap between the costs of producing and supplying water and current user charges. The analysis and assessment of the “most valuable use” of water as a basis for the cost-effective allocation of an increasingly scarce and finite resource is

frequently absent. One evaluation <sup>52</sup> found that external agencies should avoid becoming doers rather than promoters. The evaluation team identified the need for a stronger focus on capacity building and an analytical rather than an operational bias. Donors current staffing structure was found to be inadequate to address this type of approach.

Although many donor agencies have improved their performance in terms of promoting management of water resources at the lowest appropriate level (see, for example, Danida, 1996b), there is still a need for much stronger community participation to be built in at the initial project design stage. The involvement of beneficiaries is not only a way of lowering the costs but a critical means of achieving sustainability.

The continued lack of “double-loop” learning was also highlighted in connection with water resource management projects in Bangladesh:

“Lessons have been learnt from project experience but unfortunately these have not always led to improved implementation of the next generation of projects” (Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 1998, p. 148).

The sample of projects reviewed suggests that, despite the political commitments made in Copenhagen, Dublin and Rio, mainstreaming of environmental issues in water and sanitation projects and programmes remains piecemeal. Even the most basic requirements for EIAs have been neglected in the course of planning and implementing water sector projects. Comparatively limited attention is still given to water resources management as distinct from water resources development <sup>53</sup>. In many countries the use and allocation of water resources is still not based on economic values and attendant environmental costs and cannot, therefore, be considered to be sustainable.

#### ***3.1.4 Mainstreaming of environmental issues in energy sector projects and programmes and support for the development of traditional energy sources***

Although the energy sector is significant in many donor agencies’ overall ODA programmes, the relative importance attached to the sector varies from donor to donor. For example, as a proportion of total bilateral assistance, Sida allocated 8% (1995), OECF (Japan) 23% (1996) and Danida 7% (1996).

*Agenda 21* called on nations to find more efficient systems for producing, distributing and consuming energy, for greater reliance on environmentally sound energy systems and with a particular emphasis on renewable sources of energy. However, a 1997 report on trends in global energy production and consumption after Rio reported that:

“... current patterns of the production, distribution and use of energy are not sustainable... Current unsustainable approaches to energy are a barrier to sustainable socio-economic development” (UNDP, 1997c, p. 7).

Of a total of 982 projects and commitments of US\$ 430m from UNDP over the last two decades, 677 (69%) were to support the conventional sub-sectors such as petroleum, electrical energy and general

---

<sup>52</sup>. Sida support to UNICEF water and sanitation projects in seven Central American countries.

<sup>53</sup>. For example, the Royal Government of Thailand’s laudable efforts to improve watershed management nevertheless constituted only 2% of fiscal support for water resources development.

energy planning and management. Only 79 projects were directed towards renewable sources of energy receiving a meagre US\$ 15m (3%) of UNDP funding (UNDP, 1997f, p. ii).

There appears to be a particular emphasis placed by donor agencies on supporting technical projects with a clear focus on developing commercial energy production and distribution systems (thermal and hydro-power) and comparatively little support provided for the sustainable development of traditional energy resources such as woodfuels, dung and crop residues. Woodfuels provide between 70 and 90% of primary energy consumption in most Sub-Saharan Africa countries affecting communities in both rural and urban areas (UNDP, 1997c, p. 23).

The UNDP ex-post evaluation study divided UNDP energy sector projects into 7 categories none of which included traditional energy sources. Over 90% of Sida's energy-related aid (cumulatively totalling ca. 1 billion Swedish Kroner in 1995) was allocated for the development of the electricity sub-sector (Sida, 1996b, p. 3). Only one of the projects in the sample for the present study included the development of woodfuel resources in its project objectives (AusAID, 1994c).

The focus of energy sector projects and programmes among both recipient country institutions and donor agencies has continued to be the production of commercial energy with comparatively less emphasis accorded to pricing policies, traditional and renewable energy resources and demand-side management of all energy types<sup>54</sup>. Despite many energy sector projects' direct and indirect local environmental impacts, a major incentive for donor support to energy sector programmes in developing countries has been the increasing concern for global, rather than local, environmental issues<sup>55</sup>.

Few energy sector projects and programmes commissioned EIAs, even though they often had environmental components and some even included environmental objectives. Only one project in the sample was found to have established a monitoring system which included environmental parameters. In addition, there was often a lack of *ex-ante* socio-economic analyses to assess, for example, alternative options which could have resulted in improved cost-benefits ratios and/or enhanced environmental benefits or the improved mitigation of negative environmental impacts.

In spite of these findings, the history of Sida support to energy projects in Tanzania would tend to suggest that there have been donor agency improvements in project preparation with regard to addressing environmental considerations:

“...the goal of ensuring the timely inclusion of EIA results into the project cycle has not to a full extent been achieved... the quality and comprehensiveness of the environmental studies in connection with hydroelectric power development has been steadily improving since the first projects began in 1974” (Sida, 1997g).

The preparation of a Sida-supported energy project (the *Lower Kinshasi Hydropower Project*) included an EIA which preceded for the first time the choice of project site.

---

<sup>54</sup>. See, for example, UNDP (1997c). It should be noted, however, that a World Bank-led Regional Programme for the Traditional Energy Sector (RPTES) has been initiated in several West African countries and encompasses support from several bilateral donor agencies (e.g. Danida's pilot phase assistance to Burkina Faso). Netherlands support for Rural Energy Planning and Environmental Management in the SADC region endorses these recent trends.

<sup>55</sup>. This is endorsed by the findings of the Overall Performance of the GEF which found that the significant leveraging of World Bank-administered GEF funds was associated with large-scale investments in the energy sector.

The sample of project evaluations reviewed (*cf.* Annex 7) has also indicated that donor agency support has tended to focus on centralised energy organisations with limited institutional pluralism and limited project ownership. In none of the cases was the recipient country involved in the preparation of the Terms of Reference for the evaluation of the projects and no recipient country/institution representatives were included in any of the evaluation teams. There was, likewise, very limited consideration given to national environmental policies in relation to the energy sector projects and programmes.

Donor agencies need to exhibit greater policy compliance in conducting EIAs as an integral part of technical and economic feasibility studies during the project preparation/design stages. More systematic baseline studies on energy consumption patterns and substitution trends should encompass the collation of environmental and socio-economic data. This should, in particular, provide an improved basis to monitor long-term and downstream effects. Energy sector projects and programmes need to focus more on building national and local capacities to produce and manage energy resources, to internalise EIA procedures and to address critical contextual issues such as pricing policies.

The new energy sector support programmes of several donor agencies have already started to address many of these issues. Greater attention is needed to minimise centralisation and monopolisation and to enhance local ownership and institutional pluralism. A recent study (USAID, 1996e) highlighted several of the critical elements -- appropriate legislative measures, sound pricing policy (including price incentives) and public awareness activities -- to support capacity building through successful energy conservation projects. These steps can also be springboards for encouraging the adoption of broader environmental measures.

In sum, there is an apparent lack of systematic mainstreaming of environment in energy sector projects and programmes. Energy sector programmes attribute limited attention to and analysis of local environmental problems and/or the development of traditional energy resources.

To the extent that environmental issues have been addressed, they have often focused more on global environmental problems such as climate change. Support to institutional capacity building has primarily focused on technical and financial issues and not on environmental sustainability *per se*.

### **3.2 Funding for "Environment"**

Donor agencies' overall support for environment has increased during the period after the first generation of special environment funds were established in the mid-1980s, but falls far short of either the UNCED commitments or the *Agenda 21* funding target. It remains unclear in many cases, however, whether this increase constitutes new and additional financial resources or reallocations and recategorisations of existing and, in many cases, declining ODA budgets. The Global Environment Facility, GEF, and the Danish Environment and Disaster Relief Fund, MIKA, are exceptions.

"Environment" typically represents between 8 and 15% of donor agencies' bilateral assistance programmes although "environment sector" programmes in particular countries can constitute up to 30% of country allocations. World Bank lending for environmentally sustainable development increased from US\$ 0.03 to 11.9 billion between 1986 and 1997. Nevertheless, in 1996 environmental projects represented only 1.3% of total cumulative lending.

The most significant growth in funding has been donor agencies' support for the implementation of the international environmental conventions, core fund contributions to the GEF (Denmark's annual

contributions increased from US\$ 1.3m to more than 19m between 1992 and 1996) and support for the sink functions of the environment <sup>56</sup>.

The UNCED Secretariat estimated that an annual US\$ 125 billion in grant or concessional terms would be necessary to assist developing countries in implementing *Agenda 21* between 1993 and 2000. Donor agency contributions to the UNDP Capacity 21 Trust Fund amounted to US\$ 70 million by the end of 1997. These contributions together with total GEF financing committed between 1992 and June 1996 (US\$ 1.2 billion) represented approximately 1% of the internationally-agreed *Agenda 21* grant funding target.

Furthermore, the total net disbursements of ODA from OECD countries remained stagnant at approximately US\$ 59 billion during the period 1992-95. ODA accounted for an average 0.27% of the GNP of the OECD countries in 1995, the lowest level since 1970. The decline in ODA budgets has been accompanied by increasing political pressure to use ODA to support domestic economic interests (ActionAid, 1995).

In contrast to ODA, the total financial flows to developing countries have risen due to a substantial increase in private capital investment. In 1995, the total net resource flows to developing countries amounted to US\$ 253 billion, of which 70% was from private lending and investment. The increased resource flows and shift towards private financing during the early 1990s have been accounted for almost entirely by Asian and Latin American countries (between 1989 and 1993, 87% of private investment went to 20 countries including India, China and Indonesia).

Some commentators have argued that it is a “deceptive hope” that private financial resources can substitute for declining ODA, since for private companies:

“...when it is time to make decisions, environmental and social concerns play a secondary role at best” (Martens and Mucke, 1996).

It remains unclear to what extent donor agencies’ environmental policies and procedures are systematically applied to projects and programmes that are co-financed with private sector organisations. Earlier studies (by the Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Danida for example) have already indicated that funding of NGOs does not follow the normal environmental policies and procedures for bilateral projects and programmes.

A large number of recent initiatives have focused on the critical issue of mobilising sustainable sources of funding for developing countries, including the creation of “National Environmental Funds” and the greater use of economic instruments to support environmentally sustainable development <sup>57</sup>.

---

<sup>56</sup>. For example, Japan’s Fourth Yen Loan Assistance to China includes 40 projects of which 25 are for economic infrastructure and the productive sectors. The other 15 are categorised as “environmental” projects but are mainly for reducing industrial air and water pollution and the improvement of sewerage systems (OECF Newsletter No. 22, 1995).

<sup>57</sup>. See, for example, Arden-Clarke (1994); African Development Bank/SDC/UNDP (1994); OECD-DAC (1995c); The Nature Conservancy/Ecofondo/UNDP (1996a and 1996b); IUCN-ROSA (1995); Foundation for the Philippine Environment/Nature Conservancy/UNDP (1997); UNDP/UNSO (1997); United Nations (1997); Panayotou (1997b) and Crossley *et al.* (1997).



### 3.3 Institutional Reforms of Donor Agencies

Many DAC Members have undertaken far-reaching organisational reforms during the 1990s. In some cases these have formed part of reviews of the effectiveness of all government agencies as in the United Kingdom and the United States. Japan and Germany, however, have not initiated any “significant organisational reforms of their ODA agencies, despite the fact that both countries have complex and cumbersome organisational structures” and “a variety of reforms have been recommended in OECD-DAC reviews” (JACSES, 1996, p. 153; OECD-DAC, 1995c and 1996c).

The main characteristics of these reforms can be summarised in terms of donor agencies’ attempts to:

- secure greater coherence between all policies affecting developing countries including ODA, trade, debt, political, economic and cultural relations;
- improve addressing the social and environmental sustainability of development projects and programmes;
- achieve a greater focus on general and sectoral programmes rather than project-based assistance in priority countries;
- strengthen in-house capacities to manage the increased complexity of the procedures required to ensure participation, stakeholder analysis and social, environmental and institutional assessments;
- changes in the internal organisational arrangements for themes such as “environment”;
- improve implementation and the measurement of projects and programmes through the introduction of results-oriented and performance-based policy monitoring systems<sup>58</sup>.

#### 3.3.1 Information and learning

***No dearth of information on environmental and CDE issues but weaknesses often remain vis à vis the "in-house" collation, abstraction, dissemination, retrieval and use of the information***

It is still too early to assess the outcomes of these reforms but certain trends can be discerned which indicate that much environmental information, and many useful lessons and experiences exist within donor agencies’ documentation, but weaknesses remain *vis à vis* the collation, abstraction, dissemination, retrieval and use of this information.

There is no dearth of literature on environment and CDE issues among donor agencies. However, in-house information and data retrieval systems typically remain weak (with clear exceptions provided by UNDP’s Evaluation Office, USAID’s Development Experience Clearinghouse and both Sida’s and DfID’s Evaluation Departments). This finding has been endorsed during the course of the present study both in terms of retrieving cited documents and the difficulties encountered by donor agency staff in completing the CDE questionnaire. This confirms the findings of earlier studies which have highlighted that:

“...access to detailed information on specific projects is not well organised or systematized in most donor agencies, compared with policy related information” (JACSES, 1996, p. 125).

---

<sup>58</sup>. For example, USAID, DfID, Sida, UNDP and the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

An important determining factor of the quality of management of environmental and CDE projects and programmes is the learning ability of the organisations implicated in the design and implementation of the projects.

Several recent studies have continued to highlight the fact that many donor agencies are characterised by “single loop” (reviewing and improving the functioning of existing systems) rather than “double loop” (reviewing and assessing the validity of existing systems) learning processes <sup>59</sup>.

### **3.3.2 Public participation and access to information**

#### ***Public participation and public access to information have improved***

*Agenda 21* calls for the actions of governments and donor agencies to ensure:

“...access by the public to relevant information, facilitating the reception of public views and allowing for effective participation” (United Nations, 1997).

Donor agencies have undoubtedly become more receptive to growing public demand for greater accountability in the delivery and sustainability of ODA. NGOs have been instrumental in instigating this change in many donor countries.

For example, the World Bank’s former restrictions on access to its own documents (all were treated as confidential and were restricted thereafter for a period of ten years) were changed in January 1994. The World Bank has, subsequently, opened Public Information Centres in Washington DC, Tokyo, Paris and its field offices. Similarly, the Government of the United Kingdom adopted a new Open Government Code of Practice in April 1994 which also applies to ODA. The Department for International Development (DfID) has an effective project information system and will, upon request, provide information to the public, including *i.a.* aid figures, bilateral project agreements, EIAs, country strategies and progress, evaluation and completion reports. DfID has more recently also proposed to provide pipeline project information to the public (Chakrabati *et al.*, 1995). USAID, under the Freedom of Information Act 1974, provides extensive public information through its Public Inquiry Section and Development Experience Clearinghouse. USAID also provides information on pipeline projects under its “stakeholder” procedures. The Asian Development Bank approved a new information policy in January 1995.

A multitude of NGOs and specialist institutes in donor countries continue to provide independent information on ODA for their members, other NGOs and the general public. A co-ordinated independent annual review of trends and policies of bilateral aid is now conducted by NGOs in 22 donor countries (*The Reality of Aid*). The environment figures prominently as a thematic area where disclosure has been perceived as being “beneficial” to donor agencies. However, two key weaknesses in information disclosure remain, viz.,

- securing public and national resource base (NGOs, consulting firms, university departments, research institutes, etc.) access to information at critical stages in the project or (sector)

---

<sup>59</sup>. See, for example, Huizenga (1997). A rare exception was the Wapenhans Report (Portfolio Management Task Force, 1992) which questioned the validity of the World Bank’s management system.

programme cycle in order to have an effective input into the design of projects and programmes <sup>60</sup>;

- making more information available in local languages to facilitate greater participation of local communities.

### **3.3.3 Inter-institutional co-operation and co-ordination**

***Inter-institutional co-operation and co-ordination have improved but weaknesses often remain vis à vis internal arrangements for organisational communication and co-ordination***

Donor agencies have, in general, successfully strengthened their co-operation with a broader diversity of donor country institutions encompassing NGOs, university departments, research institutes, consulting companies and other private sector organisations and specialist environmental fora. This has been endorsed in some donor agencies' more recent policy statements. For example, the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs (1995) stressed that:

“Measures to strengthen important social institutions and organisations will be key areas of long-term co-operation ... In this connection, the Government considers it important to provide the best possible conditions for participation by a broad range of Norwegian expertise and institutions. Co-operation will not be limited to strengthening public institutions, but will also include institutions in business and civil society” (pp. 42-44).

In certain cases, however, institutional “turf battles” among donor agencies have mitigated the effectiveness of new environmental programmes. This is exemplified by the conflicts and tensions which have existed between the GEF's three implementing agencies and the Danish Government's two implementing agencies (see, for example, UNDP/UNEP/WB, 1994, p. 145).

Intra-organisational co-ordination often remains weak. This is exemplified by the parallel CD and CDE initiatives within some donor agencies and the general lack of formalised mechanisms to exchange ideas and experiences in developing common strategies. For example, UNDP's Management Development and Governance Division and the Sustainable Energy and Environment Division (the latter encompasses *i.a.* the Capacity 21 Unit and the UNDP-GEF Unit) have both been involved in supporting generic and specific CDE initiatives but which remain, essentially, isolated from each other. There have been limited formalised attempts to exchange and integrate experiences and/or lessons learned from the Evaluation Office.

## **3.4 Key Constraints and Mitigating Factors**

***The key factors which have mitigated donor agencies' overall environmental performance are considered to be:***

- i. Generic capacity constraints;
- ii. Specific environmental capacity constraints;
- iii. Lack of conceptual clarity;

---

<sup>60</sup>. The Japanese Ministry of Foreign Affairs indicated that “information disclosure is restricted by the necessity to eliminate ulterior economic motives from the aid process” (Japan's ODA 1994 Annual Report, p. 234).

- iv. Unrealistic levels of ambition and inadequate timeframes;
- v. Lack of precision in targeting environmental and CDE interventions;
- vi. Limited integration of the economic and social dimensions of sustainability in environmental projects;
- vii. Weaknesses in monitoring;
- viii. Financial sustainability issues.

#### **Ad 1) Generic capacity constraints**

##### ***The institutional characteristics of most donor agencies are not conducive to learning, supporting “hands-off” processes or effectively managing CDE projects and programmes***

There are few indications of significant structural changes in the orthodox delivery mechanisms for ODA (Mathiason, 1997), of a significant “changing relationship between donors and developing countries” (CDE Framework, 1995, p. 13) or “fundamental changes in the performance criteria of ODA” (JACSES, 1996, p. 149) during the period 1992-98. As one observer has noted:

“Donor approaches to development cooperation are still driven, in large part, by domestic interests (contracts for donor country suppliers, securing of future markets, supporting strategic interests, etc.). Tied aid policies, limited reliance on local sourcing options, contracting procedures which discourage joint ventures or sub-contracting to local personnel all represent obstacles to host country ownership.”<sup>61</sup>

Most donor agencies are characterised by:

- being relatively centralised organisations with limited decentralisation of budgetary authority;
- the high rotation of personnel and, thus, limited institutional memory;
- being understaffed and overworked in relation to the overall magnitude of aid budgets administered and, thus, limited capacity to co-ordinate efforts;<sup>62</sup>
- institutional cultures based on “pressure to lend” or “pressure to spend” and which measure performance in terms of the quantity rather than the quality of aid disbursements;
- accountability in the use of ODA funds to *i.a.* boards, national parliaments, national audit offices and an increasingly sceptical public. Reconciling the need for donor agency accountability and the perceived need for “hands-off” management (to promote “ownership”) remains a key challenge in development co-operation in general;
- an increasing number of in-house policy papers, strategies and guidelines which has necessitated (explicitly or implicitly) prioritisation in the extent to which they are used -- or not (*cf.* the negligible use of EA/EIA guidelines);

---

<sup>61</sup>. In Ownership: The Concept and CIDA’s Experience, paper presented at the European Centre for Development Policy Management Round Table on Partnership in Development Cooperation: “Combining Recipient Responsibility with Donor Accountability”, 29 June – 1 July 1994, Maastricht.

<sup>62</sup>. Sector programmes potentially provide an improved framework for the coherence and co-ordination of ODA interventions but it remains too early to assess if this will be the case in practice.

- internal bureaucratic imperatives and, increasingly, external domestic political pressures which mitigate against learning and flexibility;
- promoting policies which recognise the increasing complexity of effective programming but which have not been reflected in significant operational changes in either the time or the human resources required to undertake and support programme design and preparation activities. In some cases (for example, GEF and Danced), the actual resources deployed for project and programme preparation activities have probably declined;
- the lack of a systematic effort to capture and disseminate experiences and internalise lessons learned;
- continued, and perhaps increased, dependence on external human resources (third party executing agencies, consultants, etc.) resulting in the “fragmentation of responsibility” throughout the project/programme cycle;
- limited commitment to aid co-ordination at the country level.<sup>63</sup>

## **Ad 2) Specific environmental capacity constraints**

*Donor agencies’ environment units are typically small, over-worked and have not succeeded in facilitating the "mainstreaming" of environmental knowledge among generalist staff*

The study has revealed a number of recent initiatives which suggest that the DAC Members are increasingly recognising their own capacity limitations and progressively broadening their base of domestic, international and recipient country institutional partners in the design and implementation of environmental and CDE projects and programmes. This is in accordance with both the OECD-DAC’s *Principles for New Orientations in Technical Co-operation* (1992) and the CDE Principles (OECD-DAC, 1997f). These issues are discussed and explored further with illustrative case studies in Chapter 4.

Many donor agencies’ environment departments are, however, characterised by:

- being small organisational units typically boasting between 2 and 5% of total donor agency personnel but “overseeing” an estimated 10-15% of total ODA;<sup>64</sup>
- limited decentralisation of in-house environmental expertise to country offices (embassies, resident missions, etc.);

---

<sup>63</sup>. In some countries, there are encouraging signs of improvement. For example, the Informal Donor Group on Environment in Tanzania and the "donor retreats" recently introduced in Malawi.

<sup>64</sup>. The clear exception to this pattern is the World Bank’s Environment Department which had an estimated 300 environmental specialists in 1998 (against 3 in Finnida, 6 in Danida, 7 in NORAD and 8 in the Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs). However, it should be noted that a period of 23 years elapsed between the appointment of the Bank’s first environmental expert (1970) and the establishment of Environmentally Sustainable Development at Vice President level.

- limited decentralisation of environment funding;<sup>65</sup>
- a lack of executive authority in donor agencies' decision-making processes. In many cases, environment departments provide technical advisory services upon request from other organisational units, including thematic, regional and country departments. Existing workloads of environmental staff limit the efficacy of this in-house service;
- being confronted with internal organisational pressures for early and rapid funding authorisations and commitments which can compromise the quality of project and programme design work;
- the commonly expressed concern that the growing demands (which are occasionally conflicting demands in terms of their technical, managerial and training roles within the agencies) are overwhelming the environmental expertise that is available<sup>66</sup>;
- the lack of a systematic effort to capture and disseminate specific environmental experiences and lessons learned.

Furthermore, in several cases the evolution and sequencing of the components of "special" environment programmes have been poorly planned: policy, strategy, technical guidance and co-ordination support have been developed after the programme operations had been initiated (for example, NORAD's Special Grant for Environment and Development established in 1984, the Global Environment Facility established in 1991 and DANCED established in 1993).

A summarised overview of key organisational constraints within donor agencies in terms of their generic and specific environmental capacities to support the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of CDE projects and programmes is presented in Annex 3.

### **Ad 3) Lack of conceptual clarity**

#### ***Environment and CDE concepts remain nebulous***

A plethora of terms, concepts and definitions have emerged associated with the evolution of thinking and donor agency programming regarding environment, generic institutional capacity development and CDE issues. Most are characterised by being broad, most embody the principles of participation, many borrow from each other and, increasingly, many have included references to elaborately vague concepts such as "systemic", "holistic", "synergistic", "multi-faceted" and "process-oriented". This has led to confusion rather than clarity, and policy inconsistencies.

The adoption and use of poorly-defined and, often, poorly-understood terms has provided little more than loose frameworks for political consensus-building. This has resulted in concepts being subject to widely varying interpretation and in having limited operational or analytical value to either donor

---

<sup>65</sup>. Although the GEF Small Grants Programme had "successfully developed a decentralized management and implementation structure that was simple and flexible", the use of this decentralised funding mechanism constituted less than 2% of the total use of the GEF commitments up to the end of June 1996 (UNDP/UNEP/WB, 1994). An evaluation of Danida's Local Grant Authority found that only 9% of grants provided through embassies were used in support of environment projects (Danida, 1994b).

<sup>66</sup>. See, for example, CIDA (n.d.) and CEC (1997). The existence of portfolios of on-going environmental projects has exacerbated this trend in terms of the trade-offs between providing managerial support to the environmental projects and thematic (environmental) advice to other organisational units.

agencies or recipient institutions. In some cases, the conceptual and terminological frameworks proposed have become synonymous with the concept of development itself because they are too broad and all-encompassing. Vagueness and complexity have, inevitably, become the enemy of practice and action. Although generalised strategies and guiding principles provide some indication of what can or should be done, they give little concrete guidance on who can or should do it and how it could or should be done.

One consequence of this imprecision has been the emergence of politicised debates to explain the reasons for continued under-performance. Most of these debates can be characterised by pendulum swings at the extremes of “top-down vs. bottom-up”, “public sector vs. private sector”, “blueprint vs. iterative (process-oriented) approaches”, “external vs. local technical assistance”, etc. The empirical evidence suggests that the key factors which can influence institutional performance:

- are extremely variable, thus endorsing the basic management principle of “it depends” and Hirschmann’s advice that “uniform solutions to development problems invariably lead us astray”<sup>67</sup>;
- commonly involve successful mixtures of top-down/bottom-up, public/private sector, blueprint/process approach and external/local technical assistance; and
- are strongly influenced by the setting, also referred to as the “action environment” or “context” in the literature (Hilderbrand and Grindle, 1997).

This finding is endorsed by the existence of a reliable minimum estimate of some 500 descriptive and prescriptive environmental documents encompassing *i.a.* National Environment Action Plans, National Conservation Strategies, Country Environmental Profiles, Environmental Synopses, Biodiversity Assessments, Tropical Forestry Action Programmes in many African, Latin American and Asian countries but which have remained, to date, essentially “shelf documents” rather than action plans *per se* (World Resources Institute, 1995, p. 237).

#### **Ad 4) Unrealistic levels of ambition and inadequate timeframes**

##### ***Environmental and CDE projects and programmes are frequently over-ambitious***

A large proportion of the CDE evaluation reports reviewed continue to highlight the unrealistic levels of ambition and inadequate timeframes (typically less than 5 years)<sup>68</sup> in the design and implementation of environmental and CDE projects and programmes manifested particularly in terms of:

##### ***a) The (frequently) limited assessments of the political and socio-economic setting***

This is exemplified by the case of the Global Environment Facility-UNDP *Biodiversity Conservation and Resource Management Programme* with specific reference to the Lak Integrated Conservation and Development Project, New Ireland Province, Papua New Guinea (see Box 3.1).

---

<sup>67</sup>. In *World Development* 18, pp. 1119-1122.

<sup>68</sup>. The average life expectancy of GEF environmental projects was estimated to be 5 years (Global Environment Facility, 1997, p. 8). In contrast, GTZ estimated an average project duration of 8.6 years (GTZ, 1997).

**Box 3.1: GEF-UNDP support to the *Lak Integrated Conservation and Development Project (ICADP)*, New Ireland Province, Papua New Guinea (1993-96)**

Papua New Guinea's forest biodiversity provides a range of economic goods and ecological services, and underpins the country's subsistence economy. 97% of the land lies under customary tenure and right holders in local communities dictate use of, and control access to, forest resources. Competition for the forests is particularly acute in the lowland tropical rainforest where landowners' preference for current income, the limited capacity of the government's Department of Environment and Conservation and politicians' demands from constituents for "fast track" development have cumulatively favoured the interests of timber conglomerates. The Lak ICADP was hastily designed, over-ambitious, and seriously underestimated the political and socio-economic setting in which it would operate. It was described as "an unachievable act of bravado". This ultimately resulted in a joint agreement to prematurely terminate the project because of its incompatibility with the interests of the Metlak Development Corporation which held a logging and marketing agreement with Niugini Lumber Merchants Pty Ltd (a subsidiary of the Malaysian-owned Rimbunan Hijau company). Although the project successfully supported participatory processes in conducting biodiversity inventories, baseline PRAs and landowners' awareness campaigns, all were undertaken in a climate of competition and conflict with the logging company and heightened local community factionalism. The project's innovative attempts to develop new and sustainable sources of income included *i.a.* reduced impact logging, an "early rewards schedule", a carbon sequestration initiative, eco-tourism, essential oils, rattans, mushrooms and the establishment of a Conservation Trust Fund but were all unable to provide sufficiently attractive alternatives to the established logging company. Structural changes in Malaysia's forest industry (notably more restrictive practices in Sabah and Sarawak) probably influenced the "export" of logging pressure which was not assessed at the project design stage. Additional details of the lessons learned during the implementation of the Lak ICADP "experiment" are presented in Annex 10.

***b) The (frequently) limited organisational assessments, degree of consultation with other stakeholders and assessment or analysis of institutional options***

This is exemplified by the case of the UNIDO-supported *Ecotoxicology Institute*, Pakistan (see Box 3.2).



**Box 3.2: UNIDO support to the *Ecotoxicology Institute*, Pakistan (1992-96)**

Imports and use of pesticides in Pakistan grew from 1 800 metric tonnes of active ingredient (a.i.) in 1983 to 6 000 mt a.i. in 1993. Consumption of pesticides is concentrated on relatively few crops – cotton, fruit and vegetables – and supplied by 2 800 dealers with limited knowledge of handling and use.

The Ministry of Food, Agriculture and Livestock (MFAL) administers regulations governing the import, formulation, sale, distribution and use of pesticides. Surveillance and enforcement of these regulations had been minimal largely because of “institutional deficiencies”.

The UNIDO-supported project was extremely relevant in terms of its overall aims to improve capacity to analyse pesticide residues at ppm (part per million) level in samples from plants, soil and water. The project was over-ambitious in terms of plans to provide technical expertise to the ten member countries of the Regional Network on Pesticides for Asia and the Pacific.

Poor project preparation and design characterised by limited consultation with all relevant government institutions resulted in a donor agency project document and a separate government project concept. Only the latter recognised the need to build on existing laboratory capacities and was less ambitious. Both documents lacked specific immediate objectives or well-defined target groups.

Several institutions in Pakistan with relevant skills and existing capacities were overlooked. No attempt was made during project implementation to develop *i.a.* integrated pest management (IPM) strategies. Only two project management committee meetings were held in four years and neither the Steering Committee nor the Scientific Committees functioned very effectively.

The Ecotoxicology Institute was strengthened in terms of its human resources (62 man-weeks of training and 15 man-weeks of study tours) and laboratory (57% of the total budget) capacities but its role and functions in the context of other Pakistani public sector institutions remains unclear.

The project has “...so far not been able to provide a specific service to industry, extension services, farmers, consumers and the public” and “is not capable of continuing without external support...”

***c) The (frequently) low specificity of environmental activities to be undertaken within short timeframes***

This is exemplified by the case of the Danish support to the *Ministry of Science, Technology and Environment*, Thailand (see Box 3.3) for institutional capacity development.

**Box 3.3: Danced support to the *Ministry of Science, Technology and Environment (MOSTE)*, Thailand (1995-98)**

MOSTE was established after the promulgation of the National Environmental Quality Act (NEQA) in 1992 with a mandate to support the National Environment Board. The availability of a new environmental funding mechanism in 1993 underscored Danced's "institutional support" project with MOSTE.

The original design and preparation of the project was the antithesis of the CDE principles: it was formulated in haste and with limited precision by external Danish consultants, a Danced-driven process which involved nominal consultation or dialogue with the recipient institution and resulted in the "lack of a clear and common understanding between MOSTE and Danced". This necessitated a substantial reformulation exercise during project implementation.

The project was prepared without adopting the logical framework approach and expected to be able, within a two-year timeframe, to "enhance the environmental capacity and management on various issues in MOSTE in order to establish a more efficient environmental administration in Thailand." This was to be achieved through predominantly short-term technical assistance support to 7 project components (Capacity Development in Environment, international conventions, public awareness, environmental information systems, Environmental Impact Assessment and industrial audits, watershed management and water quality monitoring) and a total budget of less than US\$ 1m.

The project succeeded in conducting multiple workshops, produced 6 technical reports and facilitated study tours to Denmark for senior MOSTE officials. Negligible institutional capacity development *per se* occurred. A concluding workshop did, however, enable MOSTE to prioritise potential follow-up notably in terms of supporting government efforts to strengthen decentralised capacity at the *changwat* (provincial) level.

The project was considered unsustainable in the Project Completion Report.

***d) The (frequently) unsuccessful attempts to develop functional capacities to conduct and enforce Environmental Impact Assessments and influence decision-making at the national level***

This is illustrated by the study of the multi-donor support to the *Performance of EIA in Tanzania*, (see Box 3.4).

**Box 3.4: Support to the development of *Environmental Impact Assessment* capacity in Tanzania**

The study commissioned by the Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs and conducted by the Tanzanian Institute of Resource Assessment and IIED assessed 16 years of EIA practice in Tanzania and reviewed 26 EIAs commissioned between 1980 and 1997. The Government of Tanzania is currently in the process of formulating national EIA guidelines.

The study challenged a number of widely-held assumptions that underlie the notion of EIA as an effective tool for promoting environmentally sustainable development in finding that: EIA has had very little impact on decision-making in Tanzania. Public involvement in EIA has been minimal. EIAs were often commissioned as “afterthoughts” in the project planning and implementation processes, leaving little opportunity for public involvement or for considering alternative project options. In most cases, the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) did not define, cost and integrate environmental management into project design, and few detailed compliance responsibilities. The EIA process was so divorced from the project design that project managers were unaware that an EIA had been undertaken or were oblivious to the findings and recommendations included in the EIS.

Of the 26 EIAs reviewed, 18 (ca. 70%) had been undertaken to fulfil donor requirements, only 7 (ca. 27%) were full in-depth EIA processes and only 1 (ca. 4%) included training of Tanzanian staff. No evidence was found to suggest that donor-supported EIA processes led to more effective assessments even though they often used the skills of expensive international consultants. The reliance on external “expertise” mitigated against effective capacity-building within national institutions.

Donor agency interest in the process generally dissipated once the EIS was prepared and internal agency needs had been fulfilled. No examples were found of donor agency interest being extended to ensure that EIA recommendations were adhered to during implementation, post completion or audit phases. Not only have expensive EIA processes failed to make much of a difference, but donor agencies have failed to learn from their own experience.

In a limited number of recent cases (e.g. aquaculture development in the Rufiji Delta, 1997), EIA processes introduced early in the project cycle and serious EIA proponents did lead to positive design modifications. National capacity for the management and implementation of EIA remains extremely limited outside the National Environment Management Council. Some sectoral initiatives (national parks, wildlife and electricity) have promoted the wider use of EIA.

**Ad 5) Lack of precision in targeting environmental interventions**

*Environmental challenges can also be addressed through non-environmental projects and programmes and non-environmental institutions*

In spite of the CDE Framework’s explicit recognition of the endemic weaknesses of “environmental organisations” in recipient countries, two implicit assumptions would appear to have underpinned the CDE Framework, the CDE Guidelines and all subsequent CDE initiatives and the use of donor agency environmental funds. These are:

- address environmental problems through environmental projects and programmes and
- channel environmental projects and programmes through environmental organisations.

An earlier key lesson learned in an evaluation report which challenged this assumption would appear not to have been internalised. The Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs, which commissioned the first DAC Member thematic environment and development evaluation in 1992, found that:

“environmental problems cannot be solved by means of specific environmental projects ... if they do not or cannot address the underlying factors involved” and

“environmental interventions do not necessarily bring environmental benefits while projects not labelled environmental sometimes do much to improve environmental management” (Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 1994a).

This finding is illustrated by the case of the Danida-supported *School Maintenance Project* in Tanzania (see Box 3.5) which clearly demonstrated that it is also possible to successfully address environment as a cross-sectoral issue. This finding, it should be stressed, does not imply that environmental issues cannot, and should not, be addressed through environmental organisations but suggests that donor agencies may have lost opportunities to identify alternative and viable institutional partners in implementing their environmental strategies.

### **Box 3.5: Danida support to the *School Maintenance Project*, Tanzania (1981-1993)**

Most secondary schools in Tanzania were built before independence in 1961. The project was primarily designed to repair and rehabilitate roofs, water supplies, sewerage systems and electricity supplies in 142 secondary schools. On-the-job training was provided for 3 000 craftsmen and a preventive maintenance and repair manual was developed for the Ministry of National Education. A Danida review mission in 1988 identified woodfuel scarcity and expense as problems for the schools' recurrent budgets. A number of socio-economic, environmental health and alternative renewable energy studies were conducted and prototypes tested before concluding that firewood would remain the only feasible and sustainable energy source for institutional cooking. A subsequent “kitchen study” was followed by the testing, development and introduction of energy-saving woodfuel stoves by the Bellerive Foundation (Kenya). Although the project was classified as a “white” project i.e. no environmental impacts, it successfully demonstrated the possibilities of achieving significant environmental and economic benefits, a “win-win” scenario. The investment in the project's environmental component represented 2% of the total project cost (ca. US\$ 46m) and resulted in the installation and use of 450 200-litre stoves/70-litre water heaters and 250 50-litre stoves in 87 schools and colleges. The stoves have resulted in a significant reduction in demand for firewood, improved practices in the cutting, drying and rational use of firewood, reduced purchase costs and pronounced improvements in the working conditions for school cooks. The cost savings have allowed many schools to improve the quality of food provided to school children by offering meat, fruit and vegetables more frequently. The stove initiative has also resulted in most schools opting out of the cumbersome government-controlled Tender Board system for purchasing firewood and the establishment of small-scale woodlots on many school campuses. Non-sectoral institutions are commonly better placed to co-ordinate cross-sectoral environmental issues.

***Non-sectoral institutions are commonly better placed to coordinate cross-sectoral environmental issues.***

A number of the CDE evaluation reports and documentation reviewed indicate that political commitment and support is a key prerequisite for the successful implementation of environmental programmes. This *can* have a strong bearing on the choice between the many potential institutional entry points in developing countries.

For example:

- Non-sectoral planning departments or commissions frequently constitute more effective environmental policy and planning “champions”.

This is illustrated by the case study of the Swiss Agency for Development and Co-operation support to the Sarhad Provincial Conservation Strategy, North West Frontier Province, Pakistan (see Box 4.14).

- There are a limited number (known) of successful attempts to support capacity development in environmental policy analysis and research through national institutions.

This is illustrated by the case study of the (formerly) CIDA and USAID-supported *Thailand Development Research Institute* (see Box 4.10).

***Donor agencies have in many cases successfully promoted institutional diversity in environmental and CDE projects and programmes but have not systematically promoted institutional pluralism stricto sensu***

The concept of institutional pluralism implies, and is widely understood as, a diversification of institutional partners although the academic discipline from which it is borrowed (public administration) has a far more wide-reaching connotation, viz.,

Strengthening local-level governance by breaking the “monopoly of central control”<sup>69</sup>.

Although there are discernible trends in the administrative decentralisation of CDE initiatives (such as the widespread and progressive shifts in preparing National Environmental Action Plans to District Environmental Action Plans and processes in, for example, Zimbabwe), only one DAC Member (the Netherlands) would appear to have an explicit environmental policy guideline to support sub-national structures.

This finding is illustrated by the case study of the Swiss Agency for Development and Co-operation support to the SPCS-NWFP, Pakistan (Box 14) and UNDP-Netherlands support for *Sustainable Development to the Ministry for the Coordination of Environmental Affairs*, Mozambique (see Box 4.11).

A key area of concern is whether the general and significant shift from project assistance to sector programmes runs the risk of reinforcing institutional monopolies or distributed institutional monopolies by (re-)concentrating support through national environmental organisations.

---

<sup>69</sup>. See, for example, Administrative Decentralization: A New Framework for Improved Governance, Accountability and Performance. HIID Development Discussion Paper 582, May 1997, p. 2.

***Ad 6) Limited integration of the economic and social dimensions of sustainability in many environmental projects***

***Many donor agencies' environmental and CDE projects and programmes continue to focus on the biophysical aspects at the expense of the economic and social dimensions of sustainability***

Although biological criteria will need to be drawn upon to identify broad areas of interest for environmental projects and programmes, socio-economic criteria must dictate the actual choice of project site. Before a commitment is made, projects must collect information on local institutions, community history, social and political structures and opportunities for, and constraints to, development. In some areas, the combination of social, economic, institutional and political factors may make environmental projects simply untenable.

Donor agencies have increasingly realised that environmental projects need to concomitantly address underlying economic and social constraints to improve the sustainable management of environmental resources <sup>70</sup>.

Many projects and programmes reviewed in this study have highlighted, however, the continued:

- over-emphasis on the biophysical or technical aspects of environmental resource management;
- impediments to the successful establishment of alternative sources of livelihood, including the commonly weak infra-structural coverage, market fragmentation, low skills base and high labour investment requirements (Sekhran, 1996; Brooks, 1996);
- decline in government expenditure and limited public access to adequate basic social services.

This finding was aptly and succinctly pointed out by a villager in New Ireland Province (Bismarck Archipelago), Papua New Guinea, confronted with having to choose between a lucrative short-term option (provided by a Malaysian-owned logging company) and the less attractive environmentally sustainable option:

“I think the Integrated Conservation and Development (ICAD) Project has some really good ideas. I am happy they are considering our children’s future. Why can’t we have logging now and then have the ICAD later?” <sup>71</sup>

These findings are exemplified by the case of the Global Environment Facility (World Bank) support to the *Lake Malawi Biodiversity Conservation Programme* (see Box 3.6).

---

<sup>70</sup>. See, for example, the historical evolution of the World Bank’s Programmes de Gestion des Terroirs throughout the West African region.

<sup>71</sup>. Race for the Rainforest. Evaluating Lessons from an Integrated Conservation and Development “Experiment” in New Ireland, Papua New Guinea. GEF-UNDP (1997, p. 67).

**Box 3.6: GEF-World Bank support to the *Lake Malawi (Nyasa/Niassa) Biodiversity Conservation Project (LMBCP) (1993 - )***

The regional LMBCP has been jointly funded by *i.a.* the GEF-World Bank, CIDA, DfID, WWF-South Africa, UNDP and Danida (ca. US\$ 12.5m). The major thrust of the project has been on developing scientific capacity in fish taxonomy, limnology and watershed management.

The project has benefited from a cascade of visiting scientists (ca. 60), substantial long-term external technical assistance (ca. 70% of the total GEF/CIDA funds) and provided research scholarships for 9 Malawian, Tanzanian and Mozambican fisheries scientists. The project budget allocated for “strengthening national capacity” represents, at best, 9% of the overall funding.

Limited socio-economic or anthropological expertise has been provided or used by the project. The project has made few attempts to harness indigenous knowledge or to understand community-based institutions which influence *i.a.* lakeshore fishing communities’ practices. The project is established in Salima District on the (Malawian) lakeshore. Although the project was designed to support a process approach in developing strategies for the conservation of Lake Malawi, its catchments and its fish biodiversity, implementation has occurred in a “scientific vacuum”.

The project is characterised by the conspicuous absence of a coherent outreach or participatory strategy and negligible tangible benefits for the lakeshore communities. The project’s efforts to promote environmental education, a “Theatre for Africa”, guidebooks and a public/community awareness centre have all been undertaken independently of Government of Malawi institutions. This is in spite of the government’s decentralisation policy and the NEAP’s recognition “to give local communities the authority, power and knowledge to act so as to care for their environment and to participate in the management of protected areas.”

The Salima District Development and Executive Committees have not been involved in the design or implementation of the project. Similarly, the project has not developed effective linkages with an on-going GTZ-financed small-scale fisheries development project. The project’s scientific fisheries “bias” has resulted in excluding many stakeholders who use, or depend on the lake’s resources (e.g. lake transport, hydro-power development, small-scale farmers, tourist, hotel and cottage developers).

A recent proposal to establish a Lake Malawi Trust Fund has been designed primarily as a mechanism to sustain lakeshore (fisheries) research institutes in the riparian states. This is despite the overt declaration that “the project is for the people: those of the riparian countries, especially the lakeside dwellers” and the recognition of the need to “bridge the gap between knowledge (theory) and practical management”.

A reformulation of future support to the LMBCP is planned.

## Ad 7) Weaknesses in monitoring

Monitoring systems in many donor-supported environmental and CDE projects and programmes continue to focus on monitoring activities and outputs due, in part, to operating in an “indicator vacuum”.

Several evaluation reports reviewed in the context of the present study have continued to highlight the weaknesses (or lack) of effective monitoring systems in the design and implementation of CDE projects and programmes. The key gaps identified include:

- The frequently limited definition of baseline conditions of either environmental or institutional parameters;
- The frequent lack of contextual analysis and assessment of its influence on project or programme performance;
- The frequent lack of environmental impact monitoring.

The weaknesses in monitoring are exemplified by the case of Sida support to the *Soil and Water Conservation Branch, Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock Development and Marketing*, Kenya (see Box 3.7).

Despite a multitude of international organisations and initiatives which have attempted to develop environmental indicator sets, no coherent core set of environmental indicators is either recognised or used by the international community.

It is not clear what specific follow-up has occurred in the adoption and use of the CDE indicator framework commissioned by the WP/ENV's CDE Task Force in 1995 (see Annex 5).

Recent international initiatives have tended towards the consolidation and harmonisation of criteria and indicators (UNEP, 1994, and UNCSD, 1996). The case of the forestry sector clearly illustrates the difficulties confronting donor agencies in developing simple, replicable and useable indicator sets <sup>72</sup>. Further details are provided in the Inception Report (PEMconsult, 1997, pp. 13-15).

A key area of concern is whether the growing interest in *Results* or *Performance Based Management* systems within the donor agency community runs the risk of reinforcing output-oriented approaches to ODA projects and programmes (see, for example, Sida-UNDP, 1997, UNDP, 1997b and Morgan, 1997).

---

<sup>72</sup>. The forestry sector is treated as a sub-sector of agriculture under the current DAC classification of aid.



**Box 3.7: Sida support to the *Soil and Water Conservation Branch (SWCB)*, Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock Development and Marketing (MALDM), Kenya (1974-1996)**

Sida support to SWCB was initiated in four pilot districts. Support for a national programme started in 1981, a “catchment” area approach introduced in 1987, rapid rural appraisals in 1989 and participatory rural appraisals in 1991.

The SWCB promotes the introduction and use of improved land husbandry practices by farmers and pastoralists through *i.a.* soil and water conservation techniques, increased and diversified production and use of trees and tree products, control of run-off from physical infrastructure and use of tools and simple technologies for conservation, production, processing and marketing of agricultural products.

SWCB’s most recent approach has been based on facilitating farmers’ choices of soil and water conservation measures by District Planning Teams comprising Divisional Soil Conservation Officers and Front Line Extension Workers.

Long-term support has resulted in SWC measures being adopted on 30-40% of all farms in Kenya. SWCB remains “marginalised” within the steeply hierarchical Ministry of Agriculture and was still 95% dependent on external funding for its operations in 1995, i.e. it has essentially remained a supply-driven programme. A decentralised and participatory approach was introduced but has not been integrated into routine ministerial planning and reporting formats. Targeted district-level training was mitigated by high staff turnover.

A comprehensive set of indicators was developed and used to monitor physical implementation of the main activities of the programme. The impact of SWC measures is not, however, well documented. No impact-monitoring data had been collected after 21 years of external support. The evaluation team proposed measuring soil loss from suspended sediment loads of major rivers as a basis for impact monitoring.

Strategic long-term planning by SWCB was initiated in 1995 but the process has been framed by a “project” rather than an institutional capacity development approach. Numerous donor agencies and NGOs are involved in SWC and agroforestry activities albeit with limited overall direction from the Government of Kenya.

## Ad 8) Financial sustainability

Most donor agencies' environmental and CDE projects and programmes pay limited regard to financial sustainability issues.

A limited number of projects and programmes reviewed in this study had undertaken cursory assessments of existing financial capacities of the institutions supported.

Few, if any, references are made to existing recurrent or development budgets, let alone a contextual assessment of the relative importance of an organisation's budget *vis à vis* overall government or institutional expenditure.

Recipient country institutions' concerns with the financial sustainability of CDE projects, programmes and processes (as expressed at the 1993 CDE Workshop) would appear not to have been heeded (see, for example, Niang, 1995).

This finding is aptly reflected in a South African Community Development Resource Association Annual Report which pointed out:

“Where donors are the major source of income and where donors set the rules by limiting their interventions to short-term, package-oriented, single intervention project grants, the flexibility to change and improve is severely hampered. Where donors pay scant regard to the capacity building requirements of organisations like sustained funding for administration costs, the game becomes largely self-defeating” (cited in Eade, 1997, p. 191).

In spite of this general finding, several donor-supported organisations have successfully defined and developed their own funding strategies.<sup>73</sup>

These findings are illustrated by the case studies of the:

- Sida support to the *Centre for Science and Environment*, India (see Box 3.8)
- Sida support to the *Dissemination Division at Instituto Nacional de Biodiversidad, INBio*, Costa Rica (see Box 4.13).

---

<sup>73</sup>. See, for example, Danida-UNSO-Institute of Geography (University of Copenhagen) support to the Centre de Suivi Écologique, Sénégal (Rasmussen *et al.*, 1998) and the Peru-Canada Fund (Morgan, 1994).

**Box 3.8: Sida support to the *Centre for Science and Environment* (CSE), India (1989 - )**

Sida has primarily provided core budget support to CSE which has emerged as a leading environmental NGO in India.

CSE's public awareness, lobbying and advocacy work has resulted in the production of a large number of quality environmental publications, including its State of the Environment series, the fortnightly Down to Earth magazine, India and South Asia Green Files, three video films, fellowships for environmental journalists and general policy research.

CSE has also established an impressive network with Government of India departments, other NGOs, media organisations and the business community. Core budget support can be an effective and flexible mechanism for CDE within an NGO if the donor agency has established "trust" with senior management and the organisation has a proven "track record" in achieving results. Such flexibility, however, requires regular monitoring of a mutually agreed and understood framework to address key institutional, managerial and financial issues with indicators and "milestones" specified. "Over-funding" by several donors (CSE has also received support from i.a. NORAD, Danida, the Netherlands, UNDP, UNEP and UNIFEM) may result in significant functional capacity development but can be counter-productive vis à vis managerial and financial capacity development. Revenues from all CSE's products and services declined by 100% between 1993 and 1996.

Over-dependence on one "star" may have resulted in reinforcing an over-centralised management culture, high(-er) staff turnover and, thus, institutional instability. Organisational growth and development cannot be achieved without a commensurate decentralisation of decision-making and budgeting.

CSE's revenue base depends on external funding. CSE has not explored domestic revenue potentials (such as advertising, increased subscription costs, more effective cost-accounting, research and industry grants, and trust funds).

The evaluation team recommended CSE to prepare a "Vision"/long-term strategy, to strengthen capacity to generate domestic financing and to strengthen its own internal organisational and managerial capacities by "accompanying" the Centre through a more structured relationship encompassing annual policy dialogues and/or short-term strategic managerial/planning support.

#### **4. RECIPIENT COUNTRY INSTITUTIONS' CAPACITIES TO DESIGN AND MANAGE CDE PROJECTS, PROGRAMMES AND PROCESSES**

##### **4.1 Key Findings**

###### **4.1.1 Introduction**

The assessment of recipient country institutions' capacities to effectively design and manage CDE projects, programmes and processes was based on the functional objectives of CDE presented in 1.2. The assessment is, however, limited because of the nature of the study itself. Although the assessment of generic capacity and specific environment capacity constraints has been based as much as possible on documentation prepared by representatives of developing country institutions, it has remained, essentially, a deductive process.

The source materials used for the assessment of the different organisational types have, in contrast, invariably been commissioned by donor agencies and not recipient governments or institutions<sup>74</sup>. The assessment was based on a sample of evaluation, review and project completion reports covering 33 organisations/programmes supported by donor agencies predominantly during the period after UNCED (*cf.* Annex 7). Additional sources of information have also been used where appropriate (or available). It has not been possible during the course of the study to consult or exchange ideas with any of the recipient governments or institutions.

###### **4.1.2 Demand for CDE**

###### ***Capacity development in environment does not appear to be a priority concern in many developing countries***

In the context of the widespread political changes and civil service reforms that have characterised developing countries during the late 1980s and 1990s, the over-riding concerns of many governments have remained:

- overall macro-economic performance through the promotion of economic efficiency (with limited emphasis placed on distributional considerations); and
- the maintenance or improvement of basic social services.

These priorities have often been inextricably linked with complementary (priority) measures aimed at “down-sizing” government, decentralising government services and facilitating greater private sector

---

<sup>74</sup>. The extent to which nationals in recipient countries are engaged by and involved in evaluations is extremely variable. The sample of evaluation reports used in this study would tend to confirm earlier findings that evaluation remains predominantly the domain of donor agencies (see North, 1997b).

and civil society involvement in a broad range of developmental efforts, i.e. addressing *generic* capacity constraints rather than *specific* capacity development in environment constraints.

Capacity development in environment has not, in general, been a *priority* for most developing country governments. It should be emphasised that this does not imply that the same governments have not, concomitantly, and increasingly, attempted to address environmental concerns associated with economic development. The results or performance have, however, been extremely variable and successes (or relative failures) have frequently been shaped by the degree of political commitment and the economic and institutional settings.

The examples of three contrasting countries (Chile, Malawi and Thailand) illustrate the extent to which:

- significant changes in government in some countries have ushered in new interest in the environment (in Chile after the democratic government of President Patricio Aylwin took office in 1990, and in Malawi after President Bakili Muluzi took office in 1991);
- the evolution of the policy, institutional and legislative reforms which have been instigated by government have provided enabling frameworks but which are still constrained by capacity to implement (all three countries have introduced new policies, created new institutions and passed framework environmental laws between 1990 and 1996);
- each country's overall economic performance and the degree of involvement of the civil society, the private sector and other institutions have complemented (or not) these public sector initiatives (Chile and Thailand have both performed better than Malawi which is still confronted with enormous capacity constraints);
- governments attempted to promote institutional pluralism through the decentralisation of environmental services (all three countries).

#### **4.1.3    *Integration into macro-economic policy***

***Adjusted economic growth models still underpin development policy in many developing countries. A significant shift in emphasis towards environmentally sustainable development has occurred in a few countries***

The integration of environmental concerns in national economic and sectoral planning and decision-making processes remains weak in many developing countries. This often reflects the overriding economic growth priority. The situation is also frequently compounded by the institutional segregation of key economic and key environmental boards, councils or commissions.<sup>75</sup> In some cases, the results of structural adjustment lending (SAL) have neither restructured economies nor promoted environmentally sustainable development<sup>76</sup>.

---

<sup>75</sup>. For example, the cases of Thailand (National Economic and Social Development Board *and* a National Environment Board) and Malawi (National Economic Council *and* a National Committee for the Environment).

<sup>76</sup>. Structural adjustment loans and sectoral credits provided by IDA and a large number of bilateral and multilateral donor agencies to the Government of Malawi between 1981 and 1996 amounted to US\$ 920m. An estimated 4% of these loans were used in support of environmental rather than macro-economic, fiscal or sectoral objectives. The net outcome of the SAL is that there has been no significant structural change in the economy which remains, essentially, an "erosive" tobacco and maize economy. One recent study concluded "The development approach in Malawi has been top-

A number of countries, in contrast, have attempted to establish “super” or new structures (under the umbrellas of a Council for Sustainable Development, an inter-ministerial advisory commission or a Ministry for the Coordination of Environmental Affairs) to signal greater political commitment to, and support for, environmentally sustainable development<sup>77</sup>. Regional political endorsement of environmentally sustainable development (and regional frameworks to support its promotion) *may* have helped to galvanize such responses from national governments.<sup>78</sup>

This approach has created a new “critical focus” within government, bringing together existing -- and creating when necessary -- institutions with diverse interests to work towards a set of shared goals. In one country, an “abiding commitment to preserve its rich and varied natural endowments” has provided the cornerstone of political support for environmentally sustainable development<sup>79</sup>.

#### **4.1.4 Public sector environmental institutions**

##### ***There is a general limited capacity of public sector environmental institutions to implement environmental or monitor sectoral programmes***

Most developing countries now have in place some form of agency or ministry (sometimes both) with overall responsibility for environment<sup>80</sup>. In many countries environment ministries have been formed through a process of:

- integration with other sectoral ministries<sup>81</sup> or
- transforming earlier ministerial mandates<sup>82</sup> or
- metamorphosis of institutions into fully-fledged ministries<sup>83</sup>

---

down: as a result, projects have been implemented which have had no relevance to the real needs of the beneficiaries or they have been poorly targeted” (Chilowa and Chirwa, 1997. See also World Bank, 1996b; Centre for Development Research, 1997, and Danida, 1998b).

<sup>77</sup>. For example, Costa Rica (Ministry of Environment and Energy), Bolivia (Ministry of Sustainable Development and Environment, National Secretariat of Planning), Chile (Comisión Nacional del Medio Ambiente) and Mozambique (Ministry for the Coordination of Environmental Affairs).

<sup>78</sup>. For example, the (former) Central America (now) Latin American and Caribbean Commission on Development and Environment convened in 1988 and the growing importance attached to environmental issues by the Association of South-East Asian Nations (ASEAN).

<sup>79</sup>. For example, Bhutan (see Eighth Five Year Plan 1997-2002, Vol. I Main Document p. i, Ministry of Planning, Royal Government of Bhutan, September 1996).

<sup>80</sup>. For example, Tanzania has both an Environment Department, now placed within the Office of the Vice President (formerly it was placed within the Ministry of Tourism, Natural Resources and Environment) and the earlier National Environment Management Council established pursuant to the promulgation of the National Environment Management Act No. 19 in 1983.

<sup>81</sup>. Including, i.a, water (and formerly tourism, in Burkina Faso), energy (Costa Rica), agriculture and rural development (several countries), research (formerly Malawi) and parliamentary affairs (Sri Lanka).

<sup>82</sup>. For example, Thailand’s former Ministry of Science, Technology and Energy became the Ministry of Science, Technology and *Environment* after the National Environmental Quality Act was passed in 1992.

It is not clear to what extent these institutional changes have been “owned” by national governments or have been made in response to growing donor agency interest in environmental issues.

The most significant change associated with these institutional developments has been the broadening of the mandates and public-sector tasks and responsibilities to encompass both the historical natural resource management (source) issues and the new environmental management (sink) issues. In the context of the generic capacity constraints which have confronted developing country governments throughout this period, it is perhaps not surprising that most public sector environment institutions have not been able to cope with these additional tasks and responsibilities. Many types of environmental organisations have, however, successfully supported processes which have resulted in the preparation of the following outputs:

- environmental policies;
- environmental plans (National Environmental Action Plans, National Conservation Strategies, District Environmental Action Plans, etc.);
- framework environmental laws;
- EIA guidelines and procedures and environmental standards;
- environmental databases;
- numerous environmental publications.

The degree of stakeholder consultation during the preparation of these outputs has varied enormously.

Comparatively little effort has been expended on following through in terms of identifying and supporting the mechanisms to facilitate implementation of the plans and strategies with the aims of *improving*:

- the environmental conditions and/or
- the underlying economic and social conditions of the environmental resource users <sup>84</sup>.

The institutional division of responsibilities for the source and the sink functions of the environment remains a critically weak arena in many developing countries (Noman, 1994 and Kamukala, 1995). The capacities of national public sector environment institutions, typically, remain weak and their influence, as critical focal points, limited. These capacity constraints are recognised and have been compounded by donor agency interventions, particularly in the relatively poorer countries such as Burkina Faso:

---

<sup>83</sup>. For example, the Nicaraguan Institute of Natural Resources (1983) which became the Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources (MARENA) in 1994. The Malawian Research and Environmental Affairs Department (within the Office of the President and Cabinet) later became a Ministry of Research and Environmental Affairs in 1994 and was subsequently reorganised as a Ministry of Forestry, Fisheries and Environmental Affairs in 1996. And in Mozambique, the Comissao Nacional do Meio-Ambiente became the Ministry for the Coordination of Environmental Affairs in 1994.

<sup>84</sup>. For example, the evaluation of Environmental Programmes in Latin America and the Caribbean found that only 23% of natural resources management programmes had developed systems to sustainably *enhance* the natural resource base. Only 20% of the pollution control programmes included specific activities to *reduce* pollution (UNDP, 1997d).

“La faiblesse essentielle de la politique environnementale réside en la non-clarification du rôle de chaque acteur (institution) et la non-formulation d’une règle du jeu qui définisse les prérogatives de chaque institution en fonction de sa vocation” (Coulibaly, 1995).

“La dépendance du pays sur les ressources extérieures crée des problèmes pour la coordination de la politique nationale de l’environnement et l’harmonisation des activités. Les bailleurs de fonds ont souvent une influence sur l’organigramme de l’administration, insistant sur la création de nouvelles structures comme préalable à leur financement. Ceci mène à l’existence de multiples structures duplicatives, qui sont cohérentes du point de vue du projet donné, mais qui ne le sont pas d’un point de vue global”<sup>85</sup>.

The capacity constraints of national public sector environment institutions have also been exacerbated by the donor agencies’ growing interest in global environmental issues:

“Experience in many countries has shown that the overlapping and sometimes duplicative commitments under multiple (global) instruments<sup>86</sup> can produce tremendous challenges. Commitments to prepare inventories, reports, plans and public information programmes, can lead to in-country conflicts, confusion and wastage of resources, particularly for countries with limited financial, human and institutional capacity” (UNDP, 1997e).

#### **4.1.5 Environmental information**

***National environmental information systems have been successfully developed in many countries. The systematic use and application of environmental information in economic and sectoral policy, planning and programming remains, however, limited***

Many countries, often with donor assistance, have invested considerable resources in the development of environmental information systems, frequently encompassing the use of geographic information systems (GIS). The success of these initiatives has, however, been extremely variable.<sup>87</sup>

In spite of this achievement, reliable information on the state of the environment is still often fragmented and frequently “divorced” from economic or sectoral data collected and collated by *i.a.* ministries of finance, economy, planning, water, energy and agriculture.

Most projects and programmes reviewed in this study continue to focus almost exclusively on monitoring progress of physical implementation, *i.e.* project and programme activities and outputs to

---

<sup>85</sup>. *Resumé des questions institutionnelles concernant la gestion de l’environnement*. Internal document prepared for a NEAP Coordination Meeting held in Ouagadougou, 9 March 1995 (UNDP, 1995).

<sup>86</sup>. The Convention on Biological Diversity, the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change, the Convention to Combat Desertification and the Forestry Principles.

<sup>87</sup>. For example, the *Centre de Suivi Écologique* in Sénégal has successfully developed and applied national environmental monitoring capacity through a long-term twinning arrangement with a university (Rasmussen et al., 1998). In contrast, the *Mapping of Land Use by Remote Sensing Project* in Belize was characterised by “design flaws, weak national ownership and frequent turnover of government counterpart staff which limited the impact of the project’s institutional strengthening component” cited in UNDP, 1997).



satisfy donor agency reporting requirements. This invariably reflects the absence of clearly established baseline conditions or well-defined environmental impact parameters <sup>88</sup>.

Recipient countries and donor agencies are encountering considerable difficulties using environmental information in developing and using operational CDE indicators which will:

- allow environmental resource users (the primary stakeholders) to set objectives and monitor progress at the local level;
- allow aggregation at the national level;
- meet the goals of results-based systems, which are increasingly required by donor agencies, without compromising the principles of “ownership” and “participation” <sup>89</sup>.

#### **4.1.6 Public participation**

##### ***Public participation is increasingly demand driven***

In many developing countries, particularly those in Asia and Latin America, the sustained activities of environmental NGOs have engendered the progressive emergence of public demand for greater environmental accountability in government decision-making. Public conflicts have, in some cases, precipitated policy and institutional reforms. <sup>90</sup>

Many countries still lack, however, statutory public disclosure legislation and have not established formal public enquiry systems. The need for substantial improvements in fostering public involvement and “ownership” of the EIA process were also highlighted in a recent study which found:

“Despite the near absence of public involvement in EIA practice in Tanzania, there was a strong consensus that this should be a central feature of EIA.”

“Inadequate scoping, poor terms of reference, insufficient time and socio-cultural factors” were found to “constrain public involvement” (Mwalyosi and Hughes, 1998, pp. 29-30).

In the context of governments’ decentralisation imperatives, the need to develop and formalise mechanisms to promote public participation with urban municipal authorities and rural communities are key challenges. Preliminary evidence suggests that greater progress has been achieved in the former case, sometimes due to an historical legal precedent <sup>91</sup>.

---

<sup>88</sup>. For example, no impact-monitoring data (of soil and water conservation measures advised by the Government of Kenya’s Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Marketing) had been collected after 21 years of continuous assistance (Sida, 1996d). See also Box 3.7.

<sup>89</sup>. See, for example, CIDA (1994); Institute of Development Studies (1997); Morgan (1997) and Boesen and Lafontaine (1998).

<sup>90</sup>. For example, public criticism of the original Bangladesh Flood Action Plan resulted in national policy and institutional reforms and donor agency policy reform [see Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs (1998), and Hanchett, 1997].

<sup>91</sup>. For example, the City Planning Law of 1972 in Thailand has enabled public participation in the process of formulating specific urban land use plans at the local level (ICLEI/UNCHS, 1995).

Participatory processes are, in several countries, still predominantly at the institutional rather than at the community level <sup>92</sup>.

#### **4.1.7 Institutional networking**

##### ***Institutional networking is increasingly promoted and formalised***

An indicative estimate of trends in institutional networking was provided in the evaluation of *Environmental Programmes in Latin America and the Caribbean* (UNDP, 1997d) which found that more than 60% of projects had resources and mechanisms for consulting institutions and people who would be affected by the project.

Many different forms of effective institutional networking mechanisms have been identified including *i.a.*

- regional training programmes <sup>93</sup>;
- national policy research institutes <sup>94</sup>;
- national networks of focal persons <sup>95</sup>;
- national environment programmes involving several organisational types (national/sub-national public sector, universities, schools and NGOs) <sup>96</sup>;
- national NGO alliances to promote environmental policy dialogue <sup>97</sup>;
- community-based organisations (CBOs) <sup>98</sup>.

---

<sup>92</sup>. A clear exception is where recipient country institutions have been able to effectively use donor agencies' decentralised funding mechanisms. The GEF Small Grants Programme in Bolivia administered by a coalition of NGOs, the Environmental Defence League – LIDEMA cited in UNDP (1997d) and the Peru-Canada Fund established as an independent foundation under Peruvian civil law (Morgan, 1994) provide good examples.

<sup>93</sup>. For example, the SADC Training Programme for Rural Energy Planning and Environmental Management with 8 institutions and 23 individuals participating (the Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 1996) and the Asian Institute of Technology (Sida, 1996/12).

<sup>94</sup>. For example, the Thailand Development Research Institute, the Bolivian Social Policy Analysis Unit (UDAPSO) and the Malawian Centre for Social Research.

<sup>95</sup>. For example, the Land Use Planning Section, Ministry of Agriculture, Royal Government of Bhutan.

<sup>96</sup>. For example, Sustainable Development in Mozambique. Support to the Ministry for Coordination of Environmental Affairs (UNDP/the Netherlands, 1996-2001).

<sup>97</sup>. For example, the Woodland Mangement Policy Group comprising four NGOs in Zimbabwe (SAFIRE, BUN ENDA and ZERO).

<sup>98</sup>. For example, the *Sagip Kalikasan* (Save the Environment) Development Foundation in the Bicol Region of South Luzon, Philippines (AusAID, 1995a).

#### 4.1.8 Financial sustainability

***Mobilising sources of local funding to sustain environmental organisations and programmes remains a fundamental constraint in many countries. Innovative financing arrangements have been successfully developed in a few countries***

Fiscal support for environmental institutions and programmes is limited in most developing countries<sup>99</sup>.

A key generic constraint common to many developing countries is that national public sector institutions are unlikely -- in the context of widespread government austerity measures -- to relinquish already limited budgets to sub-national public sector structures in order to promote institutional pluralism.

Many of the organisational types reviewed in this study continue to be confronted with weak funding bases and/or increased donor dependency, even after several years of external support<sup>100</sup>.

Managerial (and commercial) capacity development is frequently absent or lags behind technical capacity *per se* in many organisational types<sup>101</sup>.

Potentially significant "zero" financing options (policy reforms, the removal of subsidies and market distortions, and the application of other economic instruments) to promote environmentally sustainable development have often proved difficult to implement for political, economic and social reasons<sup>102</sup>.

Innovative financing mechanisms have, however, been successfully developed:

- *sometimes* after earlier "failures"<sup>103</sup>

---

<sup>99</sup>. For example, 90% of the Government of Burkina Faso Public Investment Programme budget allocation to the Ministry of Environment and Water in 1996 was for water resources development. The Royal Government of Thailand's Cabinet resolution of 16 November 1993 to provide additional financial support to improve watershed management amounted to only 2% of the total fiscal support for water resources development projects in the same year. Budgetary allocations to the Nicaraguan Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources grew from 0.6% to 3.8% of all ministerial allocations between 1991 and 1994.

<sup>100</sup>. For example, the Government of Kenya's Soil and Water Conservation Branch, the Ecotoxicology Institute in Pakistan, the National Wetland Steering Committee in Sri Lanka and the Centre for Science and the Environment in India.

<sup>101</sup>. See, for example, the Land Use Planning Section, Ministry of Agriculture in Bhutan and the Eastern and Southern Africa Management Institute in Tanzania.

<sup>102</sup>. A recent World Bank study found that the average price charged for water covered only a third of the cost of supplying it several years after the Copenhagen Statement adopted the principle of treating water as an economic good. Cited in *The Economist* 21 March 1998. See also Thailand Development Research Institute/HIID (1995) with reference to water pricing and, with reference to subsidies of commercial energy supplies, Danida (1996h) and Wardell (1997).

<sup>103</sup>. For example, the Peru-Canada Fund (Morgan, 1994).

This would tend to indicate the need for greater understanding and acceptance (among both recipient governments and donor agencies) of the distinction between “output failure” and the value of lessons learned which can be applied by persevering in complex institutional settings<sup>104</sup>.

- *rarely* during design/inception phases of CDE projects<sup>105</sup>

This would tend to indicate the need for donor agencies, in particular, to undertake more thorough *ex-ante* institutional analyses and assessments.

- *more commonly* involving “hands-off” core funding support from donor agencies to allow the organisations to determine and develop their own future funding modalities<sup>106</sup>.

This would tend to indicate the need for greater compliance *vis à vis* the OECD-DAC *Principles for New Orientations in Technical Co-operation*<sup>107</sup>.

## 4.2 Generic Capacity Constraints

A poignant description of generic capacity constraints (and the attendant failure of earlier capacity development efforts) in developing countries -- with particular reference to Africa -- was presented by the African Governors of the World Bank to President James D. Wolfensohn in September 1996<sup>108</sup>.

This report highlighted many endemic problems associated with public sector organisations, viz.,

“If there is one, most obvious lesson that can be drawn from the experience of the generation after independence in Africa, it is the crucial importance of establishing good governance...” (p. 2)

“There are severe capacity constraints in literally all sectors in almost all the countries, characterized by a shortage of skilled staff and weak institutional environments which undermine the proper utilization of existing capacity... Almost every African country has witnessed a systematic regression of capacity in the last thirty years; the majority had better capacity at independence than they now possess...” (p. 5)

“In practically every country, the civil service was found to be too large in non-essential areas and in critical need of personnel in others. The civil service is also too politicized and lacking in professionalism. Even where skills are available, they are underutilized because of poor deployment, a weak institutional environment, lack of morale, or political interference in administration and the assignment of responsibilities...” (p. 6)

---

<sup>104</sup>. This finding is also aptly illustrated by the “failure” of the GEF-UNDP *Lak Integrated Conservation and Development Project* in Papua New Guinea, providing lessons now being used in the *Bismarck-Ramu ICADP*.

<sup>105</sup>. For example, the National Biodiversity Institute in Costa Rica (Sida Evaluation 97/4, October 1996).

<sup>106</sup>. For example, Centre de Suivi Écologique in Sénégal (Rasmussen *et al.*, 1998) and the Environmental Protection Training and Research Institute in India (Sida Evaluation 97/3, December 1996).

<sup>107</sup>. An indicative scale of the relative extent to which different DAC Member donor agencies follow “hands-on” or “hands-off” approaches is presented in Kealy (1994 p. 36).

<sup>108</sup>. *Partnership for Capacity Building in Africa: Strategy and Program of Action* (African Governors of the World Bank, 26 September 1996) cited in Klitgaard (1997). See also World Bank (1996d).

“Civil service remuneration is extremely low and employment benefits (such as pension schemes, health facilities and loan schemes), which used to make the civil service attractive, are no longer attainable in many countries. This has led to ‘institutionalized corruption’, laxity and general lack of discipline in the civil service...” (p. 6)

“Consensus is building around the idea of a different kind of government and civil service – smaller and less expensive in the aggregate, but staffed by a highly motivated, capable, and competitively paid corps of public servants. However, in the past, adjustment programs have tended to emphasize the first half of this agenda -- fiscal restraint -- while paying little attention to how best to reorient the civil service. This has contributed to a steady decline in real public sector wages, the undermining of capacity to deliver public services, and erosion in the credibility of public administration. Adjustment policy matrices, while specific in terms of wage bill limits and reduction in civil service employment, are usually vague, or even silent, on how to implement such restraints without further damage to morale and the effectiveness of the public service...” (pp. 25-26)

“African governments must commit themselves to reforming and revitalizing their civil services, rebuilding them around the ideals of professionalism, meritocracy, accountability, and provision of quality services to citizens. Much has been said, written and attempted in the past in these areas, while results have been far from satisfactory. This suggests that governments must be willing to take bold and radical actions that require political courage. These may include drastic reductions in the size of the civil service so that governments can afford to pay competitive salaries to the civil servants who remain...” (p. 33)

Generic capacity constraints are particularly severe in Africa but comparable situations exist in other developing countries and regions. This “erosion” of capacity is all the more remarkable in the context of the multiple civil service reform and CD initiatives supported by donor agencies during the 1980s and 1990s.<sup>109</sup>

The World Bank’s Operations Evaluation Department found among completed projects evaluated in 1994:

“... only 44%... were expected to sustain their benefits throughout the operational phase that follows the completion of Bank loan disbursements. Institutional development goals were substantially achieved in 39% of the operations...” (World Bank *Annual Report* 1996).

Efforts to improve public sector performance in achieving higher productivity and service quality have been influenced, to a large extent, by donor agencies’ own civil service reform and CD programmes. Four other factors are considered to have negatively influenced the outcomes of generic institutional capacity development initiatives, viz.,

- weak and inconsistent political and administrative leadership of reform processes (notably in connection with implementing retrenchment programmes)<sup>110</sup>;
- poor retention or effective utilisation/deployment of professional and technical personnel<sup>111</sup>;

---

<sup>109</sup>. In 1992 it was estimated that there were approximately 100 000 expatriate advisors working in the public sectors of Sub-Saharan African countries alone at an annual cost of more than US\$ 4 billion (Cohen, 1992).

<sup>110</sup>. One known exception to this rule is Uganda under President Museveni.

- capacity “overload”, inadequate donor co-ordination and limited familiarity of recipient institutions with donor agencies’ procedures<sup>112</sup>;
- the existence of corruption in the public and private sectors (including NGOs)<sup>113</sup>.

It is interesting to note the growing recognition among donor agencies that they are often part of the capacity problem in developing countries. According to a recent World Bank report, the Bank has tended:

“... to exacerbate Africa’s capacity problems through approaches that have been supply driven and geared to satisfying internal institutional demands rather than tackling the more difficult task of helping Africa countries to build capacity to do things themselves.”<sup>114</sup>

### 4.3 Specific Environmental Capacity Constraints

A recipient country delegate at the 1993 CDE Workshop in Costa Rica was asked the question: “How does government get in-house co-ordination?” to which she replied:

“Never! This is the really crucial thing: when the environmental entity tries to co-ordinate itself with others, disaster starts precisely because the environmental sector has been placed as a sector and a very weak one. A sector that nobody pays any attention to because it’s a sector that doesn’t have the money, doesn’t have the political clout, many times doesn’t have the political support. How is this environmental entity going to enforce and to co-ordinate the others? How is this environmental entity going to co-ordinate the finance minister, the planning ministry? The only thing that has been changing a little bit is that, now that the banks are interested, and the banks usually talk to the finance minister and the planning minister, now these ministers have been forced to talk to the environmental sector” (OECD-DAC, 1994).

The specific environmental capacity constraints of many national public sector environmental organisations in developing countries can be summarised as:

- Environment ministries are commonly relatively young, poorly staffed and, hence, weak organisations with limited political influence or fiscal support;<sup>115</sup>
- Environment ministries are typically centralised (i.e. institutional monopolies) with limited representation at the level of decentralised public sector structures;<sup>116</sup>

---

<sup>111</sup>. This problem is frequently compounded by donor agencies providing more attractive opportunities in country or in regional organisations they (also) support. See, for example UNDP/HIID (1996) and Cohen and Wheeler (1997).

<sup>112</sup>. See, for example, Adamolekun *et al.* (1997).

<sup>113</sup>. See, for example, Helleiner *et al.* (1995, p. 33) and Klitgaard (1997).

<sup>114</sup>. Cited in OECD-DAC (1997d). Another recent academic and complementary trend is the attempt to further develop indices to rank foreign donor agencies in terms of the scale and equity of aid giving (see, for example, McGillivray, 1989; White, 1992; Rao, 1994 and Rao, 1997).

<sup>115</sup>. See, for example, OECD-DAC (1994) pp. 46-53.

<sup>116</sup>. For example, in Thailand the Ministry of Science, Technology and Environment has four regional (sub-national) offices to cover 25 provincial administrations created under the Regional Administration Act, 1991.

- The mandates of environment ministries frequently overlap with other sectoral and non-sectoral line ministries resulting in institutional “turf battles” and, thus, they are often limited by their own institutional setting;
- Environmental policy and attendant sectoral legislation is often inchoate;
- The capacity to commission, review and use EIAs in national planning is often rudimentary;<sup>117</sup>
- The capacity to enforce mitigation measures prescribed in EIAs or the “polluter pays” principle is wantonly lacking;
- Few attempts have been made to routinely and systematically internalise the environmental costs of development projects as a precondition for approval.

#### 4.4 Organisational Successes

##### *Many organisations in developing countries have performed relatively well*

The initial macro-economic reforms associated with stabilisation and structural adjustment programmes have not resulted in significant or widespread improvements in institutional performance in many developing countries.<sup>118</sup>

Similarly, the experience with subsequent types of reform which have focused on improving incentives (salaries, conditions of employment, etc.) through the “down-sizing” of the state and the establishment of “leaner and meaner” civil services has also not proved uniformly successful (de Merode and Thomas, 1994).

In spite of these trends, a number of organisations have continued to perform relatively well, even in the context of overall poor public sector performance. This finding has resulted in the (re-)emergence<sup>119</sup> of the concept of an organisational culture to explain and understand organisational change and to identify the “missing ingredients” in efforts to improve institutional performance.

The examples of organisations which have performed relatively well distinguish between the following organisational types:<sup>120</sup>

---

<sup>117</sup>. See, for example, Mwalyosi and Hughes (1998). Some Asian and Latin American countries have developed relatively more effective EIA procedures (for example, Malaysia, Thailand and Nicaragua).

<sup>118</sup>. See, for example, Reed (1992); SASDA (1994); Lindauer and Nunberg (1994); Zartman (1995) and Grindle (1997b).

<sup>119</sup>. Earlier work challenged the established view of organisations as “machines” or “organisms” and led to the idea of an organisational “spirit”, “character” or “culture”. See Barnard (1938); Roethlisberger and Dickson (1939); Selnick (1957); Deal and Kennedy (1982); Peters and Waterman (1982); Martin (1992); Kotter and Heskett (1992) and Grindle (1997a).

<sup>120</sup>. The CDE Questionnaire responses indicate that most donor agencies continue to support organisations within this typological framework. No evaluation reports of *private sector* organisations were received (or identified) by the study team.

- i. Regional organisations
- ii. National policy research institutes
- iii. National ministries of environment
- iv. Other national sectoral ministries
- v. Specialised national environment institutes
- vi. Sub-national organisations
- vii. Non-governmental organisations
- viii. Community-based organisations.

The organisational examples have, to a large extent, been selected from the sample of CDE projects and programmes assessed in the context of this study. In other cases, additional evaluation or “lessons learned” reports and complementary sources of information have been used. In each case, comparable cases of relative “successes” in other countries or geographical regions are indicated.

#### **Ad 1) Regional organisations**

***Regional organisations can improve inter-governmental policy-making, institutional networking, collective action and assistance for capacity development in environment but may have exacerbated national capacity constraints***

Several regional environmental organisations have performed relatively well but *may* have weakened national capacities by often providing better incentives than most national institutions. These include the illustrative case of the Eastern and Southern African Management Institute -- specifically the Agriculture, Energy and Environmental Management Division (see Box 4.1), the Mekong River Commission and the Comité Inter-États de Lutte contre la Sécheresse dans le Sahel.

The performance of regional environmental organisations (and programmes) has been enhanced and sustained when they have clearly demonstrated and/or established comparative advantages over national organisations and programmes. The lack of an appropriate regional organisation should not predetermine the need to establish a new one.

The generic lessons learned of relevance to regional organisations indicate that a process approach with well-targeted and modest interventions help to build and sustain regional capacity. (This generic framework is adapted from Danida, 1997b.) Such a process should:

- a) Specify, and initially distinguish between, the regional transboundary, local transboundary and common environmental or CDE issues to be addressed. Identify and specify the comparative advantage(s) of a regional organisation as a preferred organisational option over national organisations in terms of one or more functions of regional co-operation, viz., inter-governmental policy-making, institutional networking, collective action and CD or CDE assistance to other organisations in the region;
- b) Adopt a strategy which promotes management of environmental resources or CDE at the lowest appropriate institutional level through the diversification and rational choice of implementing partners;
- c) Choose implementing partners on the basis of four key criteria, viz., need, relevance, existing capacity and accessibility;
- d) Integrate these four dimensions to select priority areas of intervention.



**Box 4.1: Netherlands support for *Rural Energy Planning and Environmental Management, Agriculture, Energy and Environmental Management Division, Eastern and Southern African Management Institute (ESAMI)***

ESAMI's regional *Programme for Rural Energy Planning and Environmental Management (REPEM)* was funded by the Netherlands (ca. US\$ 3.3m) between 1994 and 1997 based on a tripartite MOU established after "extended negotiations and preparation" between the SADC-Technical Administration Unit for the Energy Sector, ESAMI and the Technology and Development Advisory Group of the University of Twente (TDG –TU), the Netherlands.

*Key lessons learned:*

- REPEM design process addressed a common regional environmental issue. This followed a slow and focused approach to fill a perceived (regional) gap in rural energy supply policies which "place significant emphasis on sophisticated technology aimed at energy switching and improving efficiency of utilisation and less emphasis on active management of natural resources on the supply side" by providing training services and developing curricula.
- The MOU delineated clear responsibilities to all participating organisations and included some regional financing (10% of ESAMI's income met through SADC member states' contributions). A simple management hierarchy was established and a core regional energy expert was appointed. A separate contract between the Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs and TDG-UT weakened "ownership" because ESAMI did not have final control over their inputs.
- Networking promoted and formalised with 8 national energy institutions in the region and 23 regional resource persons although limited involvement of private sector organisations. Regional co-operation enriched the programme through "joint lecturing, excursions and exchange of experiences".
- Design of REPEM was "over-ambitious" but 314 participants trained (68% government civil servants and only 23% women) during 16 courses and 4 policy seminars. Quality of courses offered was progressively improved due to good feedback from participants, the appointment of a specific regional monitoring consultant and greater targeting of course end-users (policy, extension and research).
- Teaching methods included a broad range of techniques (lectures, group exercises, field visits, assignments and own country examples) although initial problems in contextualising courses to meet SADC country needs. Most popular courses offered were the non-technical ones (Mass Awareness, Gender, and REPEM II).
- National committees have been set up as a result of REPEM (e.g. Zambia's Task Force on Woodfuel Energy and Swaziland's National Biomass Committee).
- Weak administrative and financial management and participant selection systems mitigated ESAMI's overall performance. Main weaknesses were related to the lack of an effective marketing strategy or a long-term strategic plan and "insufficient attention to the institutional and financing mechanisms to facilitate the more widespread dissemination of rural energy technologies."
- ESAMI has been strengthened through the TDG-TU "twinning" arrangement and is now "recognised as a leading training institute in rural energy in the SADC region".
- Further development of a core rural energy curriculum *may* enable ESAMI to effectively transfer training functions to national institutions highlighting the temporal dimension of capacity development.

## **Ad 2) National policy research institutes**

***National policy research institutes can improve policy dialogue processes based on rigorous analysis and are better placed to achieve policy reforms than external change agents***

A few national policy research institutes have performed well. These include the illustrative case of the Thailand Development Research Institute (see Box 4.2), the Bolivian Social Policy Analysis Unit (UDAPSO) and the Centre for Social Research in Malawi. This organisational type would appear not to have been widely supported by donor agencies.

The generic lessons learned of relevance to national policy research institutes <sup>121</sup> indicate that a long-term process which recognises that certain preconditions will need to be met for their successful establishment and that initial donor agency's core funding support can lead to sustained capacity development. The key factors in this iterative process are:

- a) there should be widely-perceived changes in the setting (usually a significant change of government) and the need for policy reforms;
- b) they require a policy champion in government (who can also often act as a guarantor of "trust" for the donor agency's initial core funding) and often an "influential" board of senior and respected public and private sector representatives;
- c) they require flexibility to pursue innovations in organisational structure, recruitment, management styles and continuous staff development to attract and retain qualified personnel (this may include the need for an affirmative act of government);
- d) they require flexibility and autonomy in the development of research programmes and research teams which regularly interact with civil servants and other client groups;
- e) they require flexibility and the right to pursue and receive grants and contracts in attracting and sustaining funding from a broad range of clients;
- f) to be influential, useful and capable of building effective networks, their relationship to government must combine autonomy from day-to-day political pressure and change, the provision of quality "honest broker" information and a capacity to balance responses to short-term requests for policy advice with long-term policy research (which anticipates emerging policy issues, in effect, creating demand);
- g) they should be "accompanied" by external research institutes on the basis of collaborative and mutually-agreed (and beneficial e.g. co-authoring of papers in refereed journals) research programmes.

It took six years before the Thailand Development Research Institute was established in 1984 with initial funding support being provided by CIDA and, subsequently, USAID.

---

<sup>121</sup>. These lessons learned are based on *Environmental Policy Dialogue: Lessons Learned* (USAID, 1997), Myers (1997) and Malawi Centre for Social Research (1997).

#### **Box 4.2: Multi-donor support to the *Thailand Development Research Institute (TDRI)***

TDRI was established as a private foundation with special legal status in 1984. Between 1984 and 1993, TDRI survived cabinet and party changes, a military coup, two interim governments and the restoration of civilian rule. In 1992, TDRI included 6 research programmes (including natural resources and the environment) managed by 6 directors, 16 fellows and 34 assistants with an annual recurrent budget of *ca.* US\$ 4m. Donor agency support (*i.a.* CIDA, USAID, UNEP and UNFPA) has progressively been replaced by national public and private sector sources (more than 100).

##### *Key lessons learned:*

- Preconditions for establishment were met. The Royal Government of Thailand's planning agency realised it had neither the time nor the staff to do in-depth research on national development issues. A "godfather with a big network", the existence of CIDA core funding and an act of the Thai parliament cemented the framework.
- TDRI's relationship to different governments has effectively balanced being "close enough" to influence policy-makers and "distant enough" to maintain its objectivity, integrity and reputation. This was achieved through two key mechanisms, viz., senior government (changed) and private sector representation at Board level and middle-level government officials implicated in policy research project teams which gave them a strong sense of ownership of the results. These connections also helped focus the research agendas, improve the quality of research programmes, build networks and increased the likelihood that policy recommendations would be implemented.
- TDRI's status as a private foundation enabled it to attract competent staff. TDRI's structure and management style facilitated the devolution of authority (and responsibility for conceptualisation, conduct, staffing, dissemination of results and financing) to each of the 6 research programmes. Staffing decisions and incentives were decentralised to minimise the institutionalisation of seniority and sinecure and to emphasise performance, results and quality. TDRI's 5-year research programme plans have been complementary, multidisciplinary, continuous and cumulative and have involved many different stakeholders in government and the civil society. Capacity has been developed to enable TDRI to fulfill its "fire fighting" role, to deliver quality policy analysis (on several occasions in place of ideology, intuition or political whim) that has been responsive to client concerns and to anticipate emerging policy issues. TDRI developed collaborative research projects with *i.a.* the Harvard Institute for International Development which have strengthened linkages between environmental policy and economic development. (See, for example, Thailand Development Research Institute/HIID, 1995, which raised several critical water pricing policy issues.)
- The long-term viability of policy research institutes can be sustained if three conditions are met: a progressive shift from external to local funding sources, political stability and the avoidance of institutional self-satisfaction. In addition, complementarity (rather than competition) with more specialised institutes (e.g. Thailand Environment Institute) can strengthen existing networks.

### Ad 3) National ministries of environment

*National ministries of environment are over-stretched and under-resourced but can play an important co-ordinating and facilitating role in promoting environmentally sustainable development*

Some governments have recognised the capacity limitations of national (sectoral) ministries of environment or environmental protection agencies (EPA). These include the illustrative case study of the Ministry for the Coordination of Environmental Affairs in Mozambique (see Box 4.3), the Republic of Bolivia's Ministry of Sustainable Development and Environment within the National Secretariat of Planning, and the Royal Government of Bhutan's National Environment Commission.

The generic lessons learned of relevance to national (public sector) environment institutions are difficult to discern due to the large differences in the political, economic and social settings between and within countries (see Kikula, 1998, and Thomson, 1998). However, in many countries "environmental management is highly sectoralized due to administrative efficiency and convenience"<sup>122</sup> and, invariably, has been modelled on "command and control" approaches to environmental management originally developed in North America and Western Europe. The centralised EPA approach has failed to deliver in terms of changes in habits and attitudes throughout government and civil society, the use of EIAs to influence decision-making or in improving cross-sectoral co-ordination (Mwalyosi and Hughes, 1998 and Kikula, 1998). The irony is that "lack of seriousness to environmental matters prevail despite the apparent high level awareness" (Kikula, 1998, p. 3).

The preliminary indications suggest that a long-term process which facilitates the elevation and integration of environment within national institutions with a mandate for co-ordination, experience in policy formulation, political influence and access to more significant budgets is more likely to promote CDE across a broad range of organisational types at national, sub-national and local levels. Similarly, the translation of "descriptive and prescriptive" national plans (NEAPs, NCSs, etc.) into more modest thematic components designed to address specific environmental issues within an overall environment investment framework, defined and determined by government, is considered more likely to facilitate CDE processes, to lead to improved donor co-ordination and to more efficient allocation of scarce human and fiscal resources.

It took three years for the Government of Mozambique to establish a framework environment support programme which is co-ordinated by the Ministry for the Coordination of Environmental Affairs.

---

<sup>122</sup>. *Environmental Management in Tanzania: Challenges of the 21st Century*. Kikula and Mwalyosi (1994) in Msambichaka and Moshi (eds.) (1994).

**Box 4.3: Multi-donor support to the *Ministry for the Coordination of Environmental Affairs* (MICOA), Mozambique**

A “National Environmental Management Programme Document” (assisted by the World Bank, UNDP and bilateral funds) provided the basis for a Framework Environmental Support Programme (FESP), initially, between 1996 and 2001. MICOA (established in 1994), with assistance from UNDP, subsequently produced a “Capacity and Institution Mission Report” in 1995. Project proposals were prepared by MICOA with assistance from a group of consultants (provided by the Netherlands). The FESP includes 16 individual projects. The emphasis on individual “projects” was intended to generate a feeling of responsibility and ownership through participatory analysis and assessment of options and the sequencing of activities through a large number of implementing partners. Total estimated budget, ca. US\$ 19.4m, of which 7% is allocated specifically for CDE within MICOA. CDE in other organisations has been allocated 31% of total funds.

*Key lessons learned:*

- The co-ordination of environmental investments by a large number of donors was found to be ineffective in Mozambique. To render the mobilisation and allocation of funding more effective and efficient and to avoid over-funding and project duplication, a bilateral donor agency (the Netherlands) took the lead role among donors to co-ordinate and plan an environment sector “investment framework” with MICOA. Funds are channelled through a UNDP trust-fund. Annual tripartite reviews of the programme are conducted between MICOA, the Dutch Embassy and UNDP. A mid-term evaluation is planned in January 2001.
- The process followed to date constitutes the first slow and incremental steps in CDE of a co-ordinating and facilitating central government agency. The programme comprises a broad range of activities with particular emphasis placed on training, creating capacity to train and “learn by doing”. External technical assistance is mainly to be used on a “need” basis. The responsibility for implementation is therefore placed with MICOA, consequently improving opportunities for both capacity development and ownership during the process.
- The objectives of the FESP are implicitly to promote institutional pluralism by building environmental capacity through direct support and training: at ministry, departmental, provincial and local public sector levels; in the private sector; in NGOs; in the educational sector (primary school to university); and in central and regional documentation centres.
- Training is being provided in environmental policy formulation, planning and management. Legal frameworks for environment and financial systems for transparency and “good governance” are also being established. Strengthening of capacity to publish and to disseminate information, rehabilitation of the Museum of Natural History and supplying complementary funds for national parks (related to GEF) are also included.
- Effective co-ordination of the various actors/sectors (to mitigate against re-centralisation or institutional monopolies) is strongly emphasised. Links between ministry and the university sector have been created.
- The setting-up of monitoring systems of (and developing capacity to monitor) pollution and environmental impacts of industry is also part of the programme design.
- There are resources allocated for a technical back-stopping component and a permanent senior consultant will be hired to monitor programme progress.

#### **Ad 4) Other national sectoral ministries**

Sectoral ministries can effectively address environmental issues and can often provide a more influential “critical focus” among government agencies.

Several sectoral ministries and non-sectoral national planning institutions have performed well in terms of integrating environmental considerations at all levels. These include the illustrative case study of the Ministry of Agriculture, Government of India (see Box 4.4), the Ministry of Agriculture’s Land Use Planning Section, Royal Government of Bhutan, and the Ministry of Agriculture’s Soil and Water Conservation Branch, Government of Kenya. This organisational type is increasingly supported by donor agencies within the framework of sector programming.

The generic lessons learned of relevance to sectoral ministries <sup>123</sup> indicate that sustained capacity development can occur if a long-term process is supported which recognises that some preconditions will need to be met for an effective change of policy direction and that clear overall direction is provided by government but which leaves sufficient room and flexibility in the choice of decentralised implementing partners. The key factors in this process are:

- a) there should be a widely-perceived need for policy reform;
- b) it requires a policy reform champion in government;
- c) it requires a long gestation period to test, change and develop relevant and replicable (affordable) technologies with all stakeholders and recognizes them as “means” to production system “ends”;
- d) it requires a national institutional, technical and fiscal framework defined and determined by government as a precondition for improved co-ordination of donor agency support;
- e) it requires flexibility in the choice of, and devolution of tasks to, decentralised implementing partners who can facilitate participatory approaches and the effective harnessing of indigenous practice and knowledge;
- f) it requires flexibility in adopting an integrated area-focused approach to be responsive to the expression of local needs;
- g) there should be strong linkages with training institutions;
- h) it should be “accompanied” by national research institutes to capitalise on relevant research findings.

It took a minimum of ten years before the Government of India’s *National Watershed Development Programme for Rainfed Areas* was successfully established. (But the original recommendation to address the problems in rainfed farming areas in India was first made by a Royal Commission of Enquiry in 1923.)

---

<sup>123</sup>. These lessons learned are based i.a. on Danida (1995c); Seth (1993, 1996 and *pers. comm.*, 1997), *National Soil and Water Conservation Programme*, Kenya, and the CDE Guidelines (OECD-DAC, 1997, pp. 5-6).

**Box 4.4: Multi-donor support to the National Watershed Development Programme for Rainfed Areas (NWDPR), Ministry of Agriculture, Government of India**

The NWDPR was launched by the Government of India during the 8<sup>th</sup> Five-Year Plan (1992-97) with a national budget of ca. US\$ 440m. It covers parts of all the 25 states and two Union Territories. Several donor agencies (e.g. Danida, GTZ, SDC, World Bank, etc.) support area-focused and/or institutional CDE watershed development components within this framework, providing ca. US\$ 145m in additional financing.

*Key lessons learned:*

- Preconditions for policy reform were met. There was national and widespread recognition of the limitations of (and inherent gaps in) the pre- and post-independence focus on the development of water resources for irrigated agriculture -- the “green revolution” (1950-1962) -- and on classical soil conservation measures (1973 to early 1980s). These measures focused on the control of soil erosion to prevent siltation of dams and reservoirs using complex engineering structures and the use of a silt-yield index. Rainfed farming areas which contribute more than 40% of total national foodgrain production were neglected. A high-level group of secretaries chaired by the Cabinet Secretary introduced the requisite policy change which was successfully synchronised with the Planning Commission’s working groups set up for the formulation of the 8<sup>th</sup> Five-Year Plan. Pilot water conservation and harvesting technologies initiated during the 6<sup>th</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> Five-Year Plans in 42 and 99 pilot watershed areas respectively. This resulted in substantial practical “how to do it best” experiences which were utilised in the preparation of a coherent national framework -- the NWDPR. This encompassed technical guidelines (with clear foci on water conservation and a farming systems development approach -- they were revised three times between 1990 and 1992), a “critical institutional focus” (Department of Agriculture and Cooperation), a significant national budget and an improved basis for the co-ordination of external funding.
- The framework has facilitated the development of participatory approaches to watershed development typically in small areas (ca. 500 – 1 000 ha) by promoting institutional pluralism and different CBO models such as Friendly Farmers’ Forums and self-help groups. A broad range of sub-national public sector structures, university research departments, training institutes, NGOs and CBOs have been involved in the implementation of the NWDPR. For example, the Indo-German Watershed Development Programme (WDP) in Maharashtra state has worked through 51 NGOs and 77 CBOs.
- The process has assisted in identifying the key criteria for a “demand-driven” approach to the adoption of soil and water conservation measures, including *i.a.* the enhancement of indigenous practices, low cost, low input, short-term economic benefits, ease of adoption and maintenance, use of local vegetative materials and flexibility to adjust to individual needs and capacities.
- Co-ordination between public sector representatives of the agriculture, forestry, animal husbandry, horticulture, soil conservation and fisheries departments has proved problematic during implementation of the NWDPR. However, “Confidence is growing that watershed development would combine ecology, economy, equity, employment and export in rainfed areas of India” (Seth, 1996, p. 37).

## Ad 5) National environment institutes

Specialised national environment institutes can effectively provide useful services to the public and private sectors and to civil society

Some specialised national environment institutes have performed well. These include the illustrative case study of the National Biodiversity Institute (INBio), Costa Rica (see Box 4.5), the Centre de Suivi Écologique (CSE), Sénégal, the National Wetlands Steering Committee, Sri Lanka, the Environmental Protection and Training Research Institute (EPTRI), India, and, to a lesser extent, the Ecotoxicology Institute, Pakistan.

The generic lessons learned of relevance to specialised national environment institutes <sup>124</sup> indicate that a long-term process which recognises that certain preconditions will need to be met (sustainable and diversified sources of financing) and that external support be characterised by either “hands-off management” or “mutually determined” and well-targeted technical assistance, can contribute to CDE. The key factors in this process are:

- a) there should be a broadly-based and recognised need for the service(s) the institute will provide (usually information, monitoring and training);
- b) they often require an institutional champion and/or a preferential institutional status which allows them to combine public service functions and the provision of private sector services <sup>125</sup>;
- c) they require strong and visionary leadership, not “stars” or “star teams”, complemented by managerial rigour and accountability;
- d) they require flexibility to allow the institutes to determine the scope and pace of change within their own institutional and cultural norms;
- e) they require high staff stability, shared vision and shared values, but with clear definition of tasks and responsibilities for each institutional division and each institutional partner;
- f) they require a flexible collaborative management style which allows mistakes to be made and lessons to be learned, the continuous revision of workplans, seizing opportunities to demonstrate and provide services and continuous access to state-of-the-art technologies and equipment appropriate to local conditions;
- g) they should be “accompanied” by known, trusted and demand-driven external assistance;
- h) they often require a gradual and phased reduction in technical assistance/budget support and the development of a marketing strategy.

It took three years for INBio to develop potentially sustainable financing mechanisms which were put in place *before* “project” activities were initiated. This process assisted in establishing INBio’s credibility and recognition within the Costa Rican institutional setting.

---

<sup>124</sup>. These lessons learned are based on Instituto Nacional de Biodiversidad, Costa Rica, Centre de Suivi Écologique, Sénégal, Environmental Protection and Training Research Institute, India, and Ecotoxicology Institute, Pakistan.

<sup>125</sup>. INBio is an independent non-profit institute, CSE is an “Association d’Utilité Publique” and EPTRI is an “Autonomous Registered Society”.



**Box 4.5: Sida support to the *Division of Biodiversity Information Dissemination (DBID)*, National Biodiversity Institute (INBio), Costa Rica**

INBio was established as a non-profit institute in 1989 with the aims of protecting biodiversity in conservation areas and national parks and promoting the non-destructive commercial and spiritual utilisation of the country's natural resources. INBio raised US\$ 6.8m from 50 grants between October 1989 and July 1992 which were invested in a Trust Fund managed jointly by Fundacion de Parques Nacionales and INBio through a national bank. DBID supported by Sida (1990-96) as a non-earmarked trust fund financed through a "debt-for-nature" swap and a subsequent project *Flow of Biodiversity Information from Wildlands to Society* (totalling ca. US\$ 0.8m).

*Key lessons learned:*

- Preconditions for institutional establishment were met. INBio's emergence as a new information and training service provider was built upon: earlier initiatives by the Planning Commission and Ministry of Environment and Energy; the growing concern for the loss of the country's biodiversity (World Resources Institute, 1991) and the overall political commitment to environmentally sustainable development.
- INBio's institutional status and the availability of core funding enabled the institute to "feel that they have been given the trust to manage the programme according to their own strategy." Sida's "hands-off" management promoted ownership of the CDE process, determined and shaped by INBio itself.
- INBio's management delegated and decentralised responsibility to four divisions as a function of the rapid expansion of the institute. Each division is headed by a co-ordinator responsible for conceptualisation, conducting activities and accountability. This allowed the Director General to focus on policy work and international contacts. DBID's (all women) activities included a clear definition of responsibilities within INBio and with partner intermediary organisations. This has included collaboration with 45 parataxonomists in 29 sites and 2 pilot schools with the Ministry of Public Education. This was achieved by identifying the information and training requirements of different target groups. DBID was able to develop a broad range of products and services using different media (e.g. newsletters in Spanish and English, web pages, bio-teleomatics, the *Kiosco de Informacion*, scientific and educational publications, species lists for use in EIAs, training courses and workshops and a national/international resource database).
- Participation has, nevertheless, primarily been focused at the institutional level rather than with local communities living near conservation areas.
- Certain pilot activities were initiated without a coherent strategy for expansion (e.g. the elementary schools programme). One key risk with INBio's strategy to secure its own funding through trust and endowment funds (33%), private sector activities (33%) and external grants (33%) is the potential saturation with donor funds. Private sector activities included the sale of "access" to biodiversity resources to pharmaceutical and fragrance companies such as Merck, convening workshops and selling publications. New funding pledges for INBio amounting to ca. US\$ 16m were made during 1996.

## Ad 6) Sub-national organisations

Sub-national organisations provide the most appropriate institutional entry point to facilitate the translation of environmental policy and CDE principles into practice but are often characterised by severe generic capacity constraints.

There is a clearly emerging trend (endorsed in both recipient governments' and some donor agencies' policy statements) to increasingly support capacity development of sub-national public sector organisations.<sup>126</sup> Their essential comparative advantages lie in the:

- a) greater proximity to *local* environmental resource users;
- b) relevance of planning processes which address *local* environmental problems;
- c) better understanding of the *local* setting; and
- d) potential to benefit from *local* knowledge of the problems and their likely solutions.

Facilitating processes with greater participation of local communities and community institutions in the design, planning, monitoring and implementation of development programmes, it is assumed, will be enhanced.<sup>127</sup>

Some sub-national organisations have performed relatively well. These include the illustrative case study of the Provincial Planning Department which was responsible for the preparation of the Sarhad Provincial Conservation Strategy in North West Frontier Province, Pakistan (see Box 4.6),<sup>128</sup> the District Environmental Action Planning in pilot Rural District Councils in Zimbabwe, the *Hifadhi ya Mazingira* (HIMA) programme in the Southern Highlands of Tanzania, the *Changwats* in Thailand and some of the state-level departments in India.

In many developing countries, sub-national public sector organisations still remain weak. In general, the District Councils in Tanzania, the Rural District Councils in Zimbabwe, the District Assemblies in Ghana, the (interim) District Development Committees in Malawi<sup>129</sup>, *les Services Provinciaux* in Burkina Faso and the *Dzongkhags* and *Gewogs* in Bhutan, all provide examples.

---

<sup>126</sup>. See, for example, Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs (1997) and DfID's support to Rural District Councils in Zimbabwe. The Royal Government of Thailand's Ministry of Science, Technology and Environment has recently established 8 new regional offices to complement the existing 4 and is currently revising the National Environmental Quality Act (1992) as a function of the decentralisation process.

<sup>127</sup>. See, for example, the Government of Malawi's District Focus for Development, 1993 and Vision 2020 (1997); the Republic of Bolivia's Agenda Bolivia 21 (1996); the Royal Government of Thailand's Eighth Five-Year Plan (1997-2001); Eldon *et al.* (1993); DfID (1994); Brett (1996); Warner (1997); Huizenga (1997) and Smith (1998).

<sup>128</sup>. It is interesting to note that the *Kalam Integrated Development Project* in Upper Swat, North West Frontier Province, Pakistan (also funded by the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation) has not been successful.

<sup>129</sup>. The Government of Malawi planned to hold District Council elections in May 1999, at the same time as the parliamentary elections.

The “down-scaling” of central government and concomitant decentralisation of budgets and budgetary authority remain critical constraints in many developing countries. The widespread continuation of national economic reform programmes and the legislative limitations, or lack of legislation, on the powers of and potentials for sub-national public sector organisations to improve/increase their own revenue base frequently exacerbate this situation.

The generic lessons learned of relevance to sub-national public sector organisations<sup>130</sup> are more difficult to discern. The preliminary indications suggest that a long-term process which recognises that:

- some preconditions will need to be met (to effectively break centralised institutional monopolies through policy, institutional, legislative and fiscal reforms);
- leadership, vision and political support are critical in both formal government structures (District Development Councils, Committees, etc.) and informal structures (local chiefs and traditional organisations);
- a strategy based on developing the capacities of existing sub-national planning structures, the enhancement of existing (strategic) sub-national development planning and financial management systems and the channelling of funds directly to these organisations;
- by anchoring CDE interventions with departments which have a mandate for co-ordination, experience in policy formulation and coercive and budgetary influence, effective co-ordination is more likely to be assured;
- environmental policy and planning constitute an integral part of development planning and not an “add-on” component;
- a “two-track” approach which combines implementation of parts of a strategy parallel to the iterative process of its formulation and which enables mistakes to be made, lessons learned internalised and mechanisms developed to promote consultation and the active involvement of all stakeholders;
- by acting strategically, the investment of limited resources in targeted and prioritised activities

will probably be more likely to lead to capacity development at this level.

<sup>130</sup>.

These lessons learned are based on the experiences gained in the decentralisation of environmental policies and CDE processes adopted in *i.a.* Pakistan: Huizenga and Rafiq (1996) and Huizenga (1997); Ghana: ODA (1993); *Local Government Service Act* (1996); National Development Planning Commission (1996) and Jecty and Company Ltd. (1997); Zimbabwe: Eldon *et al.* (1993) and ODA (1993); Malawi: Constitution (1995); District Focus for Development (1993); National Environmental Action Plan (1994); Vision 2020 (1997) and Danida (1998b) and Nicaragua: *National Environmental Action Plan* (1993); *National Plan for Sustainable Development* (1995); Danida (1996d) and Elizondo *et al.* (1996).

**Box 4.6: Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation support to the *Sarhad Provincial Conservation Strategy (SPCS)*, North West Frontier Province (NWFP), Pakistan**

The development of the SPCS has continued a process undertaken between 1986 and 1992 during the formulation of the Pakistan National Conservation Strategy (NCS). "Hands-off" funding support for implementation by the provincial Planning, Environment and Development Department (PEDD), in association with the World Conservation Union (IUCN) Pakistan, has been provided by the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation.

*Key lessons learned:*

- The NWFP Government invited IUCN-Pakistan to assist in the development of a provincial conservation strategy. The SPCS is "made in Pakistan" and aims to translate the NCS into implementable actions attuned to the "needs, aspirations and possibilities" of the communities living in NWFP. The process has involved extensive public consultation and has been pursued through existing institutions and building on existing capacities and experiences. The relative openness of the government bureaucracy in NWFP, the continuity of political support provided by the Additional Chief Secretary and growing public awareness of, and media attention to, a broad range of environmental problems -- including the degradation of the moist temperate forests in the Palas Valley, widespread soil degradation, declining aquifers in the southern part of the province and the worsening environmental quality in the capital, Peshawar -- have cumulatively supported this process.
- Responsibility for the SPCS has been led by a PEDD management team with a good combination of managerial, conceptual and communication skills and with a sound understanding of, and access to, the political system. The PEDD adopted a neutral position and gained wide acceptability among all the major stakeholders in government departments, civil society and the private sector.
- The SPCS has been based on the premises that "CDE cannot be separated from overall CD" and that communities' capacities to undertake natural resources/environmental management are developed as a function of social mobilisation and organisation.
- The SPCS has been visionary in openly addressing institutional, policy and legislative reforms and in adopting a two-track approach. The preparation of a state of the environment report, the proposed Environment Act for NWFP and watershed rehabilitation activities have been complementary to the on-going process of preparing an "umbrella" strategy.
- The SPCS has brought together (through round tables) public sector organisations at federal and provincial levels such as the PEDD, Forest, Agriculture and Public Health and Engineering Departments, and numerous NGOs (such as Sarhad NGO Ittehad and Frontier Resource Centre) and CBOs.
- The strategy has constituted a "living document" which has been and continues to be updated on a regular basis and which has allowed local organisations to determine both the scope and the pace of change, the financing of innovative and cost-effective environmental improvement programmes and establishing a "sustainable development fund".
- The transition to implementation occurred three years into the SPCS process and the need to demonstrate interim results by promoting a so-called 80:20 principle in the allocation of resources was recognised, i.e. "priority is to be given to those actions which provide relatively large returns at a relatively small expense." Linkages between the SPCS and the Government of Pakistan's Social Action Programme have been established.

## Ad 7) Non-governmental organisations

Non-governmental organisations (NGOs) can provide the most effective organisational “bridge” to promote CDE among environmental resource users and to establish linkages with other institutions. NGOs have successfully promoted awareness of environmental issues and play an increasingly important role in advocacy and environmental policy dialogue. Managerial and financial capacities of NGOs remain weak

A recent synthesis study of NGO evaluations (Finnida, 1997a) concluded that although environment “...is an issue which NGOs are eager to state as important (and), in some cases central to their development endeavours”, it also found that “there was little depth of environmental analysis”. These findings were qualified by five assessments of NGO capacities to successfully integrate environmental concerns:

- environmental impact was satisfactory -- often due to the small-scale nature of interventions <sup>131</sup>
- little environmental analysis was undertaken at any stage of the project cycle, not least because environmental impact was considered largely irrelevant to the projects in question
- environment was considered “lightly” by NGOs not merely because of the marginal importance of the issue but both because an environmental assessment was not considered and because there was not sufficient knowledge about *how* to incorporate environmental factors into appraisal and monitoring <sup>132</sup>
- largely because of this ignorance, evidence was found of projects which had a negative effect on the environment and which had not been sufficiently noticed by the project implementers
- a small minority of projects were exemplary in terms of environmental analysis and environmental impact (Finnida, 1997a, p. 28).

NGOs are increasingly including *generic* capacity assessment and development within their *own* organisations and as components in their projects and programmes. The main foci of support is still on poverty alleviation, training and micro-finance institutions <sup>133</sup>. Most evaluation reports show no specific interest in, or focus on, CDE activities <sup>134</sup>. UNCED demonstrated the widespread differences that exist between northern and southern NGOs on environmental issues. <sup>135</sup>

---

<sup>131</sup>. “Most of the programmes of NGOs are environmentally positive or neutral.” *Bangladesh. Evaluation of Netherlands-Funded NGOs, 1972-1996* Sub-Report (the Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 1998, p. 301).

<sup>132</sup>. This is exemplified by the *Environmental Rehabilitation Project* in Malawi implemented as a component of the Evangelical Lutheran Development Programme (Danchurch Aid, Project Evaluation, October 1997).

<sup>133</sup>. See, for example, Crombrugghe de *et al.* (1993); Danida (1994a); DfID (1995) ; US General Audit Office (1995) and Danida (1996a).

<sup>134</sup>. Most NGO evaluation reports focus on institutional and financial sustainability and rarely address environmental sustainability issues. Exceptions to this pattern include the international environmental NGOs such as the World Conservation Union (IUCN) and the World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF) and numerous environmental NGOs in developing countries (e.g. LIDEMA in Bolivia, CURE in Malawi and CSE in India).

<sup>135</sup>. See, for example, van Rooy (1997).

The growing interest in *generic* CD among NGOs has invariably provided the backdrop to a broader redefinition of new partnerships, particularly between northern and southern NGOs (Riddell *et al.*, 1993). New NGO approaches include country programming, focusing on families and households, building effective local partnerships, enhancing advocacy initiatives and integrating global operations.

Many NGOs have performed well. This reflects, to a large extent, the flexibility of NGOs and their key characteristics which enable them to experiment, listen and learn, and to respond effectively to the expressed needs of environmental resource users. NGOs also *do* learn, *do* try to learn *more effectively* and *do not stop learning*, even when they think they have found the answers to “problems” or capacity constraints (see Edwards, 1997, and Eade, 1997). The key weaknesses of many NGOs continue to be their limited managerial and financial capacities (including in the development of effective cost-accounting systems and “marketing” strategies), “founders” syndrome (dependence on one charismatic person) and, in some cases, their limited technical environment capacities.

Examples of relatively successful environmental NGOs include the illustrative case study of the Environmental Defence League (a consortium of NGOs) which administered the GEF Small Grants Programme in Bolivia <sup>136</sup> (see Box 4.7), the Centre for Science and Environment in India <sup>137</sup> and an alliance of four NGOs in Zimbabwe (SAFIRE, BUN, ZERO and ENDA). <sup>138</sup>

The key generic lessons learned of relevance to environmental NGOs are:

- the need to develop specific functional environmental capacities in tandem with generic managerial capacities. This should include mechanisms to harness and develop domestic revenue potentials, to improve accountability and to facilitate organisational growth through effective internal decentralisation of decision-making and budgeting;
- the need to act more as facilitators and “honest brokers” strengthening and/or supporting the emergence of environmental resource user groups at the community level. This should include “bridging” mechanisms to develop resource management agreements between public sector agencies and the local communities by building on existing production systems.

---

<sup>136</sup>. The lessons learned are based on the GEF Small Grants Programme (BOL/92/G51) in UNDP (1997d); *Environmental Rehabilitation Project*, Malawi (Danchurch Aid, Project Evaluation, 1997); *Centre for Science and Environment*, India (Sida Evaluation, November 1996); USAID (1996b) and *INSAN Support Programme*, Nepal (the Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs Mid-term Review, May 1995).

<sup>137</sup>. CSE’s public awareness and public campaigns, advocacy, policy research and publications (including the fortnightly *Down to Earth* magazine) have played an important role in shaping the environmental performance of the Government of India and the private sector in India.

<sup>138</sup>. The alliance emerged when a Core Group for Woodland Management (CGWM) was established in 1994. The CGWM constitutes a policy development and advocacy group which has strengthened linkages between resource users and both public and private sector organisations.

**Box 4.7: Multi-donor Small Grants Programme implemented by the *Environmental Defence League (LIDEMA)*, Bolivia**

Following consultations among GEF, the UNDP country office, government and NGOs, LIDEMA, a NGO coalition, was designated as the national implementing agency for the GEF SGP. During the first phase 16 projects were supported through NGOs, CBOs and NGO networks. Grants provided varied in size between US\$ 30 000 and 50 000 and focused primarily on the GEF's global climate and biodiversity objectives. 70% of the projects included CDE components and more than 80% included mechanisms to promote participation by the resource users. Two projects were considered "unsuccessful".

*Key lessons learned:*

- Although only 12% of project proposals were submitted by CBOs and only 19% of grants provided were implemented by CBOs, the evaluation team concluded that "this is the closest any project in the sample (of 22 projects) has come to working at the grass-roots level." Furthermore, "by working through legitimate community organisations and incorporating capacity building *and* income-generating additionalities into environmental conservation, a number of project activities are potentially sustainable."
- Many of the grants provided focused on reforestation, agroforestry and soil and water conservation activities which have ensured compatibility with local values and attempts to improve existing production systems. A farmer organisation has assisted rural producers to re-establish pre-Hispanic soil conservation techniques using traditional communal labour schemes through the *Laq'ása* ("our land") project. The traditional *aynoka* system of reciprocal labour has been reintroduced in several communities.
- Some projects have had multiplier and leveraging effects (e.g. the *Lorena* wood-burning stoves using female *campesina* extensionists). Most projects had minimum capital requirements and were low-risk interventions which facilitated appropriation by the local beneficiaries.

Three initiatives were considered to have had particularly significant outcomes:

1. *Forestry Management*. Ayoreo communities in Bolivia's eastern tropical lowlands received technical assistance and training to adapt traditional forest management practices to their new sedentary status. Activities included controlled timber harvesting, reforestation, participatory environmental research, the design of a sustainable forest management plan and securing communal land titles.
2. *Agroforestry*. The CICOL indigenous organisation has supported Chiquitano communities to plant high-value, endangered tree species on demonstration parcels which assist in the regeneration of degraded farmlands and will provide additional sources of income. CICOL received a green seal award from the Forestry Stewardship Council for this initiative.
3. *Recuperation of an Endangered Variety of Arboreal Cotton*. Another lowlands project helped Chiquitano communities to recuperate an endangered variety of arboreal cotton (*Gossypium arbadense*). Germplasm was distributed to farmers who developed a mixed cotton tree-groundnut-bean cropping system. The sale of dyed cotton yarn, fabric and handicrafts has generated the equivalent of US\$ 700 per hectare.

## Ad 8) Community-based organisations

While local communities are the stakeholders who are most affected by local environmental resource degradation, they are often the ones most alienated from government, donor agency and NGO decision-making processes. CBOs can be instrumental in shaping consensus-building processes which can lead to improved resource management.

*Agenda 21* placed particular emphasis on consultation, capacity-building and empowerment of citizens through the delegation of authority, accountability and resources. This implies that it is the local communities themselves who should ultimately generate, share, analyse, prioritise and contribute to, or control, decision-making:

“...if people are not brought into focus through sustainable development, becoming both architects and engineers of the concept, then it will never be achieved anyway, since they are unlikely to take responsibility for something they do not own themselves” (Redclift, 1992).

“Popular” participation has been operationalised through a broad range of community-based participatory planning methodologies<sup>139</sup> and institutionalised by most donor agencies<sup>140</sup>. A number of studies have endorsed the perceived benefits of greater community ownership, self-reliance and sustainability<sup>141</sup>.

More recent studies have started to highlight certain gaps in popular participation models and the donor agency and/or northern NGO modalities still in place for supporting southern organisations<sup>142</sup>. These include the exclusion of the external economic, institutional and political settings of communities (if the focus of participation is limited to local knowledge, priorities and perceptions) and the costs and benefits of using participatory approaches. Exclusion of these issues *can* limit community choices and undermine the key elements of local sustainability by challenging and polarising the “establishment”.

Recent efforts have focused on consensus-building to more successfully integrate the economic, social and environmental dimensions of sustainability by including key stakeholders with institutional and political influence. This form of participation creates ownership and commitment from all parties affected by, or influential in, the attainment of sustainable development. Thus, consensus-building should be the prime mover which underlies participatory approaches, not simply empowerment or institutional sustainability. Popular participation needs to encompass a thorough *ex-ante* assessment of relevant institutional stakeholders at all levels of society since these can and do influence local

---

<sup>139</sup>. Notably the well-known *Participatory Rural Appraisal* techniques favoured by the bilateral donor agencies and the less-publicised *Beneficiary Assessments* used by the multilateral donor agencies. See also Chambers (1989, 1992, 1994a and 1994b) and Davis, 1996 (CDE Workshop 1996, Theme Paper No. 5).

<sup>140</sup>. “I believe that increased participation will increase the effectiveness of development” Lewis T. Preston, President, The World Bank cited in: *The World Bank and Participation* (1994) which resulted from a long review carried out in association with Sida. See also Paul (1987 and 1991); Bhatnagar and Williams (1992) and UNDP’s *Human Development Report* (1993 p. 8).

<sup>141</sup>. See, for example, Cernea (1987 and 1991); Kottak (1991) and Upoff (1992).

<sup>142</sup>. See, for example, Thrupp *et al.* (1994); Shepherd (1995); Warner and Robb (1996); Brett (1996); Davies (1996) and Ardòn (1997).



decision-making. “Adding-on” a few community-based participatory techniques will, invariably, prove inadequate in forging sustainable partnerships since it often excludes the broader contextual actors. Furthermore, the rural or urban poor are not necessarily the only stakeholders who can be excluded. In many developing countries both powerful and weak institutions or individuals also need to be included in a dialogue to increase awareness of the mutually-reinforcing benefits of sustainable partnerships. Consensus participation requires:

- support for processes of collaborative negotiation and conflict resolution;
- the creation of a “level playing field” to ensure different stakeholders have the capabilities to participate and negotiate on an equitable basis <sup>143</sup>.

Furthermore, a participation framework is needed to manage the process of consensus building through negotiation with all stakeholders throughout project/programme cycles to secure sustainability through partnership.

Many community-based organisations and initiatives have performed well in developing countries. These include the illustrative World Bank-supported Central Visayas Regional Project in the Philippines (see Box 4.8), the Danida-IBIS-supported *Manuel Lopez* project in El Sauce Municipality, Nicaragua, and the USAID-supported *Gestion Locale Sécurisée* initiative in Madagascar. In terms of useful lessons learned (and applied), the GEF-UNDP-supported Lak Integrated Conservation and Development Project in Papua New Guinea also performed well even though the project was closed down prematurely. Community-based initiatives to address urban environmental problems have also been successful in a limited number of known cases <sup>144</sup>.

The generic lessons learned of relevance to CBOs are difficult to discern given the intrinsically diverse, dynamic and uncertain contexts in which communities live. Certain common elements in patterns of experience indicate, however, that:

- the development of managerial, political (negotiating) and technical skills and capacities must go hand in hand;
- contentious issues related to decision-making which influences rights of access, rights of use and rights of control and allocation of environmental resources need to be addressed in seeking the widest possible consensus;
- economic livelihood opportunities, social needs and environmental resource degradation can and need to be addressed in an integrated manner by building on existing production systems.

---

<sup>143</sup>. See, for example, World Bank, 1995f; Bass *et al.* (1995) and Warner (1997).

<sup>144</sup>. For example, the provision of water supplies in the Orangi slums of Karachi, Pakistan, improved and cost-effective sanitation services, known as the *condominial* system, introduced in north-east Brazil, and the Klong Toey slum dwellers in Bangkok whose initiative rewards residents with eggs for rubbish delivered to a collection point.

**Box 4.8: World Bank support for *Grassroots Organisations for Resource Management in the Philippines***

A World Bank loan of US\$ 26m was approved in 1983 for the Central Visayas Regional Project covering four provinces (Cebu, Bohol, Siquijor and Negros Oriental). The loan was used to reduce environmental degradation and create income opportunities for the poor by maximising local grassroots participation, thereby improving the region's autonomy. Project activities were concentrated in five sites covering 140 000 hectares, 200 km of coastline and 200 000 people:

- providing secure tenure to farmers in four watersheds and assisting them to develop and intensify crop and livestock production systems;
- rehabilitation and reforestation of degraded areas and providing communities with secure tenure and incentives for conservation;
- establishing artificial reefs, replanting degraded mangrove areas, coral reef sanctuaries and allocating user rights to participating households;
- building access roads, village water supplies and small irrigation works;
- providing institutional strengthening, training, technical assistance and research.

*Key lessons learned:*

- The project design was innovative in that the implementation unit was independent of core government structures and reported directly to the Prime Minister. An executive board comprised four local representatives and four from line agencies.
- A World Bank evaluation found that the project had succeeded in reaching the poor and was "largely successful" (World Bank, 1997a; World Bank Performance Audit Report No. 153, November 1997).
- The majority of the farmers in the upland agriculture sites adopted the management practices (soil and water conservation, agroforestry, reforestation, fishponds and small watershed planning and implementation). The project assisted in establishing a number of farmers and other grassroots organisations that have become experienced and sophisticated in dealing with the government and local authorities. They have learned to take advantage of opportunities to get *action* on *their* priorities and have become valuable resources in learning teamwork, negotiation skills and practical information on land management issues.
- The project was instrumental in establishing a land tenure task force which has since grown into a regional committee that provides a counterweight to the power of local landowners.
- The project included extensive training for environmental resource users, local government officials and line agency staff at the regional level.
- The project's innovations are being replicated (e.g. new management methods for inshore fisheries and community forestry programmes).
- Efforts to improve natural resource management must be an institutional as much as a technical process that fosters change, rather than investing only in physical goods.
- Projects must be flexible enough to adapt to changing conditions and must be backed by four critical elements, viz., i) an appropriate policy and legal framework; ii) local communities with adequate decision-making powers allowing problems to be solved without central government intervention; iii) grassroots organisations with managerial, political and technical skills; iv) local officials with sufficient decision-making powers.

## 5. CONCLUSIONS

Many low- and middle-income countries continue to be confronted with a complex of serious economic, social and environmental challenges and long-standing generic capacity constraints. These have been further exacerbated by structural adjustment and the overall decline in ODA. DAC Members' evaluation reports published throughout the period 1992-98 have continued to highlight the fact that institutional capacity remains one of the most common bottlenecks in the development process.

Capacity in the environment represents the ability of individuals, groups, organisations and institutions in a given setting to address environmental issues as part of a range of efforts to achieve sustainable development. The concept of CDE describes the process by which capacity in the environment and appropriate institutional structures are enhanced. The key underlying principles of the CDE concept are that it integrates environment and development concerns at all levels, aims to strengthen institutional pluralism, belongs to, and is driven by, the community in which it is based and involves a variety of management techniques, analytical tools, incentives and organisational structures in order to achieve a given policy objective.

CDE is a key element for the management of environmental problems. The development of the CDE approach has been an ambitious and important step forward in dealing with development and environment. The 1996 CDE Workshop in Rome placed CDE firmly on the international agenda among environmental specialists. The Rome Workshop nonetheless recognised that «there is much to do to urge the process forward at all levels in donor and partner communities». This study has confirmed that active work is still required to ensure greater awareness and understanding of the CDE approach.

This study recognises that CDE constitutes a valid, realistic and relevant approach to the issues entailed in the management of development and environment. The DAC Task Force on CDE successfully collated several aid principles -- notably the principles of integration, ownership and subsidiarity -- into a coherent CDE framework. This has provided donor organisations with both a conceptual and, potentially, an operational framework to ensure greater compliance with the DAC's established *Principles for New Orientations in Technical Co-operation*. However, the modalities for implementation of many donor agencies have not evolved at the same pace, or to the same extent, as their own conceptual and policy-making structures.

The CDE Framework underlined the importance of strengthening operational approaches and providing a "detailed planning guide" to meet the requirements of individual donors. The CDE questionnaire used in this study has revealed that few DAC Members have developed specific CDE guidelines *per se* although several have successfully carried the CDE process forward in other guises. The study has also identified a considerable number of successful donor-supported CDE initiatives in Latin America, Africa and Asia.

Institutional capacity development in ODA programmes has been partially successful. Several generic and specific environment capacity constraints continue to hamper the performance of donor agencies and recipient country institutions alike. There is a clear need for reforms to improve the efficiency, effectiveness and responsiveness of many environmental organisations in developing countries.

Although donor organisations would still appear to be less effective at CDE than at other types of ODA, considerable progress has been made, notably in terms of the growing importance of environment in general and the growing mainstreaming of environmental issues.

Five critical factors would appear to have mitigated the widespread adoption and institutionalisation of the CDE approach among both donor agencies and recipient countries and their institutions. These are:

- the compounded conceptual confusion resulting from the fusion of two poorly-defined frameworks -- “environment” and “capacity development”;
- the institutional characteristics of many donor agencies and the extent to which CDE projects and programmes are effectively supported as *processes*;
- the limited integration of environmental policy with economic development concerns at all levels of government and civil society in many developing countries;
- the additional organisational demands resulting from the substantial broadening of the scope of environmental problems (including, most recently, the growing emphasis on global environmental issues which *may*, ironically, have weakened capacities to address national environmental challenges) without a commensurate increase in either human or financial resources or staff skills to fulfill specific tasks or roles;
- the conspicuous absence of a coherent core set of internationally-agreed environmental indicators (in contrast to both economic and social indicators) as well as functional institutional performance indicators.

CDE presents a profound challenge to donor organisations and recipient country institutions because of the complex interplay of socio-cultural, political, economic and environmental interests. A lucid cautionary note raised in the CDE Framework in 1995 is still relevant:

*“Raising the environmental performance of organisations and people in any society is a daunting task even for its own citizens. Assuming this can be done easily by outside interveners may be the first mistake in any capacity development programme. Recognition of the need to experiment, listen and learn may be the first step to some sort of progress.”*

Three functional objectives of CDE processes require particular attention if the goal stated in *Shaping the 21<sup>st</sup> Century* of reversing current trends in the loss of environmental resources is to be effectively addressed at local and national levels by the year 2015.

These are:

- further strengthening of capacities to plan and implement at the lowest appropriate institutional level. This should be based on the principle of integrating environment and development concerns at all levels rather than on promoting the decentralisation of specialised environmental agencies;

- further strengthening of capacities to effectively utilise and apply existing environmental tools and instruments and to monitor environmental impacts with, by, and for environmental resource users. This should be based on the discretionary -- rather than mandatory -- use of environmental assessment as a planning tool as and when necessary; making environmental assessments a mandatory requirement in donor operations may be a costly and unproductive option;
- further strengthening of capacities to mobilise additional and sustainable sources of funding in support of environmental organisations in recipient countries.

Improvements in CDE performance could also be gained by:

- strengthening the planning and preparation of CDE interventions particularly in terms of undertaking more thorough *ex-ante* organisational analyses and assessments of the institutional setting and management capacities;
- matching policy objectives with realistic timeframes for implementation and longer-term commitments;
- addressing institutional capacity development issues in a broader context which encompasses changes in the “rules of the game”. These may include policy reforms which relate to the pricing and allocation of scarce natural resources, sectoral subsidies, “green” taxes or incentives, and changing organisational cultures;
- integrating environmental, social and economic aspects at all levels;
- revising environmental procedures and environmental guidelines with a clear view of existing capacity constraints;
- adopting more flexible programming approaches which espouse a willingness to experiment and to learn from “failure”;
- adopting more flexible approaches to funding and reporting.

## ANNEX 1

### OVERVIEW OF DAC MEMBERS WHO PARTICIPATED IN THE CDE STUDY

DAC Member/ Organisation	Evaluation Reports Forwarded	CDE Questionnaire Response	Written Comments to “Work in Progress” Documents <sup>1</sup>
Australia	Yes	Yes	Yes
Austria	-	Yes	-
Belgium	Yes	-	-
Canada	-	- <sup>2</sup>	Yes
Denmark	Yes	Yes	-
Finland	Yes	Yes	Yes
France	Yes	-	-
Germany	Yes	-	- <sup>3</sup>
Ireland	-	-	-
Italy	-	-	-
Japan	Yes	Yes (MoFA + OECF)	-
Luxembourg	Yes	Yes	-
Netherlands	Yes	Yes	Yes
New Zealand	-	-	-
Norway	Yes	-	-
Portugal	-	Yes	-
Spain	-	Yes	-
Sweden	Yes	Yes	Yes
Switzerland	Yes	-	Yes
United Kingdom	Yes	Yes	Yes
USA	Yes	-	-
CEC	Yes	Yes	-
ADB	-	Yes	-
World Bank	Yes	-	Yes
UNDP	Yes	-	-
EBRD	-	- <sup>4</sup>	-
OECD Secretariat	Yes	N/A	Yes
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>9</b>

<sup>1</sup>. Discussed under Agenda Item No. 6b at the 30th DAC Working Party on Aid Evaluation Meeting, Paris, 27-28 May 1998.

<sup>2</sup>. Expression of interest in completing the questionnaire received by e-mail on 13 February 1998.

<sup>3</sup>. Extensive discussions were held with representatives of BMZ, KfW and GTZ between 17-18 September 1998.

<sup>4</sup>. Letter of general interest in CDE of the Multilateral Finance Institutions including the European Investment Bank dated 30 March 1998.

## ANNEX 2

### OVERVIEW OF DAC MEMBERS' RESPONSES TO THE CDE QUESTIONNAIRE

No.	QUESTION	RESPONSE <sup>1</sup>
1	<b>Respondent details including years of present function</b>	Environmental specialists have on average been 3.7 years within their respective departments (n = 10)
2	<b>Has your aid administration produced CDE guidelines?</b>	77% do not have their own CDE guidelines
3	<b>Do you use other CDE guidelines in your work?</b>	62% refer to other CDE guidelines published by <i>i.a.</i> OECD-DAC and IIED
4	<b>Have there been other initiatives to promote understanding and awareness of the principles of CDE?</b>	92% have undertaken other types of CDE initiatives including <i>i.a.</i> training, national workshops, revision of EA/EIA guidelines
5	<b>To what or with whom do other departments refer, or consult with, on technical and institutional environmental issues?</b>	Evaluation reports are consulted occasionally (54%), rarely (38%) and most frequently (8%) as a source of information on technical and institutional environmental issues
6	<b>Does your aid administration use any of the OECD-DAC CDE guidelines?</b>	85% have sometimes used the OECD-DAC CDE guidelines
7	<b>Are there environmental policy statements, guidelines and profiles published by your own aid administration?</b>	54% have often used environmental policy statements, guidelines and profiles. 85% do not have policies or strategies to promote the decentralisation of CDE
8	<b>Is “environment” important as a sector and/or as a cross-cutting issue in your ODA programme?</b>	46% indicated that environment was very important as a sector whereas 31% indicated that environment was very important as a cross cutting issue
9	<b>How would you rank the emphasis placed on environment by your aid administration in relation to other cross-cutting issues?</b>	Priority cross-cutting issues were specified as poverty (69%), environment (23%) <sup>2</sup> and trade and debt (8%)
10	<b>Do you think it will be easier or more difficult to integrate environmental considerations in sector programmes than in individual projects?</b>	62% estimated that environmental issues will be more difficult to address in sector programmes
11	<b>Which are the <u>key</u> constraints in your aid administration which may limit the extent to which environmental considerations are satisfactorily addressed?</b>	Key constraint to address environmental concerns in ODA specified as limited in-house capacities, reflected in the small numbers of specialist staff; inadequate training opportunities; existing procedures not rigorously applied and/or EA guidelines under-utilized

<sup>1</sup>. All respondents were from donor agency environment departments. Number of Respondents (n) =13 unless specified. Caution has to be taken in interpreting and extrapolating these collated responses.

<sup>2</sup>. One respondent ranked environment as the first priority issue in accordance with “current workload”.

**OVERVIEW OF DAC MEMBERS' RESPONSES TO THE CDE QUESTIONNAIRE**  
(continued)

No.	QUESTION	RESPONSE
12	<b>Which countries include environment and natural resource management sector programmes and/or projects?</b>	DAC Members currently support an estimated 203 “environment” sector programmes in 93 countries <sup>3</sup>
13	<b>Estimate what proportion of funding is specifically allocated for CDE activities?</b>	62% estimated that CDE typically accounts for between 10-25% of overall support for environmental projects and programmes in ODA
14	<b>In which sectors are environmental concerns successfully addressed ?</b>	Environmental concerns are most often successfully integrated in the Water, Energy and Forestry sectors
15	<b>Examples of sector programmes and/or projects where environmental concerns are successfully integrated</b>	Discernible improvements in addressing environmental concerns in recent years. 85% of examples cited were from Central and South American or Asian countries.
16	<b>In which sectors have environmental concerns not been successfully addressed ?</b>	Environmental concerns are most often poorly integrated in the Education and Health sectors, Development Planning and Programme Assistance
17	<b>Has your aid administration turned down a project or programme due to the lack of attention to integrating environmental considerations?</b>	46% have rejected project proposals on environmental grounds. 31% provided concrete examples
18	<b>What initiatives have been taken to support and develop the use of environmental economic valuation techniques?</b>	67% have supported the development and use of environmental economic valuation techniques frequently as part of research and training programmes (n = 12)
19	<b>Which mechanisms have promoted greater understanding of the CDE principle of integration of environment and development?</b>	Numerous mechanisms have promoted greater communication and understanding of the principle of integrating environment and development (n = 10)
20	<b>Which types of organisations are supported through your aid administration’s environment and natural resource management projects and programmes?</b>	National environment ministries are the most frequently-supported organisational type. Private sector, media and consulting organisations are, comparatively, rarely assisted (n = 12)

<sup>3</sup>. Estimate includes “major” and “minor” programmes.



**OVERVIEW OF DAC MEMBERS' RESPONSES TO THE CDE QUESTIONNAIRE**  
(continued)

No.	QUESTION	RESPONSE
21	<b>Examples of organisations which have improved capacity in environment</b>	Several donor-supported organisations have developed capacity in environment
22	<b>Which funding mechanisms are used by your aid administration to support different types of organisations involved in CDE activities?</b>	Bilateral and multilateral grant assistance and embassy-administered funds are the most commonly used funding channels to support environmental projects and programmes
23	<b>Are institutional “twinning” arrangements between institutions in your country used to support CDE activities?</b>	75% have supported institutional twinning arrangements between donor and recipient country institutions
24	<b>Are institutional “twinning” arrangements between institutions in different recipient countries used to support CDE activities?</b>	25% have supported institutional twinning arrangements between two different recipient countries
25	<b>Does your department use specific tools or guidelines in making assessments of existing institutional capacity?</b>	46% have tools for assessing existing organisational capacities. Some DAC Members use in-house institutional development advisors and are developing Institutional Sector Assessment Guidelines or generic capacity development strategies
26	<b>Do clearly defined criteria exist which your department is expected to follow in the choice and selection of institutional partners?</b>	69% have loosely-defined criteria used in the selection and choice of organisational partners for environmental projects and programmes
27	<b>Do any of these criteria include a formalised requirement to define and elaborate on the alternative institutional options which have been considered prior to final selection?</b>	23% have a formalised requirement to assess alternative organisational options prior to selecting organisational entry points for environmental projects and programmes
28	<b>Which mechanisms have promoted greater communication and understanding of the CDE principle of institutional pluralism?</b>	38% specified mechanisms which have promoted communication and understanding of the CDE principle of institutional pluralism. One respondent noted that “the average Desk Officer is not familiar with the concept of institutional pluralism”
29	<b>How would you assess and rank the relative importance accorded in your ODA to different types of CDE activities?</b>	Extremely variable responses. 31% did not attempt to rank the types of CDE activities

**ANNEX 3**  
**OVERVIEW OF DAC MEMBERS' GENERIC AND ENVIRONMENT**  
**CAPACITY CONSTRAINTS**

Key Constraint to:	Example(s)	Exception(s)	Source(s)
<b>GENERIC CAPACITY</b>			
Centralised decision-making and budgetary authority	Most donor agencies GEF	NMFA*after 1996 Embassy- funds GEF <i>Small Grants Prog.</i>	<i>i.a.</i> World Bank/ UNDP/UNEP (1994)
Recentralised decision-making and budgetary authority	CIDA	-	Morgan (1993)
High rotation of personnel (usually an explicit policy of Ministries of Foreign Affairs) which mitigates against “institutional learning”	Most bilateral donor agencies and UNDP	World Bank?	<i>i.a.</i> Danida (1996) and Finnida (1998)
Limited number of institutional specialists	Most donor agencies	-	Huizenga (1997)
Short project and programme cycles, typically 2-5 years	Most donor agencies	KfW and GTZ ?	Baser (1994)
Organisational culture based on “pressure to lend” or “pressure to spend”	World Bank & many bilateral donor agencies	UNDP?	Rich (1994) Danida (1996) CEC (1997)
Endemic understaffing in relation to the overall size of ODA budgets	Most donor agencies	-	JACSES (1996)
Limited support from senior management	Many bilateral donor agencies	-	<i>i.a.</i> Danida (1996) Finnida (1998)
Limited effective <u>intra</u> -organisational co-ordination and weak information/data retrieval systems	Many donor agencies	-	-
Lessons learned from evaluations not internalised	Many donor agencies	-	OECD-DAC (1997+) Sida/UNDP (1997)
Over-emphasis on technical qualifications in the recruitment of external advisors	Most donor agencies	-	Kealy (1995)
Public audits address accountability issues but usually fail to examine the root causes of institutional under-performance	Most donor agencies	World Bank	<i>Portfolio Management Task Force</i> and JACSES (1996)
<b>SPECIFIC ENVIRONMENTAL CAPACITY</b>			
Lack of conceptual clarity	Most donor agencies	World Bank?	Baser (1994) Dixon (1997)
Limited number of environmental specialists	Most donor agencies	World Bank	CIDA (n.d.) CEC (1997)
No environmental specialists within the donor agency	<i>i.a.</i> Luxembourg and Austria	-	CDE Questionnaires
Limited decentralisation of donor agencies' own environmental expertise	Most donor agencies	NMFA*	Huizenga (1997) CEC (1997)
Limited compliance with established procedures regarding screening, strategic environmental assessments and EIA	Most bilateral & multilateral donor agencies	World Bank [cf. OD 4.01 and 4.02 (1991/2)]	<i>i.a.</i> Mwalyosi and Hughes (1998)
Limited follow-up to and relevance/ effectiveness of “environmental” training provided to in-house “generalist” staff	Most donor agencies	CEC (DG IB)	USAID cited in JACSES (1996) CEC (1997)
Limited awareness of the CDE concept outside of environment departments	Most donor agencies	GTZ?, CIDA?, World Bank?	OECD-DAC (1989)

Sources: Several donor thematic *Environment and Development* evaluation reports.

NMFA: Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

## ANNEX 4

### HISTORICAL BACKGROUND TO ENVIRONMENT AND DEVELOPMENT

#### Environment and development

A number of milestones spanning a period of more than thirty years have underscored international concern for environment and development issues. These have included *i.a.*:

- The publication of Rachel Carsen's *The Silent Spring* in 1962.
- The *Stockholm Conference on the Human Environment* in 1972, the first international forum which addressed concerns for global environmental challenges and resulted in the establishment of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP).
- The *World Conservation Strategy* published by the (now) World Conservation Union in 1980. This first gave prominence to the term "sustainable development" "through the conservation of living resources" (The World Conservation Unit, 1980).
- The Brundtland Report, *Our Common Future*, produced by the World Commission on Environment and Development (WCED) in April 1987. This resulted in the adoption of "sustainable development" as a global policy statement defined as "...development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs" (WCED, 1987 p. 43). Environmental sustainability has, henceforth, been considered an aspect of the development process and not a goal in itself.
- The establishment of the *Global Environment Facility* on the basis of an "Enabling Memorandum" approved by the World Bank's Executive Directors on 14 March 1991 and a subsequent tripartite agreement -- (between the World Bank, UNDP and UNEP) -- "Operational Cooperation under the Global Environment Facility", signed in October 1991.
- The United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED) in June 1992 focused world attention on the continuing environmental challenges and their cumulative impacts on development potentials in low-income countries. This resulted in the preparation of the *Earth Charter*, the attendant Plan of Action -- *Agenda 21* -- and the international conventions on Climate Change, Biodiversity Conservation and (post-UNCED) to Combat Desertification.
- The publication of the OECD-DAC's *Shaping the 21<sup>st</sup> Century: The Contribution of Development Cooperation* in May 1996 which endorsed the environmental dimension of sustainable development.

"...so as to ensure that current trends in the loss of environmental resources are effectively reversed at both global and national levels by 2015" (OECD-DAC, 1996a, p. 2).

Three formal commitments made in the *Declaration of Rio de Janeiro on Environment and Development* were:

“In order to achieve sustainable development, *environmental protection shall constitute an integral part of the development process and cannot be considered in isolation from it*” (Principle 4), and

“...to protect the environment, the precautionary approach shall be widely applied by states according to their capabilities. Where there are threats of serious or irreversible damage, lack of full scientific certainty shall not be used as a reason for postponing cost-effective measures to prevent environmental degradation” (Principle 15)

“Environmental impact assessment, as a national instrument, shall be undertaken for proposed activities that are likely to have a significant adverse impact on the environment and are subject to a decision of a competent national authority” (Principle 17)

The UNCED Secretariat estimated that the implementation of *Agenda 21* would require an *additional* annual transfer of resources amounting to US\$ 600 billion (including annual grants and concessional loans of US\$ 125 billion) between 1993 and 2000.<sup>1</sup>

The burden of debt in, and terms of trade with, many developing countries have continued to constitute serious constraints to promoting environmentally sustainable development in the post-UNCED era. Long-standing debt in low- and middle-income countries reached US\$ 1 537 billion in 1994. The overall debt of the 32 countries classified as Severely-Indebted Low-Income Countries amounted to US\$ 210 billion in 1994, four times higher than in 1980. As one study found:

“Although UNCED deliberations focused heavily on the issue of more foreign assistance, little was said and nothing decided on the *need to improve the ecological and economic quality of existing aid*, totally some US\$ 55 billion annually. The tens of billions of dollars lost annually to developing countries because of trade barriers on the part of the industrialized nations was not on the agenda. Nor was the need for forgiveness of developing country debt discussed” (Rich, 1994, pp. 262-263).

The United Nations Commission for Sustainable Development (UNCSD) has continued to highlight the urgent need for providing new and additional financial resources for sustainable development and particularly for integrating public and private financial resources. Several new international financial mechanisms have been explored such as the introduction of an internationally-agreed tax on air transport, a tax on foreign currency exchange transactions and global carbon taxes. The removal of existing subsidy schemes to encourage more sustainable patterns of production and consumption and to eliminate unnecessary public expenditure have, in contrast, received comparatively limited attention. NGOs have proposed the establishment of an inter-governmental panel on finance to undertake more concrete action to resolve the problem of the lack of resources for sustainable development (see, for example, Bramble, 1996, and Martens and Mucke, 1996).

Environmental awareness has also grown on a global scale as a result of:

---

<sup>1</sup>. It is far from clear *how* the UNCED Secretariat arrived at this figure.

- transboundary environmental challenges (including land degradation, the quantity and quality of water resources, depletion of the ozone layer, etc.);
- increasing concern regarding species' extinctions and the loss of biodiversity;
- increasing concern regarding the social disparities that emerged in the wake of the so-called "green revolution" in many low income countries;
- increasing recognition of the limitations of traditional yardsticks of economic performance which did not reflect the "welfare" or the state of the environmental resources of a particular country;
- increasing recognition of the need to treat environmental resources as economic goods (and services);
- the information, lobbying and advocacy activities of international and national environmental NGOs.

During the 1980s, donor agencies' attention was focused on providing support to the source functions of the environment which continue to provide the foundation for most economic activity for the majority of the rural poor in low-income countries (Dasgupta and Mäler, 1994). In the late 1980s and early 1990s, a discernible shift of emphasis occurred when donor agencies started to increase their support to the sink functions of the environment. This trend has continued throughout the 1990s.

Hundreds of environmental strategies, guidelines, profiles and synopses have been produced by donor agencies and recipient governments from the early 1980s to date <sup>2</sup>.

The continued global and, increasingly, "popularized" interest in "environment and development" issues has been sustained throughout the post-UNCED era. <sup>3</sup>

### **Institutional capacity development**

The concept of institutional capacity development <sup>4</sup> has once more gained importance in international development co-operation in the 1990s. "Institution building" was a significant theme of the modernisation theories which underpinned development co-operation in the 1960s.

---

<sup>2</sup>. See, for example, Asian Development Bank (1988, Vols. I and II); NORAD (1989); Danida (1989); Overseas Development Administration (1992); World Bank/Ministère des Finances et du Plan (1994); IEM/GEC (1996); Republic of Bolivia (1996); Latin American and Caribbean Commission (1997); Sida (1997a).

<sup>3</sup>. See, for example, *Our Precious Planet. Why saving the environment will be the next century's biggest challenge*. *TIME Special Issue*, November 1997, 84pp; and "Dirt Poor, A Survey of Development and the Environment". *The Economist*, 21 March 1998, 14pp.

<sup>4</sup>. A large number of terms have been (and still are) used loosely and interchangeably in donor agency documents and the academic literature. These include institution building, institutional support, organisational strengthening, institutional strengthening, public sector management, development management, development administration, human capacity development, capacity building and capacity development.

The evolution of thinking about institutional issues in development co-operation has constituted a continuum of multiple changes in underlying concepts and refinements of methodological approaches during a period of approximately fifty years. The initial foci on building and strengthening individual public sector organisations and providing technical and managerial training through “orthodox” technical assistance programmes have been progressively replaced by attempts to support endogenous processes and networking with a broader array of public and private sector institutions.

Issues of capacity development have been inextricably linked with those of sustainable development and technical assistance throughout this evolutionary process and, more recently, with other concepts such as *ownership*, *good governance* and *decentralisation*.<sup>5</sup>

Organisational development approaches have, to a large extent, been influenced by theories and management practices originating in North America and Western Europe. It would not be particularly useful, in the context of the present study, to attempt to define rigorously “institutional capacity development” or to enter into a detailed analysis of the theoretical background to institutional development (Moore *et al.*, 1994, p. 14). However, four related approaches can be discerned from the literature, viz.,

- “Orthodox” Organisational Development Approach which focuses on individual organisations, managerial issues (internal functioning) and the provision of services;
- Governance Approach which lays greater emphasis on political issues and the linkages with other institutions in the public, private and civil sectors;
- Institutional Economics Approach which lays greater emphasis on economic issues (macro-economics, socio-economics, market forces, competition and incentives) and strategic choices;
- Capacity Development Approach which attempts to synthesise the managerial-political-economic approaches in addition to addressing the many other cultural factors which are used to contextualise organisational changes.

A summarised historical overview of approaches to institutional capacity development is presented in Table A4.1.

There remain striking differences between donor agency generic institutional capacity development programmes in, for example, Eastern Europe and the Commonwealth of Independent States (which focus on strengthening institutions to promote the emergence of competitive market economies), and those, for example, in Sub-Saharan Africa (which have focused on building up local African capacity to analyse and implement economic policy options and reforms).

The shift from state-centred development policies has precipitated a significant increase in aid flows through non-governmental organisations (NGOs). The umbrellas of “good governance”, “gender”, “environment” and “private sector” programmes have resulted in a broad array of capacity building initiatives with a large number of public, quasi-public, private and civil institutions.

---

<sup>5</sup>. See, for example, OECD-DAC (1997c); OECD-DAC (1997a, 1997b, Parts I and II); and Cohen and Wheeler (1997).

In spite of these trends, a large proportion of institutional capacity development initiatives continue to involve centralised public sector organisations in both donor and recipient countries. Two examples illustrate this continuing trend, viz.,

- The World Bank's African Capacity Building initiative (with its clear focus on macro-economic reforms) which has largely been driven by external Washington-based "change agents" in collaboration with centralised ministries of finance <sup>6</sup>, and
- The United Nation's efforts to combat desertification which have resulted in a plethora of policies, action plans and programmes, strategies prepared by, and for, centralised environmental institutions and, most recently, an international convention. These initiatives, spanning a period of more than twenty years, have not resulted in significant tangible benefits for the local communities most affected by land degradation processes.

The increasing diversity of institutional partners implicated in development co-operation programmes has rendered the task of operationalising a theme such as "institutional capacity development" even more difficult.

The most significant change in the evolution of thinking on institutional capacity development has been the incremental improvements in understanding the factors which contribute to better organisational performance. Many gaps in knowledge still exist but clear patterns have emerged from empirical research and donor agencies' evaluation reports, including the re-emergence of the notion of an organisational "culture" <sup>7</sup>.

---

<sup>6</sup>. One evaluation report highlighted the need for "some accompanying shift in the World Bank's *style* of appraisal and negotiation" and "quite a substantial change in the approach of the IADB itself" (Austin, 1994, pp. 33-36).

<sup>7</sup>. See, for example, Inter American Development Bank (1988); Goldsmith (1992); Morgan (1993); World Bank (1993b); Danida (1993a); Austin (1994); UNDP/HIID (1996); Cohen (1995) and Grindle (1997b).

**Table A4.1: Historical Overview of Approaches to Institutional Capacity Development**

PERIOD	DOMINANT APPROACH	KEY CHARACTERISTICS
1950s and 1960s	INSTITUTION BUILDING	Equipping developing countries with public sector institutions deemed necessary to manage public investment programmes. Emphasis on the design, establishment and functioning of individual organisations in the public sector with assistance centred on training, technical assistance, financial support, programme design and organisational improvements to structures and systems. Little or no attention given to the political or cultural context of organisations or to non-public organisations.
1960s and 1970s	INSTITUTIONAL STRENGTHENING	Improving the performance of existing (individual) organisations. Emphasis on improving internal functioning through the introduction of financial management systems and training/upgrading of individual professional capacities. Institutional strengthening seen as a component or means to achieve other project objectives.
1970s	DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT	Management and implementation of development programmes to meet basic human needs. Emphasis on delivery systems of public sector programmes and the ability of governments to reach special target groups ignored by the centralised bureaucracies created in the colonial era and in the 1960s. Shift towards more strategic thinking and political content, greater decentralisation and involvement of local groups and institutions (NGOs and CBOs).
1980s	INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT	Long-term process of restructuring and organisational change and increased recognition of the broad array of public and private sector institutions, the linkages between sectoral and macro-policy issues and the need to assess organisational effectiveness as being the outcome of interactions between internal management and the external domestic and international context. Emphasis on public sector reforms and macro-economic policy adjustments, including widespread use of balance of payments support and technical assistance. Shift from project assistance to programme support initiated.
1990s	CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT	Long-term endogenous process that is shaped by local organisational, cultural and political dynamics. Increased emphasis on inter-organisational relationships, enabling environments and the catalytic/facilitating roles of donor interventions.
1992 onwards	CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT IN ENVIRONMENT	CDE gained prominence after the establishment of an OECD-DAC Task Force in October 1992 in the wake of UNCED. The <i>CDE Principles in Practice</i> published in 1997 adopted a broad framework.
1995-1998	CAPACITY ASSESSMENT AND DEVELOPMENT	First generation of comprehensive frameworks developed to assess existing capacities of institutions ( <i>i.a.</i> World Bank, UNDP, GEF and CIDA). UNDP's CAD Guidelines distinguish between the system, entity and individual levels. New emphasis on results/performance-based management.

**Sources:** Phillips (1969); Davis and North (1971); World Bank (1989); North (1992); Morgan (1993); Moore *et al.* (1994); World Bank (1994a); OECD-DAC (1995a); Ohiorhenuan and Wunker (1995); UNDP (1996); Grindle (1997b); OECD-DAC (1997f) and UNDP (1998).



## The Perseverance of Environmental Challenges

Many low-and middle-income countries continue to be confronted with a complex of serious economic, social and environmental challenges. Many of the difficulties have increased as a consequence of structural adjustment lending <sup>8</sup>, the decline in overall levels of ODA and the growing significance of the private sector and/or commercial aid flows, the latter notably in South East Asia. Three generic environmental challenges continue to exist in many donor agencies' recipient countries and can be summarised in terms of:

- the development of environmentally sustainable production systems using land and water-based resources;
- the development of environmentally sustainable energy production systems which meet the primary energy requirements of both rural and urban (low income) communities and in meeting the growing energy demands in the agricultural, industrial and service sectors;
- the development of institutional capacities and the statutory, regulatory and service functions of *i.a.* national and local governments, NGOs, community-based organisations (CBOs) to mitigate against and reduce the economic, social and environmental impacts associated with the degradation of air, land and water resources.

A number of complementary environmental challenges also continue to confront donor agencies and many recipient governments. These include:

- Conceptual limitations

There are still widespread differences of interpretation among both donor agencies and recipient governments as to what constitutes an environmental problem in the context of economic development. The economist's perception of the need to transform natural capital as a *sine qua non* for economic development has consistently sat uncomfortably with the ecologist's perception of nature requiring protection from the assumed negative effects of human activities. These diametrically opposed viewpoints have tended to reinforce the assumption (particularly in development co-operation) that all environmental impacts are necessarily negative. This underlying tenet has characterised the content, structure and general view expressed in environmental assessment and environmental impact assessment guidelines by many, if not most, donor agencies.

- History and uncertainty

Several uncertainties still exist regarding the nature and spatial and temporal extent of environmental problems, whether of global, regional, national or local significance. Attempts to scientifically validate the character and extent of the major environmental problems have, in several cases, challenged the underlying premises and assumptions which have underscored both academic and donor agency "doom and gloom" predictions of impending environmental "disasters" (English, Tiffen and Mortimore, 1994). Historical records suggest that this has been the case for more than a century.

---

<sup>8</sup>. See, for example, Reed (1992); Gibbon (1996) and Harrigan (1998).

This is illustrated by the case of Tanzania and a number of West African countries <sup>9</sup>. Many environmental issues, at all levels, are still shrouded in controversy and uncertainty <sup>10</sup>.

- Conflicting interests

Conflicting interests continue to exist in the design and implementation of environmental projects and programmes. At the national level, the adoption of environmentally-adjusted economic growth models in national planning efforts remains, at best, piecemeal and, at worst, non-existent in many low income countries. At the community level, the poverty trap continues to predetermine individual, family, clan and village choices in the use and overuse of environmental resources and to reaffirm that environmental degradation is a cause of accentuated poverty among the rural poor in low-income countries. Environmental problems are perceived differently by different groups of people and the institutions they represent <sup>11</sup>.

The growth of interest in environmental economics as a means of providing a truer account of the real costs and benefits of policies and projects by qualifying their environmental effects, of furnishing the data necessary for national resource or environmental accounting, and in assisting environmental policy through “green” pricing remains, essentially, an academic discipline with limited application among most donor agencies or recipient governments. The exceptions to this pattern are the international finance institutions and regional development banks.

- The changing focus of environmental projects and programmes

The focus of donor-supported environmental projects and programmes has changed with time. In essence, their breadth and complexity have increased as the inter-relationships between poverty and environmental resource degradation and the now recognised “failures” of markets *and* institutions have been better understood <sup>12</sup>. These changes have also reflected donor agency responses to the growing problems associated with increasing urbanisation and industrialisation and the increasing numbers of people squatting in urban peripheries.

Modes of production and patterns of consumption in most developing countries will, in the future, pose even greater strains on the environment. Development planning is still dominated by adjusted economic growth models, and assistance in supporting the sustainable use and management of environmental resources will probably remain a critical issue up to and beyond the year 2015.

---

<sup>9</sup>. See, for example, Burton (1860); Speke (1863); Stanley (1872); Southton (1881); Stuhlmann (1891); Hore (1892); Staples (1942); Christiansson (1988); Schabel (1990); Kuponen (1994); Mearns and Leach (1997) and Fairhead and Leach (1998).

<sup>10</sup>. For example, a CDE Workshop 1996 case study suggested that “erosion control and soil conservation measures, together with afforestation and other projects, have led to an increased availability of drinking water in the areas covered by the project” (OECD-DAC, 1996d). The hydrological responses to the conversion of tropical forests and land degradation are still not sufficiently understood to provide a *de facto* basis to explain such types of environmental change through simplified “cause-effect” linkages.

<sup>11</sup>. A “green backlash” has occurred. See, for example, Rowell (1996), “Environmental Scares. Plenty of Gloom”. *The Economist* 20 December 1997, pp. 21-23.

<sup>12</sup>. See, for example, Feder (1977 and 1979); Jodha (1986); Wade (1987 and 1988); Howe (1986); Hecht *et al.* (1988) and Ensminger (1990).

## The perseverance of institutional challenges

Public sector organisations continue to perform poorly in many developing countries; a number of States have literally collapsed in the face of poverty, economic crisis and political insecurity. Governments' increasing recourse to budget austerity measures, the corrupt and rent-seeking behaviour of public officials and political insecurity are commonplace, particularly in Sub-Saharan African countries.

This situation clearly endorses the continued need for reforms to improve the efficiency, effectiveness and responsiveness of the public sector (and other institutions) in developing countries.

This need has been reflected in the increasing importance attached to institutional capacity development (or components) in most donor agencies' ODA programmes since the late 1980s. One evaluation estimated that institutional strengthening components had increased from 16 to 40% of gross bilateral aid between 1963 and 1990 (Austin, 1994, pp. 12-13).

In spite of this clear trend, donor agencies' policy statements, strategies and evaluation reports have continued to highlight the fact that:

- limited institutional capacity remains one of the most common bottlenecks in the development process; and
- institutional capacity development (components) in ODA programmes are at best partially successful, and commonly unsuccessful <sup>13</sup>.

Institutional capacity development projects and programmes (or components) whether generic CD or specific CDE, have been -- and will continue to be -- characterised by being:

- extremely difficult to plan, design, implement and monitor;
- confronted with the ubiquitous need for institutional *change* but which remains hard to achieve, assess and measure in most contexts;
- constrained by the lack of formulae or prescriptions available on *how* to do it effectively.

---

<sup>13</sup>. See, for example, Inter-American Development Bank (1988); Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs (1988); World Bank (1991g); Austin (1994); UNDP/HIID (1996) and UNDP (1997a).

## ANNEX 5

### THE CDE FRAMEWORK AND CDE GUIDELINES

#### Background

In November 1987 (in the wake of the Brundtland Report) and March 1991, the OECD and GTZ respectively conducted seminars in Paris and New Delhi entitled *Strengthening Environmental Cooperation with Developing Countries* and *Institutional Development in Environment*. These were the first known and specific donor agency initiatives regarding CDE. The former occurred a year *before* and the latter occurred three to four years *after* generic capacity development initiatives were undertaken by several donor agencies, including the Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Danida, USAID, the World Bank and the Inter-American Development Bank.

A summarised overview of known donor agency generic CD and specific CDE initiatives between 1980 and 1998 is presented in Table A5.1.

In October 1992 (in the wake of the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development), the DAC WP/ENV set up the Task Force on CDE which was led initially by GTZ, CIDA and the Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs. In 1993, several other donor agencies and institutions were co-opted on to the CDE Task Force (World Bank, UNDP, JICA, IUCN and IIED). The Task Force was assisted by two external consultants.

The mandate of the Task Force was:

“...to develop common approaches, planning and analytical tools for donor programmes of technical co-operation for capacity development in environment” (OECD-DAC, 1995a, p. 7).

The Task Force met five times between 1992 and 1995, issued two progress reports and, in addition to the CDE Workshops cited in 1.1 of the main text, commissioned six “updated” *Environmental Considerations in Development Cooperation* surveys of DAC Members’ activities in support of environmental goals.<sup>1</sup>

The composition and frequency of follow-up meetings of the Task Force between 1995 and 1997 are not clear.

The Task Force developed the following definition of CDE:

“Capacity in the environment represents the ability of individuals, groups, organisations and institutions in a given context to address environmental issues as part of a range of efforts to achieve sustainable development. The term *Capacity Development in Environment* (CDE) describes the process by which capacity in environment and appropriate institutional structures are enhanced” (OECD-DAC, 1995a).

---

<sup>1</sup>. Only one of these studies (the Netherlands) was referred to in the DAC Members’ CDE questionnaire responses (IDEM Consult, 1995a). Five additional *Guidelines on Environment and Aid* were published by the OECD-DAC between 1992 and 1993 (see OECD-DAC, 1992c, 1992d, 1992e, 1992f and 1993b).

## The CDE Framework

The first comprehensive framework for CDE was published as *Developing Environmental Capacity. A Framework for Donor Involvement* (OECD-DAC, 1995a). The CDE Framework proposed a broad analytical framework comprising five components, viz.,

- functions such as networking, planning, regulating and communicating;
- actors such as formal organisations, individuals and informal institutions;
- the context of values and policies including democratisation and incentives;
- the societal context, including conditions at the global, regional, national and community levels;
- resources, including human, informational, financial and technological.

The CDE Framework, furthermore, briefly reviewed some of the main techniques and analytical tools for use by donors for capacity programmes in the environment encompassing methodologies in:

- participation and the facilitation of local ownership;
- contextual analysis techniques;
- capacity mapping techniques;
- programme design;
- programme management.

The foci of the CDE Framework were to increase donor agencies' familiarity with methodologies to assist in the "development of an enabling environment for capacity development", to highlight "challenges for donors" that had arisen from presumed on-going "programmes of capacity development for the environment" and to suggest "other objectives", including *i.a.* "developing local organisations for environmental management". Finally, the CDE Framework recognised the need for donor agencies to:

- move to partnership arrangements with developing countries;
- reconcile accountability and capacity issues;
- strengthen their field operations;
- increase their familiarity with CD methodologies;
- improve their ability for aid co-ordination; and
- promote greater sharing of knowledge, learning and best practices.

It also lucidly expressed a cautionary note:

"Raising the environmental performance of organisations and people in any society is a daunting task, even for its own citizens. Assuming that this can be done easily by outside interveners may be the first mistake in any capacity development programme. Recognition of the need to experiment, listen and learn may be the first step to some sort of progress" (OECD-DAC, 1995a, p. 10).

## CDE Indicators

In recognition of the need for “devising new indicators and evaluation criteria to reflect quantitative, qualitative and process elements of CDE to measure efficiency and efficacy” the Task Force on CDE commissioned a study (through the Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs) on indicators for CDE (IDEM Consult, 1995b). This study built on the findings of an earlier OECD *Working Group on the State of the Environment* (see OECD-DAC, 1993c).

The Task Force specified that indicators for the assessment of CDE programmes must meet a number of criteria:

- they must reflect for whom the capacity is developed;
- they will frequently need to differentiate between short, medium and long term;
- they should distinguish between collection of information in support of *ex-ante* planning and of baseline information to facilitate *ex-post* evaluation;
- they should distinguish between assessing the effectiveness of the CDE programme in terms of impacts or effects (monitoring) and assessing the quality of the implementation process (policy review and management learning);
- they will normally include both qualitative and quantitative indicators <sup>2</sup>;
- they should distinguish between different user groups broadly specified as “donor organisations” and “organisations in developing countries” (IDEM Consult, 1995b, pp. 2-4).

Three core sets of CDE indicators -- built around the CDE Task Force’s five components (functions, actors, normative context, societal context and resources) -- were proposed to assist in assessing:

- the state of the environment (modelled on the “issue-pressure-state-response” system) <sup>3</sup>;
- the existing capacity in the environment supplemented by indicators for judging the intermediate and eventual effects or impacts;
- the effectiveness of the planning and implementation processes.

Numerous subsequent initiatives have been undertaken to develop and refine approaches to participatory monitoring and evaluation and to establish sustainable development and CDE indicators <sup>4</sup>.

---

<sup>2</sup>. This was qualified by the consultant’s own recognition that qualitative indicators of “cross-sectoral relationships”, “integrative approaches”, “multi-faceted processes” and “community ownership of CDE” “are often difficult, if not impossible, to quantify” (IDEM Consult 1995b, p. 3).

<sup>3</sup>. See, for example, Friend and Rapport (1979) and Euroconsult (1995).

<sup>4</sup>. See, for example, CIDA (1994); DfID (1995); USAID (1995a); World Bank (1996c); UNCSD (1996); Institute of Development Studies (1997); Morgan (1997); OECD-DAC (1997g); Kirk (1997) and Boesen and Lafontaine (1998).

## The CDE Guidelines

The first comprehensive set of guidelines regarding CDE were published as *Capacity Development in Environment. Principles in Practice* (OECD-DAC, 1997f). The CDE Guidelines used case study material drawn from the 1996 CDE Workshop in Rome.

The CDE Guidelines were prepared in the context of (and were considered as being central to) the “paradigm shift currently underway in the theory and practice of development co-operation” built around:

“...the acceptance of a partnership model (in which) development co-operation does not try to do things for developing countries and their people, but with them. It must be seen as a collaborative effort to help them to increase their capacities to do things for themselves. Paternalistic approaches have no place in this framework. In a true partnership, local actors should progressively take the lead while external partners back their efforts to assume greater responsibility for their own development” (OECD-DAC, 1997f, p. 1).

The key underlying principles of the CDE concept are that it:

- is based on promoting sound environmental considerations and criteria in the development process;
- integrates environment and development concerns;
- is multi-faceted and process-oriented rather than product- or output-oriented;
- aims to strengthen institutional pluralism in civil society;
- is a systemic approach;
- belongs to and is driven by the community in which it is based (the principle of subsidiarity);
- takes gender issues fully into account in all aspects and levels of development and implementation;
- actively seeks to develop appropriate approaches to include all disadvantaged groups in society;
- involves a variety of management techniques, analytical tools, incentives and organisational structures in order to achieve a given policy objective.

The CDE Guidelines recognised that:

“...implementation should always be seen as one step in an iterative process (along with design, monitoring and evaluation) which should adjust to evolving development realities” (p. 19);

“...project design for CDE requires flexibility, shared understanding, agreement on both short-term priorities and the principles of external assistance and a willingness to tackle conflicts and difficulties together” (p. 25);

“...there needs to be a clear definition of roles, accountability of all parties, transparency in the decision-making processes *and sufficient time to allow stakeholders and institutions to adapt to the pace of change*” (p. 25).

## Scope and Limitations of the CDE Framework and the CDE Guidelines

The distinguishing features of the specific CDE *vis à vis* the more generic CD requirements in developing countries are unclear.

The major thrust of donor agency, academic and professional interest throughout the period 1988-98 has been focused on generic CD initiatives (*cf.* Table A5.1). To complicate matters, the *specific* CDE guidelines would achieve a tight fit in *any* sector and, as some commentators have noted, are almost synonymous with the development process itself <sup>5</sup>.

Although the CDE Framework did recognise that

“...the particular conditions of environmental work pose special problems for capacity development” (OECD-DAC, 1995a, p. 14) and that

“...much of the emerging experience over the last two decades indicates that endemic uncertainty is one of the main characteristics of environmental issues” (p. 22),

neither the CDE Framework nor the CDE Guidelines clearly elaborated any further on *what* the “special problems for capacity development (in environment)” actually are and in *which* ways these “special problems” can be distinguished from the *generic* capacity development constraints confronting most recipient countries. Furthermore, it is unclear if the CDE initiatives were expressions of recipient countries’ needs and priorities as opposed to donor agencies’ *interpretations* of their needs and priorities. Similarly, no further elaboration was proffered as to the meaning of “endemic uncertainty”.

It is thus unclear if the CDE Framework

- was providing a platform for the specific CDE initiatives and/or
- was implicitly recognising the need to address the *generic* underlying causes of environmental resource degradation and/or
- was implicitly assuming that environmental organisations were the only organisational option available to donor agencies

in specifying that:

“Unlike more traditional areas of public management such as public works or health services that have organisational frameworks going back decades and even centuries, environmental organisations are comparatively late entrants to public management systems. Their constituencies of support tend to be less powerful and they are frequently operating “ahead of the curve”, meaning that they deal with issues that many countries in the South do not yet consider a fundamental priority. Environmental departments, for example, must contend for authority and resources with more established departments and ministries usually within an inadequate legal framework. Most are underfunded, poorly structured and rarely evaluated. Establishing the mandate of environmental organisations in the public sector is a notoriously difficult task... Finally, developing countries are faced with the challenge of changing mass behaviour

---

<sup>5</sup>. See, for example, Cohen (1995). The World Bank’s *Handbook on Technical Assistance* had earlier concluded that capacity-building is so broad a concept that it can be defined to be as inclusive as the user’s application (World Bank, 1993a, p. 6).



when dealing with problems such as deforestation or desertification... Changing behaviour on a wide scale needs a major social and organisational effort involving a combination of coercive measures and regulations, incentives, education and participatory decision-making” (OECD-DAC, 1995a, pp. 14-15).

There is little substantive difference between the CDE Framework and the CDE Guidelines which *both* provide general guiding principles and an “overall macro-framework for CDE”.

The CDE Framework proposed in 1995 appropriately recognised that “the Framework... cannot be used to make strategic choices or to provide more specific techniques of CDE analysis” (p. 28). Much the same conclusion can be drawn from the CDE Guidelines published in 1997.

The CDE 1996 Workshop Proceedings do, however, provide an exhaustive array of material and examples of tools and techniques to support the identification and design, implementation, monitoring, participatory approaches, learning methodologies and donor co-ordination but are neither “synthetic” nor “user-friendly”. It is not known how widely the CDE 1996 Workshop Proceedings (OECD-DAC, 1997e) have been distributed among either donor agencies or recipient country institutions.

The all-embracing nature of the CDE concept has blurred the linkages between, and complementarity to, economic and social policy considerations.

The economic and social policy implications of the different definitions of the all-embracing concept of sustainable development have continued to differ considerably. Environmentally sustainable development is explicit in the CDE concept. The CDE Framework and CDE Guidelines assume that all other key actors think and work from the same starting point. This assumption has not necessarily been shared by either donor agency decision-makers or recipient governments’ national institutions (*and/or* local communities) whose primary concerns (measured in terms of allocations of public sector expenditure <sup>6</sup> or ODA <sup>7</sup>) have remained:

- the alleviation of mass poverty through economic growth and/or
- the improvement of basic social services (health, education and water).

Convincing arguments to answer the questions “*Why* should developing economies devote scarce resources to global pollution or biodiversity issues marked by considerable scientific uncertainty?” or “*How* should a villager continue to meet his or her short-term (survival) needs by protecting the soil or the forest?” have remained elusive in many CDE projects and programmes reviewed in this study.

There is limited attention given, in either the CDE Framework or the CDE Guidelines, to the issue of sustainable financing for commonly resource-starved environmental institutions, although the concern was raised by one delegate at the Costa Rica CDE Workshop in 1993 (see OECD-DAC 1994, pp. 46-53).

---

<sup>6</sup>. Environment ministries typically receive less than 5% (often between 1 and 3%) of public sector expenditure in developing countries (see, for example, *Tanzania Country Study*, *Burkina Faso Country Study*, *Nicaragua Country Study* (Danida, 1996) and *Lake Malawi Lakeshore District Environmental Management Programme* (Danida, 1998b).

<sup>7</sup>. Donor agency appropriation in support of ‘environment’ is typically between 8 and 15% of total ODA.

The obvious need for capacity development within recently-created organisations such as national Ministries of Environment or young environmental NGOs with limited financial bases, and the complexity of addressing a cross-sectoral issue such as environment in the frequent absence of effective cross-sectoral institutional mechanisms have proved a tempting cocktail for donor agencies.

Many environmental organisations continue to be confronted with considerable risks and (increased) donor dependency *vis à vis* their funding. However, a number of organisations and mechanisms reviewed in the context of this study have successfully “broken from the fold” and successfully managed to develop innovative approaches to sustainable financing.

There is limited assessment of existing donor agency performance or capacities and the administrative, financial and organisational requirements to implement the CDE Guidelines.

The CDE Framework and CDE Guidelines were effectively prepared in an “environmentalist’s ghetto” characterised by:

- a certain degree of fadism <sup>8</sup>;
- limited use of, or reference to, existing DAC Members’ evaluation reports and/or the lessons learned about generic institutional capacity development;
- limited use of, or reference to, the findings of other empirical institutional capacity-building research programmes <sup>9</sup>; and
- limited recognition of the potential role of evaluation findings as a managerial or as an operational tool:

“Donors should make a commitment to monitoring as a tool for management for results (not policing! Not evaluation!)” (OECD-DAC, 1997e, p. 198).

These weaknesses would tend to endorse the findings of earlier OECD-DAC reports published in 1989 and 1997 respectively (*cf.* 1.1 in the main text).

### **Follow-up to the CDE Guidelines**

The CDE Framework stated that:

“...hopefully, the broad principles set out... will provide the context for the design of more operational tools” (p. 10).

Limited follow-up by donor agencies has occurred *vis à vis* the development of:

“a detailed planning guide”

“... an important part of the next stage in thinking about CDE” and which

---

<sup>8</sup>. For example, the CDE Framework refers to a “major initiative” described as the notion of “primary environmental care” (OECD-DAC, 1995a, p. 20). This concept was not referred to by *any* donor agency or *any* recipient institution in *any* of the CDE projects and programmes reviewed in this study. See also Pretty and Sandbrook (1991).

<sup>9</sup>. See, for example, Goldsmith (1992); North (1992); Kiggundu (1991 and 1994); Brinkerhoff (1995) and UNDP/HIID (1996).

“... is best carried out by individual donors who can tailor such a checklist to their own individual requirements” (p. 10).

To date, few multilateral or bilateral donor agencies would appear to have developed their own specific CDE guidelines although there has been a proliferation of “CDE” projects and programmes in recipient countries during the period 1992-97.<sup>10</sup>

The Global Environment Facility proposed a framework (*Capacity Building Requirements for Global Environmental Protection*) in 1995 but there is little indication of systematic follow-up in its use by any of the three implementing agencies.

Several individual donor agency initiatives have, however, successfully carried the CDE process forward, albeit in different guises. The following examples illustrate the different types of follow-up related to CDE that have occurred:

- the Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs is in the process of preparing its own *Monitoring CDE Projects* guidelines (see question 2 of the CDE Questionnaire in Annex 2)
- Danida conducted an international CDE workshop in May 1998 as recommended at the 1996 CDE Workshop (Danida, 1998a)
- the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg has organised CDE training for its staff in collaboration with UNDP’s Capacity 21 Unit (see question 4 of the CDE Questionnaire in Annex 2)
- USAID commissioned an *Environmental Policy Dialogue: Lessons Learned* study through HIID and a broad array of collaborating institutions
- the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs revised and published *A Strategy for Environment in Development Cooperation 1997-2005* and has completed a study of (generic) institutional development efforts in Norwegian bilateral assistance
- the Department for International Development is complementing an earlier desk *Environmental Evaluation Synthesis Study* with country studies carried out during 1998
- Finnida initiated a thematic evaluation of environment and development in Finnish development co-operation on 26 March 1998 and
- a United Nations General Assembly mandate of 1995 to conduct six country impact evaluation studies has been completed during 1998, of which two countries where “environment” and CDE have been addressed as core themes.<sup>11</sup>

---

<sup>10</sup>. See the 34 country case studies presented at the CDE 1996 Workshop (OECD-DAC, 1997e).

<sup>11</sup>. The six countries are Brazil, El Salvador, Mali, Pakistan, Uganda and Zimbabwe. The Brazil country study includes forestry and the environment, and the Zimbabwe country study includes environment.

## Conclusions

The CDE Guidelines have reaffirmed earlier aid principles and are characterised by considerable overlap with generic CD Guidelines.

The development of the concept of CDE has been an ambitious step forward in the continuation of global political interest in, and the learning processes associated with, international development and environment issues. In several cases, the CDE Guidelines have reiterated and reaffirmed generic CD principles established in earlier international fora<sup>12</sup>. The 1996 CDE Workshop in Rome has placed the concept firmly on the international agenda, notably among environmental specialists.

The modalities for implementation of most donor agencies have not evolved at the same pace, or to the same extent, as their own conceptual and policy-making structures.

Considerable effort has been expended within donor agencies on justifying the shift towards the new institutional capacity development strategies (encompassing generic CD and specific CDE) *without a concomitant and critical reflection on what it entails or a realistic assessment of the opportunities and constraints inherent in the new approach*. Several generic and specific environment capacity constraints continue to hamper the performance of donor agencies and recipient country institutions alike. It should be stressed, however, that the study has identified a number of excellent CDE projects and programmes in Latin America, Africa and Asia.

Five critical factors would appear to have mitigated against the widespread adoption and institutionalisation of the CDE concept among either donor agencies or recipient countries and their institutions. These are:

- the compounded conceptual confusion resulting from the merging of two poorly-defined frameworks -- “environment” and “capacity development”;
- the institutional characteristics of most donor agencies which are not conducive to learning, supporting a “process” approach or effectively managing CDE projects and programmes;
- the continued limited integration of environmental policy with economic development concerns at all levels of government and civil society in many developing countries;
- the additional institutional demands resulting from the substantial broadening of the scope of environmental problems (including, most recently, the growing emphasis on “global” environmental issues which *may*, ironically, have *weakened* capacities to address priority national environmental challenges), without a commensurate increase in either human or financial resources or staff skills to fulfill specific tasks or roles<sup>13</sup>;
- the conspicuous absence of a coherent core set of internationally-agreed environmental indicators (in stark contrast to both economic and social indicators) as well as functional institutional performance indicators.

---

<sup>12</sup>. For example, the principle of “integration” of environment and development concerns was already established in 1982 (Joint Nordic Working Group for Environment in Aid *Miljø og bistånd* NU 1982:9), the principle of “ownership” was already established in 1991 (OECD-DAC, 1991a) and the principle of “subsidiarity” was enshrined in the Copenhagen Report -- *the Nordic Freshwater Initiative* (Anon, 1991).

<sup>13</sup>. See, for example, World Resources Institute (1995) and UNDP-SEED (1997).

**Table A5.1: OVERVIEW OF GENERIC "CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT" (CD) AND SPECIFIC "CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT IN ENVIRONMENT" (CDE) DONOR INITIATIVES BETWEEN 1980 and 1998**

DONOR/ INSTITUTION	YEAR	TYPE OF INITIATIVE IN:	
		Generic CD + Key Reference(s)	Specific CDE + Key Reference(s)
IUCN/UNEP/ WWF	1980		<i>The World Conservation Strategy</i>
Sida/Danida/ NORAD/ Finnida/ Iceland	1981-82		Joint Nordic Group on Environment and Development established <i>Miljö och Bistånd</i> NU 1982:9 "... improve training in the environmental field for the personnel concerned both on the donor and on the recipient side..."
OECD	June 1985		Council Recommendation C(85)104 regarding environmental assessment
WCED	1987		<i>Our Common Future</i>
OECD	1987		Seminar "Strengthening Environmental Cooperation with Developing Countries", Paris, November 1987
IADB	1988	<i>Technical Cooperation for Institutional Strengthening</i>	
Netherlands Min of Foreign Affairs	1988	<i>Final Report on Institutional Development</i>	
Danida	1988	<i>Institutional Aspects of Danish Project Assistance</i>	
USAID	1989	<i>Private Voluntary Organisations. Accelerating Institutional Development</i>	
World Bank	1989	<i>Long-Term Perspective on Sub-Saharan Africa: From Crisis to Sustainable Development</i>	
OECD	1989		Working Party on Development Assistance and Environment established <i>The Environmental Impact of Development Projects</i> (Environmental Grantmakers Association)
World Bank	1990	<i>Institutional Development Work in the Bank. A Review of 84 Bank Projects</i>	
GTZ	1991		Seminar <i>Institutional Development in the Environment</i> New Delhi, 18-20 March 1991
USAID	1991	<i>Looking Out, Looking In, Looking Ahead</i>	
OECD	1991	<i>Principles for New Orientations in Technical Co-operation</i>	
World Bank	1991	<i>Managing TA in the 1990s and The African Capacity Building Initiative: Towards Improved Policy and Analysis and Development Management</i>	Global Environment Facility established (World Bank/UNDP/UNEP)
UNCED	1992		<i>Agenda 21</i> para 37.1
UNDP	1992	<i>Capacity Building and Technical Cooperation – Managing the Connection</i>	<i>Handbook and Guidelines for Environmental Management and Sustainable Development</i>
OECD	1992	<i>DAC Principles for Effective Aid</i>	Task Force on CDE established <i>Guidelines on Environment and Aid Nos. 1-4</i>
Danida	1992	<i>Institutional Issues in Danida Projects – A Synthesis</i>	
JICA	1992	<i>Int. Symp. Sharing Experiences of Technical Cooperation-Institutional Development in Asia Tokyo, 17-18 December 1992</i>	
World Bank	1992	<i>Manual for Institutional Capacity Analysis and Development System: Operational Manual</i>	

DONOR/ INSTITUTION	YEAR	TYPE OF INITIATIVE IN:	
		Generic CD + <i>Key Reference(s)</i>	Specific CDE + <i>Key Reference(s)</i>
World Bank	1993	<i>Handbook on Technical Assistance and A Governance Approach to Civil Service Reform in Sub-Saharan Africa</i>	
UNDP	1993	Workshop on Capacity Building in the Public Sector, <i>Cambridge, Mass. 8-9 October 1993</i> and <i>Rethinking Technical Cooperation: Reforms for Capacity Building in Africa</i>	
DfID	1993	<i>The Process of Change: A Synthesis Study of Institutional Strengthening: Projects and Experience</i>	
Danida	1993	Institutional Development. Effectiveness, Participation, Sustainability and Accountability	
OECD	1993		<i>Environmental Capacity Development. Some Lessons drawn from OECD Aid Agency Experiences (Australia, Canada, France, Germany, Norway), 16 April 1993, and Proceedings of a Workshop on CDE, Costa Rica, 9-11 November 1993</i>
AusAID	1993	The Australian Public Service Improved. Task Force on Management Improvement	
ECDPM	1994	Partnership in Development Cooperation – Combining Recipient Responsibility with Donor Accountability, <b>Maastricht, 29 June – 01 July 1994</b>	
CIDA	1994	<i>Emerging Issues in Capacity Development. Proceedings of a Workshop. Institute on Governance, Ottawa, 22-24 November 1994</i>	
Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs	1994	<i>Exploring Paths and Obstacles in paving ways for Institutional Development and The Standing of Institutional Development in the Dutch Development Cooperation Policy</i>	
Sida	1994	<i>Institution Building as a Development Assistance Method. A Review of Literature and Ideas</i>	
UNDP	1994	<i>Building Sustainable Capacity: Challenges for the Public Sector and Capacity Development: Lessons of Experience and Guiding Principles and CAPBUILD for Institutions</i>	
World Bank	1994	Pilot Case on Capacity Assessment for Public Sector Management and Decentralization and Evaluation Capacity Development	<i>Valuing the Environment. Proceedings of the First Annual International Conference on Environmentally Sustainable Development</i>
DfID	1994	Strengthening Rural District Councils. <i>Joint Government of Zimbabwe/ODA Terminal Review of the Pilot District Support Programme</i>	
CIDA	1994	<i>CIDA's Experience with Technical Cooperation: Selected Lessons Learned, DAC Informal Network on Tech. Coop., London, 17-18 November 1994</i>	

DONOR/ INSTITUTION	YEAR	TYPE OF INITIATIVE IN:	
		Generic CD + <i>Key Reference(s)</i>	Specific CDE + <i>Key Reference(s)</i>
UNDP	1995	<i>UNDP Capacity Development Retreat</i>	
GTZ	1995	Technical Cooperation for Capacity-Building. A Selection from the Work of GTZ in Africa	
DSE	1995	<i>Potential and Use of National Capacities and the Role of the Foreign Expert in Future Development Cooperation, Berlin, 16-19 May 1995</i>	
Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs	1995	<i>Institutional Development in DGIS: Theory and Practice</i>	Environmental Considerations in Development Cooperation. Case Study: The Netherlands
OECD/ World Bank/ UNDP	1995	<i>Technical Co-operation Workshop on Institutional Development. Eschborn, 22-23 May 1995</i>	
OECD	1995		<i>Developing Environmental Capacity. A Framework for Donor Involvement, Donor Assistance to CDE, Indicators for CDE. Background Paper.</i>
GEF	1995		Capacity Building Requirements for Global Environmental Protection
Danida/ Sida/DfID/ India	1996	<i>Assessment of UNDP: Developing Capacity for Sustainable Human Development</i>	
Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs	1996	<i>Institutionele ontwikkeling in meervoudig perspectief: naar een methodische strategie voor capacity development</i>	
OECD	1996	<i>Shaping the 21<sup>st</sup> Century: The Contribution of Development Co-operation, May 1996</i>	<i>Coherence in Environmental Assessment, Proceedings of a Workshop on CDE, Rome, 4-6 December 1996</i>
Danida/ OECD	1996	<b>Evaluation Capacity Building.</b> Donor Support and Experiences	
World Bank	1996	Partnership for Capacity Building in Africa	
UNDP	1997	Capacity Development	
Finnida	1997-98		Thematic Evaluation on Environment and Development (on-going)
NORAD	1997-98	Development through Institutions? (on-going Study of Institutional Development Efforts in Norwegian Bilateral Assistance)	
Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs	1997		Management of CDE Programmes and Projects. Experiences and Challenges in the Dutch Development Cooperation
OECD	1997	<i>Final Report of the DAC Ad Hoc Working Group on Participatory Development and Good Governance, Parts I and II</i>	CDE Principles in Practice
USAID	1997	<i>Environmental Policy Dialogue: Lessons Learned</i>	
UNDP	January 1998	<i>Capacity Assessment and Development in a Systems and Strategic Management Context</i>	
Luxembourg/ UNDP	March 1998		CDE Training (+ UNDP's <i>Capacity 21</i> )
Danida	May 1998		International Workshop on Danish Assistance to CDE, <b>Snekkersten, 12-14 May 1998</b>

*Nota bene* This summarised table is far from comprehensive. It has been compiled on the basis of documentation provided by some DAC Members, UNDP, HIID and literature reviews.

## **ANNEX 6**

### **LIST OF PERSONS CONSULTED**

#### **Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs**

Ms. Hedy I. von Metzsch, Head, Policy and Operations Evaluation Department  
Mr. Ted Kliet, Policy and Operations Evaluation Department  
Mr. Ron Lander, Head, International Environmental Policy, Instruments and Water Management Division  
Mrs. Anneke Wevers, Senior Expert in Environmental Assessment, Environment and Development Department  
Dr. A.P.R. Visser, Head, Poverty Alleviation Section  
Mr. Phil O'Keefe (ETC U.K. Ltd)

#### **Danish International Development Assistance (Danida)**

Mr. Niels Dabelstein, Head, Evaluation Department  
Mr. Poul Erik Schmidt, Evaluation Department  
Ms. Elsebeth Tarp, Head, Environment Department TSA.6  
Mr. Hans Hessel-Andersen, Environment Advisor, TSA.6  
Mr. Henning Nøhr, Environment Advisor, TSA.6

#### **Department for International Development (DfID)**

Mr. Christopher Raleigh, Head, Evaluation Department  
Mr. Simon Robbins, Deputy Head, Evaluation Department  
Mrs. Olive Moran, Evaluation Department  
Ms. Helen Ireton, Evaluation Department  
Mr. Mike Ellis, Head, Environment Policy Department  
Mr. Dougie Brew, Environment Policy Department  
Mr. Michael Flint, Consultant, Environmental Evaluation Synthesis Study

#### **United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)**

Mr. Abdenour Benbaouli, Deputy Director, Evaluation Office (EO)  
Mrs. Kaarina Valtasaari, Senior Evaluation and Planning Officer, EO  
Ms. Christine H. Roth, Evaluation and Planning Officer, EO  
Mr. José Cruz-Osorio, Consultant, Management Development and Governance Division  
Mr. Peter Gilruth, Technical Advisor, UNSO  
Ms. Lene Poulsen, Advisor, UNSO  
Mr. Philip Dobie, Coordinator, Capacity 21 Unit, Sustainable Energy and Environment Division (SEED)  
Mr. Sean Southey, Environment Specialist, Capacity 21 Unit, SEED  
Mr. Martin Krause, Monitoring and Evaluation Coordinator, UNDP GEF Core Unit, SEED  
Mr. Roger Maconick, Coordinator, Impact Evaluation, Operational Activities for Development, UN Secretariat



**Ministry for Economic Co-operation and Development (BMZ), Federal Republic of Germany**

Dr. Horst Breier, Head, Evaluation Unit

Dr. Hans Peter Schipulle, Director, Division Environment and Forestry

**Deutsche Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit (GTZ)**

Dr. Stephan Paulus, Projektleiter, GTZ Pilotvorhaben Institutionenentwicklung im Umweltbereich

Dr. Detlef W. Schreiber, Senior Advisor, Environmental Management

**Kreditanstalt für Wiederaufbau (KfW)**

Mr. Josef Gamperl, Senior Environmental Specialist, Sector Policy Department, Development Cooperation

Mr. Jan H. Mayer, Principal Economist, Institutional and Human Resource Development

**Finnish International Development Assistance (Finnida)**

Mr. Kari Karanko, Ambassador, Head of Evaluation and Internal Audit

Mr. Pekka Salminen, Environmental Advisor

Dr. Mikael Hilden, Consultant, Thematic Evaluation on Environment and Development in Finnish Development Co-operation, Finnish Environment Institute

**Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs**

Ms. Pippi Soegaard, Evaluation Department

Ministère des Affaires Étrangères, du Commerce et de la Coopération, Grand-Duché de Luxembourg

Mr. Marc Franck, Chargé de Mission

**Austrian Development Cooperation**

Dr. Sepp Weingärtner, GPR Consulting Group

**Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD)**

Mr. Hans Lundgren, Strategic Management of Development Co-operation Division (SMDCD)

Ms. Maria Iarrera, SMDCD

**International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED)**

Mr. Richard Sandbrook, Executive Director

Mr. Koy Thomson, Assistant Executive Director

**Harvard Institute for International Development (HIID)**

Professor Merilee Grindle, Edward S. Mason Professor of International Development, John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University

Dr. Mary Hilderbrand, Development Associate, HIID

Dr. Arthur Goldsmith, Visiting Scholar, University of Massachusetts

Dr. Theodore Panayotou, Institute Fellow, Director of the International Environment Programme

## ANNEX 7

### BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Action Aid** (1995),  
The Reality of Aid 1995: an independent review of international aid. Earhscan, London, United Kingdom.
- Adamolekun, L., Kulemeka, N. and Laleye, M.** (1997),  
“Political Transition, Economic Liberalization and Civil Service Reform in Malawi”. *Public Administration and Development* 17, pp. 209-222.
- Adamu, G.** (1994),  
Pilot Study of Capacity Building -- Ghana. Harvard Institute for International Development, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts, USA.
- African Development Bank/Swiss Development Cooperation/UNDP** (1994),  
“New Forms of Programme Aid. Workshop Report”. International Workshop 30 January-1 February 1994, Harare International Conference Centre, Harare, Zimbabwe.
- Agarwal, A. and Narain, S.** (1989),  
Towards Green Villages: a strategy for environmentally sound and participatory rural development. Centre for Science and Environment, New Delhi.
- Anderson, D.** (1996),  
“Energy and the Environment: Technical and Economic Possibilities”. In *Finance and Development*, June 1996. pp. 10-13. Published by The World Bank, Washington, D.C., USA.
- Anon** (1982),  
“En nordisk utredning med förslag till bättre integration av miljö- och naturresurspekterna i biståndsarbetet”. *Miljö och Bistånd* Nu 1982:9. pp. 10.
- Anon** (1991),  
Copenhagen Report -- “The Nordic Freshwater Initiative”.
- Anon** (1997),  
Our Precious Planet. Why Saving the Environment will be the Next Century’s Biggest Challenge. pp. 84. *TIME Special Issue*. November 1997.
- Anon** (1998),  
“Dirt Poor. A Survey of Development and Environment”. pp. 14. *The Economist*, 21 March 1998. London, United Kingdom.
- Ardón, P.** (1997),  
Los Conflictos en Centroamérica. Unpublished mimeo. In: Eade, D. (1997) *Capacity-Building. An Approach to People-Centred Development*. Oxfam, Oxford.
- Arden-Clarke, C.** (1994),  
*Environmental Taxes and Charges and Border Tax Adjustment — GATT Rules and Energy Taxes*. A Critique for the World Wide Fund for Nature. WWF International, Gland, Switzerland.
- Asian Development Bank** (1988),  
*Guidelines for Integrated Regional Economic-cum-Environmental Planning*. Vols. I and II. ADB, Manila, Philippines.

- AusAID** (1994a),  
 “Alilem Integrated Water Resources Development, Philippines. In *Environment Audit of the Australian Overseas Aid Program*. pp. 79-86. Canberra, Australia.
- AusAID** (1994b),  
 “Central Visayas Water Supply and Sanitation Scheme, Philippines”. In *Environment Audit of the Australian Overseas Aid Program*. pp. 60-78. Canberra, Australia.
- AusAID** (1994c),  
 “Firewood Replacement Scheme, Duan County”. In *Environment Audit of the Australian Overseas Aid Program*. pp. 95-103. Canberra, Australia.
- AusAID** (1994d),  
 “Luoyang Coal Gasification Plant”. In *Environment Audit of the Australian Overseas Aid Program*. pp. 104-114. Canberra, Australia.
- AusAID** (1995a),  
 “Basud Agro-forestry and Rural Development Project. Philippines”. In AusAID (1995b), pp. 87-94.
- AusAID** (1995b),  
*Environment Audit of the Australian Overseas Aid Program*. pp.168. Canberra, Australia.
- AusAID** ( 1995),  
 Support to the *Bicol Uplands Resources Development Foundation*, the Philippines. In AusAID Environment Audit 93/02/G009.
- Austin, C.** (1994),  
 The Process of Change: A Synthesis Study of Institutional Strengthening Projects and Experience. Overseas Development Administration Evaluation Report EV 559. ODA, London.
- Barnard, C.I.** (1938),  
 The Functions of the Executive. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Barcena, A.** (1994),  
 “What is Capacity in Environment: A Developing Country Perspective”. pp. 46-53. In *Capacity Development in Environment*. Proceedings of a Workshop held in Costa Rica, 9-11 November 1993. OECD, Paris, France.
- Barnes, D.F. et al.** (1997),  
 “Tackling the Rural Energy Problem in Developing Countries”. In *Finance and Development*, June 1997. pp. 11-15.
- Baser, H.** (1994),  
 “CIDA’s experience with technical co—operation: selected lessons learned”. Paper presented at the DAC Informal Network on Technical Cooperation Meeting, 17-18 November 1994. CIDA, Ottawa, Canada.
- Bass, S., Dalal-Clayton, B. and Pretty, J.** (1995),  
 Participation in Strategies for Sustainable Development. Environmental Planning Issues No. 7. IIED, London.
- Bhatnagar, B.** (1991),  
 NGOs and World Bank-supported Projects in Asia: Lessons Learnt. Departmental Papers Series No. 2. Asia Technical Department, The World Bank, Washington.

- Bhatnagar, B. and Williams, A.C.** (eds.) (1992),  
Participatory Development and the World Bank: Potential Directions for Change. World Bank Discussion Paper 193. The World Bank, Washington.
- Berg, E.J.** (1993),  
*Rethinking Technical Cooperation*. UNDP, New York, USA.
- Biswas, A.K. and Agarwala, S.B.C.** eds. (1992),  
*Environmental Impact Assessment for Developing Countries*. Butterworth-Heinemann, Oxford, United Kingdom.
- Boesen, J. and Hansen, E.** (1991),  
“Case Study on Local Water Management in the Ismani Rural Area, Tanzania”. Paper prepared for the Freshwater Resources -- Nordic Initiative (August 1991).
- Boesen, J. and Lafontaine, A.** (1998),  
“Indicators and monitoring of capacity development in environment initiatives”. 46 pp. Draft background document presented at the International Workshop on CDE, Danida and Danced, Snekkersten, 12-14 May 1998.
- Bolger, J.** (1994),  
“Ownership: The concept and CIDA’s experience”. Paper presented at the European Centre for Development Policy Management Round Table on Partnerships in Development Cooperation: Combining Recipient Responsibility with Donor Accountability, 29 June - 1 July 1994, Maastricht, The Netherlands.
- Bossuyt, J. and Laporte, G.** (1994),  
Partnership in the 1990s: How to make it work better. *Policy Management Brief* No. 3, December 1994. 8 pp. European Centre for Development Policy Management, Maastricht, The Netherlands.
- Bossuyt, J.** (1995),  
“Capacity Development: How can donors do it better?”. *Policy Management Brief* No. 5, September 1995. 6 pp.
- Bramble, B.J.** (1996),  
“The future of the CSD or Bringing *Agenda 21* into the 21st Century”. Statement of Barbara J. Bramble on behalf of the National Wildlife Federation at the High Level Segment of the Fourth Session of the CSD. 2 May 1996.
- Brett, E.A.** (1996),  
“The Participatory Principle in Development Projects: the Costs and Benefits of Cooperation”. *Public Administration and Development* 16, pp. 5-19. Published by John Wiley & Sons, Chichester, United Kingdom.
- Brew, D. and Lee, N.** (1996),  
“Reviewing the quality of donor agency environmental assessment guidelines”. *Project Appraisal* 11 (2), pp. 79-84.
- Brinkerhoff, D.W.** (1991),  
“Looking Out, Looking In, Looking Ahead -- Guidelines for Managing Development Programs”. USAID’s Implementing Policy Change Project. Working Paper No. 1. USAID, Washington, D.C., USA.
- Brinkerhoff, D.W.** (1992),  
“Promoting the Sustainability of Development Institutions: A Framework for Strategy”. In *World Development*, Vol. 20.

- Brinkerhoff, D.W.** (1995),  
“Cooperation in Policy Reform”, *Development Policy Management Network Bulletin*, Vol. 3,  
No. 1, Maastricht, The Netherlands.
- Brooks, S.** (1996),  
“Small Business Development in Papua New Guinea”. PNG Biodiversity Conservation and  
Resource Management Programme. Department of Environment and Conservation,  
Conservation Resource Centre, Port Moresby, Papua New Guinea.
- Burton, R.F.** (1960),  
*The Lake Regions of Central Africa*. Vols. 1 and 2. pp. 412 + pp. 468. Longmans Green,  
London, United Kingdom.
- Buyck, B.** (1991),  
“The Bank’s Use of Technical Assistance for Institutional Development. Policy research and  
External Affairs”, Working Papers, WPS 578, The World Bank, Washington, D.C., USA.
- Carew-Reid, J. et al.** (1994),  
*Strategies for National Sustainable Development: A Handbook for their Planning and  
Implementation*. IIED, London and IUCN, Gland. Earthsacn, London, United Kingdom.
- Carley, M., Smith, M. and Varadarajan, S.** (1991),  
“A network approach to enhanced environmental management”. *Project Appraisal* 6 (2),  
pp. 66-74.
- Centre for Development Research** (1997),  
*Sustainable Social and Human Development in Malawi: Towards Poverty Alleviation ?* Bwalo.  
A Forum for Social Development. Issue 1. Centre for Social Research, University of Malawi.
- Centre for Development Research** (1998),  
*Den Ny Verden* 1, pp. 57-74. Centre for Development Research, Copenhagen, Denmark.
- Cernea, M.M.** (1987),  
Farmer organisations and institution building for sustainable development. *Regional  
Development Dialogue* 8, 1-24.
- Cernea, M.M.** (1991),  
Putting People First. 2<sup>nd</sup> edn., Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Chakrabati, S., Wilson, R. and Rundell, P.** (1995),  
“ODA Fundamental Expenditure Review. Main Report”. A Report to the Secretary of State for  
Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs, the Chief Secretary to the Treasury and the Minister for  
Overseas Development. DfID, London, United Kingdom.
- Chambers, R., Pacey, A. and Thrupp, L.A.** (1989),  
Farmer First: Farmer Innovation and Agricultural Research. IT Publications, London.
- Chambers, R.** (1992),  
Rural Appraisal: Rapid, Relaxed and Participatory. IDS Discussion Paper 311. Institute for  
Development Studies, University of Sussex, Brighton.
- Chambers, R.** (1994a),  
The origins of participatory rural appraisal (PRA). *World Development* 22 (7), 953-969.
- Chambers, R.** (1994b),  
Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA): analysis and experience. *World Development* 22 (9),  
1253-1268.

- Chew, D.C.E.** (1991),  
 “Internal Adjustments to Falling Civil Service Salaries: Insights from Uganda”. *World Development* 18 (7), pp. 1003-1014.
- Chilowa, W. and Chirwa, E.W.** (1997),  
 The impact of structural adjustment programmes on social and human development in Malawi. *Bwalo* 1. Centre for Social Research (1997).
- Christensen, S. et al.** (1993),  
 “Institutional and political underpinnings of growth in East Asian countries”. The World Bank, Washington, D.C., USA.
- Christiansson, C.** (1988),  
 “Degradation and rehabilitation of agropastoral land. Perspectives on environmental change in semi-arid Tanzania”. *Ambio* 17 (2), pp. 144-152.
- CIDA** (1994),  
*Pakistan Environment Program: Performance Indicator Tracking System*. Pakistan Program. September 1994 edition. CIDA, Hull, Canada.
- CIDA** (n.d.),  
 “Background Note on CIDA Paper on Capacity Development and Performance-Based Management”. 5 pp. CIDA, Ottawa, Canada.
- Cohen, J.C.** (1992),  
 “Foreign Advisors and Capacity Building: the case of Kenya”. *Public Administration and Development* 12, pp. 493-510.
- Cohen, J.M.** (1995),  
 Capacity Building in the Public Sector: a focused framework for analysis and action. *International Review of Administrative Sciences* 61, 407-422.
- Cohen, J.M. and Petersen, S.B.** (1996),  
 “Methodological Issues in the Analysis of Decentralization”. *Development Discussion Paper* No. 555. Harvard Institute for International Development. 24 pp. HIID, Cambridge, Massachusetts, USA.
- Cohen, J.M. and Wheeler, J.R.** (1997),  
 “Building Sustainable Professional Capacity in African Public Sectors: Retention Consultants in Kenya”. *Public Administration and Development* 17, pp. 307-324.
- Cohn, J.M.** (1993),  
 “Building sustainable public sector managerial, professional and technical capacity: basic dimensions and key variables of analytical framework”. Paper prepared for the Workshop on Capacity Building in the Public Sector, Harvard Institute for International Development and the Bureau for Programme Policy and Evaluation, United Nations Development Programme, Cambridge, 8-9 October 1993.
- Coles, I.** (1996),  
 “Capacity Development in Environment. Australian Experience in Indonesia, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, India and the Philippines”. 13 pp. + 5 annexes. Paper presented at the OECD—DAC CDE Workshop, 4-6 December 1996, Rome, Italy.
- Commission Européenne** (1998),  
 “Evaluation des Actions de la CE en faveur de l’Environnement dans le cadre de sa coopération avec les Pays en Voie de Développement”. Evaluation Résumé 3. Juin 1998. 4 pp. Commission Européenne, Bruxelles, Belgique.

- Commission of the European Community** (1996),  
*Evaluation of the Environmental Performance of EC Programmes in Developing Countries* (B7-5091/95). Desk Evaluation Report. Executive Summary (Vol. I), Main Text (Vol. II) and annexes (Vol. III). 32 pp. + 169 pp. + 5 annexes. Environmental Resources Management, London and Commission of the European Community, Brussels, Belgium.
- Commission of the European Community** (1997),  
*Evaluation of the Environmental Performance of EC Programmes in Developing Countries* (B7-5091/95). Synthesis Report. Executive Summary (Vol. I) and Main Text (Vol. II). 49 pp. + 214 pp. Environmental Resources Management, London, and Commission of the European Community, Brussels, Belgium.
- Coulibaly, M.** (1995),  
 “Aperçu historique des liens entre questions environnementales et besoin de développement”. Manus., Bobo Dioulasso.
- Crombrugghe de, G. et al.** (1993),  
 Evaluation of EEC-NGO Cofinancing in relation to institutional support for grassroots organisations in developing countries. Brussels: COTA.
- Crossley, R.A. et al.** (1997),  
 “Innovative Financing for Sustainable Forestry”. *Unasylva* 188, Vol. 48, pp. 23-31.
- Danced** (1997),  
 Support to the *Department of Environmental Affairs*, Mpumalanga Province, South Africa. Mid-term Review, 123/0141.
- Danced** (1998),  
 Support to the *Ministry of Science, Technology and Environment*, MOSTE, Thailand. Project Completion Report 13.0093.
- Danchurch Aid** (1997),  
 Aid support to the *Environmental Rehabilitation Project*, Malawi. Project Evaluation.
- Danida** (1989),  
 “Environmental Profile of Tanzania”. Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Copenhagen, Denmark.
- Danida** (1991),  
 “Environmental Aspects of Electrification Projects”. In *Sector Evaluation of Electrification Projects. Synthesis*, Evaluation Report 1991/7. pp. 56-59. Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Copenhagen, Denmark.
- Danida** (1991),  
 “Drinking water projects in India”. Evaluation Report 1991/11. Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Copenhagen, Denmark.
- Danida** (1992a),  
 “Drinking Water Projects. A Synthesis of Evaluations by Nordic Countries”. Evaluation Report 1992/7. Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Copenhagen, Denmark.
- Danida** (1992b),  
 The Nordic Freshwater Initiative”. Information Office, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Copenhagen, Denmark.
- Danida** (1993a),  
 “Institutional Development Effectiveness, Participation, Sustainability and Accountability”. *Issue Paper No. 1*, 18 pp. + annex. Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Copenhagen, Denmark.

- Danida** (1993b),  
“Danida Forest Seed Centre”. Evaluation Report 1993/8, 64 pp. +7 annexes. Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Copenhagen, Denmark.
- Danida** (1993c),  
“The Sustainability of Danida Supported Urban Water Supply Projects. Synthesis”. Evaluation Report 1993/3. Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Copenhagen, Denmark.
- Danida** (1993d),  
*The Entebbe Report*. East African Water Resources Seminar, 24-27 May 1993. Follow-up on UNCED (Rio), 1992, The International Conference on Water and the Environment (Dublin), 1992, and the Nordic Freshwater Initiative (Copenhagen), 1991. Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Copenhagen, Denmark.
- Danida** (1993e),  
“Guidelines for evaluation of the sustainability of projects in the water supply sector”. 27 pp. *Issues Paper No. 3*, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Copenhagen, Denmark.
- Danida** (1994a),  
Evaluation of the Framework Agreements between Danida and four Danish NGOs. Evaluation Report 1994/3, 52 pp. + 2 annexes. Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Copenhagen, Denmark.
- Danida** (1994b),  
“The Local Grant Authority”. Evaluation Report 1994/4. Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Copenhagen, Denmark.
- Danida** (1994c),  
“Sewerage Projects, Kenya”. Evaluation Report 1994/10. Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Copenhagen, Denmark.
- Danida** (1995a),  
“Report of the Group of Independent Advisers on Development Cooperation Issues Between Tanzania and its Aid Donors”. Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Copenhagen, Denmark.
- Danida** (1995b),  
“Review/Evaluation Report. Ecological Monitoring Centre. Sénégal”. Joint UNDP/UNSO/Danida Evaluation. Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Copenhagen, Denmark.
- Danida** (1995c),  
*Watershed Development*. Proceedings of Danida’s International Workshop on Watershed Development. WDCU Publication No. 1, 570 pp. WDCU, New Dehli, India.
- Danida** (1996a),  
“The Miniprogramme Agreements between Danida and five Danish NGOs”. Evaluation Report 1996/15, 37 pp. + 11 annexes. Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Copenhagen, Denmark.
- Danida** (1996b),  
“Evaluation Capacity Building. Donor Support and Experiences”. *Issues in Aid Evaluation*. OECD-DAC Expert Group on Aid Evaluation, 32 pp. Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Copenhagen, Denmark.
- Danida** (1996c),  
“Support to National Environmental Policy formulation and Clean Environmental Production in Tanzanian Industries”. In Tanzania Country Study. Thematic Evaluation of the Danida *Plan of Action for Environment and Development*. Annex 6 Project Profiles. Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Copenhagen, Denmark.



- Danida** (1996d),  
“Energy Sector”. In Danida (1996e, Vol. I), pp. 60-65. Copenhagen, Denmark.
- Danida** (1996),  
Energy Sector. In *Environment and Development Volume I Synthesis Report*, Evaluation Report 1996/2. pp. 60-65. Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Copenhagen, Denmark.
- Danida** (1996e),  
*Environment and Development, Synthesis Report* (Vol. I) and annexes (Vol. II). 138 pp. + 10 annexes. Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Copenhagen, Denmark.
- Danida** (1996f),  
“Water and Sanitation Sector”. In Danida (1996e, Vol. I), pp. 55-60. Copenhagen, Denmark.
- Danida** (1996g),  
“Tanzania Country Study. Environment and Development”. Evaluation Report 1996/2, 85 pp. + 2 appendices + 6 annexes. Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Copenhagen, Denmark.
- Danida** (1996h),  
“Burkina Faso Country Study. Environment and Development”. Evaluation Report 1996/2, 90 pp. + 2 appendices + 6 annexes. Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Copenhagen, Denmark.
- Danida** (1996i),  
“Nicaragua Country Study. Environment and Development”. Evaluation Report 1996/2, 57 pp. + 2 appendices + 5 annexes. Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Copenhagen, Denmark.
- Danida** (1996),  
Support to the *School Maintenance Project*, Tanzania. Tanzania Country Study. Thematic Evaluation of Danida’s Plan of Action for Environment and Development.
- Danida** (1997a),  
“Land Use Planning Project (Phase 3)”. Final Review Report. Joint Review Mission. 63 pp. + 7 annexes. Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Copenhagen, Denmark.
- Danida** (1997b),  
“Regional Policy-Making and Local Capacity Development. Study of Regional Organisations and Institutions in South-East Asia related to Danish Environmental Assistance”. Draft Report, 45 pp. + 2 annexes. Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Copenhagen, Denmark.
- Danida** (1998a),  
International Workshop on Danish Assistance to Capacity Development in Environment. Snekkersten, 12-14 May 1998. Background Material and Workshop Proceedings. Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Copenhagen, Denmark.
- Danida** (1998b),  
“Lake Malawi Lakeshore District Environmental Management Programme. Malawi”. Draft Component Document + annexes 1-23. Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Copenhagen, Denmark.
- Dasgupta, P. and Mäler, K-G.** (1994),  
“Poverty, Institutions and the Environmental Resource Base”. World Bank Environment Paper No. 9, 64 pp. The World Bank, Washington, D.C., USA.
- Davies, R.** (1995),  
The Management of Diversity in NGO Development Programmes. Centre for Development Studies, University College, Swansea.
- Davis, S.H.** (1996),  
Public Involvement in Environmental Decision-Making. The Experience of the World Bank.

- Theme Paper No. 5 presented at the OECD-DAC Workshop on Capacity Development in Environment. pp. 251-262. Proceedings of the CDE Workshop held in Rome, Italy, 4-6 December 1996. OECD-DAC, Paris.
- Davis, L.E. and North, D.C.** (1971),  
*Institutional Change and American Economic Growth*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, USA.
- Deal, T. and Kennedy, A.A.** (1982),  
*Corporate Cultures: The Rites and Rituals of Corporate Life*. PA: Addison-Wesley, Reading.
- De Merode, L. and Thomas, C.** (1994),  
“Implementing civil service pay and employment reform in Africa: The experiences of Ghana, The Gambia and Guinea”. In Lindauer, D. and Nunberg, B. eds. (1994) *Rehabilitating Government: Pay and Employment Reform in Africa*. The World Bank, Washington, D.C., USA.
- Department for International Development** (1992),  
“Forestry Synthesis Evaluation Study”. Evaluation Report EV 541, 41 pp. + 6 annexes. Department for International Development (DfID), London, United Kingdom.
- Department for International Development** (1994),  
“Cairo Wastewater Project. Egypt. Interim Evaluation”. Vol. I and Vol. II. 73 pp. + 145 pp. Evaluation Report EV: 539, Evaluation Department. DfID, London, United Kingdom.
- Department for International Development** (1995),  
“Guidance note on indicators for measuring and assessing primary stakeholder participation”. Social Development Department. DfID, London, United Kingdom.
- Department for International Development** (1996a),  
“Madura Goundwater Irrigation Project, Indonesia”. Vol. I and Vol. II. Evaluation Report EV: 548, Evaluation Department. DfID, London, United Kingdom.
- Department for International Development** (1996b),  
“Evaluation of Nepal Eastern Region Water Supply Project”. Vol. I and Vol. II, 56 pp. + 103 pp. Evaluation Report EV: 549, Evaluation Department. DfID, London, United Kingdom.
- Department for International Development** (1997a),  
“Evaluation Synthesis of Rural Water and Sanitation Projects”. 46 pp. + 5 annexes. Evaluation Report EV: 596, Evaluation Department. DfID, London, United Kingdom.
- Department for International Development** (1997b),  
“Environmental Evaluation Synthesis Study. Report of Phase 1”. Main Report (Vol. I) and Summary Report on the Sampled Projects (Vol. II). 39 pp. + 6 appendices and 317 pp. Evaluation Department, DfID, London, United Kingdom.
- Dia, M.** (1993),  
“A Governance Approach to Civil Service Reform in Sub-Saharan Africa”. Technical Paper 225. The World Bank, Washington, D.C., USA.
- Diakonhjæmmets Internasjonale Senter/Nordic Consulting Group** (1997),  
**Development through Institutions? A Study of Institutional Development Efforts in Norwegian Bilateral Assistance**. Parts I (Plan of Implementation) and II (Terms of Reference Sub-Studies). Norwegian MFA, Oslo, Norway.

- Diallo, A.S. et al.** (1991),  
“Capacity Building for Aid Coordination in the Least Developed Countries”. Central Evaluation Office, UNDP, New York, USA.
- DfID** (1992),  
Support to the *Forest Department*, Kenya. Evaluation of the Embu-Meru-Isiolo Forestry Project. Evaluation Report EV 522.
- DfID** (1994),  
Support to the *Rural District Councils*, (Ministry of Local Government Rural and Urban Development) Zimbabwe. Terminal Review of the Pilot District Support Programme.
- Dubois, O.** (1998),  
“Capacity to Manage Role Changes in Forestry. Introducing the ‘4Rs’ Framework”. IIED Forest Participation Series No. 11. 22 pp. IIED, London, United Kingdom.
- Eade, D.** (1997),  
*Capacity-Building. An Approach to People—Centred Development*, 226 pp. Oxfam Development Guidelines. Oxfam, Oxford, United Kingdom.
- Edgcomb, E. and Cawley, J.** (1991),  
“The Process of Institutional Development: Assisting Small Enterprise Institutions to Become More Effective”. Growth and Equity through Microenterprise Investments and Institutions (GEMINI). Working Papers. Development Alternatives Inc., Michigan, USA.
- Edwards, M.** (1997),  
“Organisational Learning in Non-Governmental Organisations: What have we learned?”. *Public Administration and Development* 17, pp. 235-250.
- Eldon, J. et al.** (1993),  
Strengthening Rural District Councils: an approach to institutional capacity building – the experience of the Pilot District Support Project. ODA, London.
- Elizondo, D., Hessel—Andersen, H. and Boesen, N.** (1996),  
“Developing environmental capacity in Nicaragua. Case Study No. 1. National Capacity at the Implementation Level”, 10 pp. Paper presented at the OECD-DAC Workshop on Capacity Development in Environment, Rome, Italy, 4-6 December 1996.
- English, J., Tiffen, M. and Mortimore, M.** (1994),  
Land Resource Management in Machakos District, Kenya 1930-1990. World Bank Environment Paper No. 5 in cooperation with the Overseas Development Institute, London. The World Bank, Washington.
- Ensminger, J.** (1990),  
“Co-opting the elders: The political economy of state incorporation in Africa”. *American Anthropologist* 92.
- Euroconsult** (1995),  
Identification d’indicateurs de durabilité environnementale et écologique pour la zone sahélienne aride et semi-aride d’Afrique de l’Ouest, en particulier pour les zones d’agriculture sèche. Rapport Final préparé pour la Direction Générale de la Coopération Internationale (DGIS), La Haye, Pays Bas.
- Eurostep and ICVA** (1996),  
*The Reality of Aid 1996*. Earthscan, London, United Kingdom.

- Fairhead, J. and Leach, M.** (1998),  
 “Reconsidering the extent of deforestation in twentieth century West Africa”. *Unasylva* 192, Vol. 49, pp. 38-46.
- Fallon, P. and da Silva, P.** (1991),  
 Public pay and employment issues in Mozambique. The World Bank, Washington.
- Feder, E.** (1979),  
 “Agricultural resources in underdeveloped countries: competition between man and animal”. *Economic and Political Weekly* 14.
- Feder, E.** (1997),  
 “Agribusiness and the elimination of Latin America’s rural proletariat”. *World Development* 5.
- Finnida** (1996),  
 “Western Water Supply Programme, Kenya”. “Rural Water Supply and Sanitation Project in the Western Development Region, Nepal”. “Harispattura and Udunuwara Water Supply and Sanitation Project, Sri Lanka”. “Mtwara-Lindi Rural Water Supply Project, Tanzania”. “Hanoi Water Supply Project, Viet Nam”. In *Effects or Impacts? Synthesis Study on Evaluations and Reviews 1988 to mid-1995*. pp. 111-118, 146-148 and 170-173. Report of Evaluation Study 1996:1. 408 pp. Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Helsinki, Finland.
- Finnida** (1997a),  
 “Searching for Impact and Methods: NGO Evaluation Synthesis Study”. OECD-DAC Expert Group on Aid Evaluation, 118 pp. + 2 annexes. Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Finland, Helsinki, Finland.
- Finnida** (1997b),  
 “Master Terms of Reference. Thematic Evaluation on Environment and Development in the Finnish Development Co-operation”, 13 pp. + 7 annexes. Evaluations and Internal Audit, Department for International Development Co-operation, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Helsinki, Finland.
- Finnida** (1998),  
 “Executive Summary, Major Component. Thematic Evaluation on Environment and Development in the Finnish Development Co-operation”, 7 pp. Evaluations and Internal Audit, Department for International Development Co-operation, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Helsinki, Finland.
- Foundation for the Philippine Environment/Nature Conservancy/UNDP** (1997),  
 “Report on the First Asia-Pacific Forum on Environmental Funds”. A Regional Consultation on National Environmental Funds in Asia and the Pacific. Ceby, Philippines 16-21 February 1997. UNDP, New York, USA.
- Friend, A. and Rapport, D.** (1979),  
*Towards a comprehensive framework for environmental statistics: A stress—response approach*. Statistics Canada, catalogue 11-510, Ottawa, Canada.
- GEF-UNDP** (1997),  
 Support to the *Biodiversity Conservation and Resource Management Programme*, Papua New Guinea. Evaluating Lessons Learned from an Integrated Conservation and Development “Experiment” in New Ireland, Papua New Guinea. UNOPS-PNG/93/G31.
- GEF-UNDP** (1997),  
 Support to the *Environmental Defence League (LIDEMA)*, Bolivia in the implementation of the

Small Grants Programme. In *Environmental programmes in Latin America and the Caribbean: An Assessment of UNDP Experience*. OESP Lessons Learned Series.

**GEF-World Bank** (1997),

Support to the *Lake Malawi Biodiversity Conservation Project*, Malawi, Tanzania and Mozambique. Memorandum and ecommendation for a proposed grant from the Global Environment Trust Fund to the Government of Malawi for SADC Lake Malawi/Nyasa Biodiversity Conservation Project. Part II: Technical Report 13044-MAI, 30 December 1994 and Mid-term Review Documents, 24 November.

**Gibbon, P.** (1996),

“Everything’s for Sale. Some preliminary reflections on economic liberalization, forms of production and environmental degradation in Tanzania’s water and forests”. Centre for Development Research Working Paper 96.2, 49 pp. Centre for Development Research, Copenhagen, Denmark.

**Global Environment Facility** (1997),

“Lessons Learned from the Pilot Phase”. Draft report, 72 pp. Resources Future International, Ontario, Canada.

**Goldsmith, A.R.** (1991),

*Institutional Development for Agricultural Research: Concepts, Models and Measures*, International Service for National Agricultural Research (ISNAR), The Hague, Netherlands.

**Goldsmith, A.R.** (1992),

“Institutions and Planned Socioeconomic Change: Four Approaches”. *Public Administration Review* 52 (6), pp. 582-587.

**Gray et al.** (1990),

“Institutional Development Work in the Bank. A Review of 84 Bank Projects”. Policy Research and External Affairs, Working Papers, WPS 437, The World Bank, Washington, D.C., USA.

**Grindle, M.S.** (1996),

*Challenging the state -- Crisis and innovation in Latin America and Africa*. 243 pp. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom.

**Grindle, M.S.** (1997a),

“Divergent Cultures? When Public Organisations Perform Well in Developing Countries”. *World Development* 25 (4), pp. 481-495.

**Grindle, M.S.** e.d. (1997b), *Getting Good Government. Capacity Building in the Public Sector of Developing Countries*. 504 pp. Harvard University Press, Harvard, USA.

**Grindle, M.S.** (1997c)

“The Good Government Imperative: Human Resources Organizations, and Institutions”. In Grindle (1997b), pp. 3-28.

**GTZ** (1992),

“Institutional Pluralism -- Focus of German Technical Cooperation”. pp. 1-3 and 63-71. Deutsche Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit, Eschborn, Germany.

**GTZ** (1995a)

“Technical Cooperation for Capacity-Building -- A Selection from the Work of GTZ in Africa”, 17 pp. Deutsche Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit, Eschborn, Germany.

**GTZ** (1995b),

“Incentives and the NARMS Approach. A hand-out for project desk officers, consultants and

- on-site project staff". Environmental Protection, Conservation of Natural Resources, Dissemination of Appropriate Technologies (GATE). 402/95 13e NARMS. GTZ, Department 402, Eschborn, Germany.
- GTZ** (1997),  
 "Is Technical Cooperation Achieving the Set Goals?". Outcomes of Technical Cooperation Projects Third Cross-Section Analysis, 16 pp. + 1 appendix. Deutsche Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit, Eschborn, Germany.
- GTZ** (1998a),  
 "Towards Decentralised Natural Resource Management. Case Study: The Village of Balingnar in Burkina Faso". GTZ, Eschborn, Germany.
- GTZ** (1998b),  
 "Technical Assistance in Environmental Law and Institutional Development in Environment". Focus, Methodology, Resources. 63 pp. Environmental Management, Water, Energy, Transport. GTZ, Division 44. 24 e PVI. GTZ, Eschborn, Germany.
- Gunderson, L.H. et al.** (1995),  
*Barriers and Bridges to Renewal of Ecosystems and Institutions*. 593 pp. Columbia University Press, New York, USA.
- Hanchett, S.**,  
 "Participation and Policy Development: The Case of the Bangladesh Flood Action Plan". *Development Policy Review* 15, pp. 277-295. **Harrigan, J.** (1998). "Effects of the IMF and World Bank on public expenditure accountability in Jamaica". *Public Administration and Development*, pp. 5-22.
- Harvard Institute for International Development** (1997),  
 Support to the *Thailand development Research Institute*, Thailand. Myers (1997) In Getting Good Government. Grindle (ed).
- Hecht, S. et al.** (1988),  
 "The subsidy from nature: shifting cultivation, successional palm forests and rural development". *Human Organisation* 47.
- Helleiner, G.K. et al.** (1995),  
 Report of the Group of Independent Advisers on Development Cooperation Issues between Tanzania and its aid donors. Royal Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Copenhagen.
- Hilderbrand, M.E. and Grindle, M.S.** (1997),  
 "Building Capacity in the Public Sector: What Can be Done?". In Grindle (1997b). pp. 31-61.
- Hirschmann, D.** (1993),  
 "Institutional Development in the era of economic policy reform: concerns, contradictions and illustrations from Malawi". *Public Administration and Development* 13, pp. 113-128.
- Hore, E.C.** (1982),  
*Tanganyika: Eleven Years in Central Africa*. 306 pp. E. Stanford, London, United Kingdom.
- Howe, J.** (1986),  
*The Kuna Gathering*. University of Texas Press, Austin, Texas.
- Huizenga, C.** (1997),  
 "Management of Capacity Development in Environment Programmes and Projects. Experiences and Challenges in the Dutch development cooperation". Final Draft, 50 pp. Geoplan International, Amsterdam, The Netherlands.

- Huizenga, C. and Rafiq, M.** (1996),  
 “Sarhad Provincial Conservation Strategy, NWFP, Pakistan. A Case of Capacity Building for Environment”. Paper submitted to the OECD-DAC Workshop on CDE, Rome, 4-6 December 1996. 25 pp. Geoplan International, Amsterdam and IUCN, Pakistan.
- Hussen van, J.** (1995),  
 “Experiences of Donors with the Employment of Local Expertise. Survey of DAC/TC members in four countries”. 16 pp. + 5 appendices. Paper presented at the International Round Table *Potential and Use of National Capacities and the Role of the Foreign Expert in Future Development Cooperation*, 16-19 May 1995. German Foundation for International Development (DSE).
- ICLEI/UNHCS** (1995),  
 “Nongkhai Municipal Province”. pp. 65-70. In *The Role of Local Authorities in Sustainable Development*. 14 Case Studies on the Local Agenda 21 Process. ICLEI/Secretariat of the UNCSD/UNHCS, Habitat, Nairobi, Kenya.
- IDEM Consult** (1995a),  
 “Environmental Considerations in Developing Cooperation”. Updated survey of DAC Members’ activities in support of environmental goals: pilot study. Case study: the Netherlands. IDEM Consult, Utrecht and Project Services International, Hull, Canada.
- IDEM Consult** (1995b),  
 “Indicators for Capacity Development in the Environment”. Background paper prepared for the OECD—DAC Working Party on Environment and Development. 7 pp. + 3 annexes. IDEM Consult, Utrecht, The Netherlands.
- IEM/GEC** (1996),  
 “Mekong River Basin Diagnostic Study”. Final Draft. Mekong River Commission Secretariat, Bangkok, Thailand.
- Institute of Development Studies (IDS).** (1997),  
 “Who counts reality? Participatory monitoring and evaluation: A Literature Review”. Working Draft prepared for the International Workshop on Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation: Experiences and Lessons, International Institute for Rice Research, Cavite, Philippines.
- Inter-American Development Bank** (1988),  
 Technical Cooperation for Institutional Strengthening: An Evaluation of the Bank’s Experience. IADB Report No. PPR-37/88.
- International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED)** (1997),  
 “Capacity Development in Environment. A Detailed Programme Proposal (1997-2000)”. IIED, London, United Kingdom.
- International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED)** (1997),  
 The Performance of EIA in Tanzania: An Assessment. 95 pp. IRA Research paper No. 41/IIED Environmental Planning Issues No. 14. Institute of Resource Assessment, University of Dar es Salaam and IIED, London.
- Israel, A.** (1987),  
 “Institutional Development - Incentives to Performance”. 214 pp. The World Bank, Washington, D.C., USA.
- IUCN** (1980),  
 World Conservation Strategy: Living Resource Conservation for Sustainable Development. IUCN/UNEP/WWF. IUCN, Gland.

- IUCN--Regional Office for Southern Africa** (1995),  
 “Exploring Financing Options and Mechanisms for Environmentally Sustainable Community-Based Natural Resource Development”. IUCN-ROSA, Harare, Zimbabwe.
- JACSES** (1996),  
 “Environmental and Sustainable Development in Official Development Assistance since the 1992 Earth Summit”. 167 pp. + 2 appendices. Japan Center for a Sustainable Environment and Society, Tokyo, Japan.
- Jecty and Company Ltd** (1997),  
 Forest Administration Study Report Volumes I-III. Jecty and Company Ltd, Accra.
- Jodha, N.S.** (1986),  
 “Common property resources and the rural poor”. *Economic and Political Weekly* 21.
- Kakonge, J.O. and Imevbore, A.M.** (1993),  
 “Constraints on implementing environmental impact assessments in Africa”. *Environmental Impact Assessment Review* 13 (5), pp. 271-294.
- Kamukala, G.L.** (1995),  
 “Institutional Structures for Environmental Management in Tanzania”. Paper presented at the *National Environmental Legislation Workshop*, 4-6 September 1995, Dar-es-Salaam. National Environment Management Council, Dar-es-Salaam, Tanzania.
- Kealey, D.J.** (1994),  
 “Overseas Screening and Selection. A Survey of Current Practice and Future Trends”. Paper prepared for Technical Cooperation Directorate, CIDA, and presented at the International Round Table *Potential and Use of National Capacities and the Role of the Foreign Expert in Future Development Cooperation*, 16-19 May 1995. 55 pp. + 4 appendices. German Foundation for International Development (DSE). Berlin, Germany.
- Kealey, D.J.** (1995),  
 “Overseas Screening and Selection. A Survey of Current Practice and Future Trends”. An Addendum. 10 pp. + 2 appendices. Paper prepared for OECD-DAC Technical Cooperation Informal Network/CIDA, and presented at the International Round Table *Potential and Use of National Capacities and the Role of the Foreign Expert in Future Development Cooperation*, 16-19 May 1995. German Foundation for International Development (DSE). Berlin, Germany.
- Kean, J. et al.** (1988),  
 “Synthesis of AA.I.D. Evaluation Reports: FY 1985 and FY 1986”. Evaluation Occasional Paper 16, USAID, Washington, D.C., USA.
- Kelman, J.** (1994),  
 “Water resources management system in Ceará, Brazil. In Lundqvist and Jønch-Clausen (1994), pp. 79-99.
- Kiggundu, M.** (1991),  
 “The Challenges of Management Development in Sub-Saharan Africa”. *Journal of Management and Development* 10 (6), pp. 32-47.
- Kiggundu, M.** (1994),  
 “Managing Research Institutions in Developing Countries: Test of a model”. *Public Administration and Development* 14, pp. 201-222.
- Kikula, I.S. and Mwalyosi, R.B.B.** (1994),  
 Environmental Management in Tanzania: Challenges of the 21<sup>st</sup> Century. In: Msambichaka,



- L.A. and Moshi, H.P.B. (eds) (1994) *Development Challenges and Strategies for Tanzania. An Agenda for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century*. Dar es Salaam University Press, Dar es Salaam.
- Kikula, I.S.** (1998),  
 “Capacity Development in Environment as a National Endogenous Process -- the Role of External Assistance”. 11 pp. Paper presented at the International Workshop on Danish Assistance to Capacity Development in Environment, 12-14 May 1998, Snekkersten, Denmark.
- Kirk, C.** (1997),  
 “Notes on participatory monitoring and evaluation in DfID. Challenges and Potential”. DfID, London, United Kingdom.
- Kjørven, O.** (1995),  
 “Environmental Assessments: The World Bank’s Experience”. 12 pp. In *Integration of Environmental Concerns into Norwegian Bilateral Development Assistance: Policies and Performance*. Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA), Oslo, Norway.
- Kleemeier, L.** (1995),  
 “From supply-driven to demand-driven provision of rural drinking water”. 22 pp. Centre for Development Research Working Paper. Centre for Development Research, Copenhagen, Denmark.
- Klitgaard, R.** (1997),  
 “Cleaning Up and Invigorating the Civil Service”. *Public Administration and Development* 17, pp. 487-509.
- Kochendörfer-Lucius, G.** (1995),  
 “Institutional Change for Sustainable Development: Networking and Inter-Institutional Cooperation. What can Donors Contribute?” Paper presented at the OECD/World Bank/UNDP Informal Donors Network Meeting on Technical Cooperation, 22-23 May 1995, Eschborn, Germany.
- Kottak, C.P.** (1991),  
 When people don’t come first: some sociological lessons from completed projects. In: Cernea, M.M. (ed) *Putting People First*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edn, OUP, Oxford.
- Kotter, J.P. and Heskett, J.L.** (1992),  
*Corporate Culture and Performance*. Free Press, New York, USA.
- Kuponen, J.** (1994). *Development for Exploitation. German colonial policies in Mainland Tanzania, 1884-1914*. Tiedekirja, Helsinki/Lit Vederlag Dieckstrasse, Hamburg, Germany.
- Langseth, P.** (1995),  
 Civil service reform in Uganda: lessons learned. *Public Administration and Development* 15, 365-390.
- Latin American and Caribbean Commission on Development and Environment** (1997),  
 “Dawn in the Andes”. 177 pp. Corporación de Fomento, Caracas, Venezuela/Inter-American Development Bank, Washington, D.C., and UNDP, New York, USA.
- Lee, N. and Colley, R.** (1992),  
 “Reviewing the quality of environmental statements”. Occasional Paper 24 (2nd edition). Department of Planning and Landscape. University of Manchester, Manchester, United Kingdom.
- Lélé, S.M.**  
 “Sustainable Development: A Critical Review”. *World Development* 19 (6) pp. 607-621.

- Leonard, D.K.** (1987),  
 “The Realities of African Management”. *World Development* 15 (7) pp. 74-79.
- Lethem, F. and Cooper, L.**  
 “Managing Project-related Technical Assistance: The Lessons of Success”. Staff Working Papers, 586. The World Bank, Washington, D.C., USA.
- Lindauer, D. and Nunberg, B.** eds. (1994),  
*Rehabilitating Government: Pay and Employment Reform in Africa*. The World Bank, Washington, D.C., USA.
- Lundqvist, J. and Jønch-Clausen, T.** (1994),  
 “Putting Dublin/Agenda 21 into Practice. Lessons and New Approaches in Water and Land Management”. Special Session at the VIIIth IWRA World Congress, Cairo 21-25 November 1994.
- Macgregor, J., Peterson, S. and Schuftan, C.** (1998),  
 “Downsizing the Civil Service in Developing Countries: the Golden Handshake Option Revisited”. *Public Administration and Development* 18, pp. 61-76.
- Malawi Centre for Social Research** (1997),  
 “*Bwalo*. A Forum for Social Development. Issue 1, 1997. Sustainable Social and Human Development in Malawi: towards poverty alleviation?” Centre for Social Research, University of Malawi, Zomba, Malawi.
- Martens, J. and Mucke, P.** (1996),  
 “Some remarks at the German NGO Forum on Environment and Development”. Cited in JACES (1996).
- Martin, J.** (1992),  
*Cultures in Organizations: Three Perspectives*. Oxford University Press, New York, USA.
- Mathiason, J.R.** (1997),  
 “Who Controls the Machine, Revisited: Command and Control in the United Nations Reform Effort”. *Public Administration and Development* 17, pp. 387-397.
- McCallum, R. and Sekhran, N.** (1997),  
 Race for the Rainforest: Evaluating Lessons from an Integrated Conservation and Development “Experiment” in New Ireland, Papua New Guinea. UNDP, New York.
- McCarney, P.** (ed) (1996),  
 The Changing Nature of Local Government in Developing Countries. Centre for Urban and Community Studies, University of Toronto and International Office, Federation of Canadian Municipalities. Praeger, London.
- McGillivray, M.** (1989),  
 The allocation of aid among developing countries: a multi-donor analysis using a per capita aid index. *World Development* 17(4), 561-568.
- Mearns, R. and Leach, M.** (1997),  
*The Lie of the Land*. James Currey/Heinemann, London, United Kingdom.
- Ministère de la Coopération** (1996a),  
 “Appui au Programme d’Action Environnementale. Madagascar”. Ministère de la Coopération (1996b). Paris, France.
- Ministère de la Coopération** (1996b),  
*La Dimension “Environnement” dans les Politiques et les Projets du Ministère de la*

- Coopération. Evaluation de la Politique Française (1972-1995)*. 99 pp. + 5 annexes. Collection Evaluations No. 30. Ministère de la Coopération, Paris, France.
- Ministère de la Coopération** (1997),  
 “L’Environnement et l’Aide au Développement”. Séminaire Coopération Française -- Commission Européenne, 22-23 janvier 1997, Bruxelles. 8 pp. + 5 annexes. Ministère de la Coopération, Paris, France.
- Ministère de l’Eau du Burkina Faso** (1993),  
 “Vers une planification efficace de l’eau potable”. Rapport de la mission d’évaluation des projets “Bilan d’Eau” et “Renforcement DEP”, 42 pp. + 8 annexes. Ministère de l’Eau, Ouagadougou.
- Ministry for Economic Co-operation and Development** (1996),  
 “Aide Mémoire d’évaluation du Projet d’Appui aux Collectivités Locales”. 4 pp. Coopération Technique entre la République Islamique de Mauritanie et la République Fédérale d’Allemagne. Referat 201. BMZ, Bonn, Germany.
- Ministry for Economic Co-operation and Development** (1997),  
 “Support for Decentralization Measures. Project Brief”. 12 pp. Indonesian-German Governmental Co-operation. Referat 340. BMZ, Bonn, Germany.
- Ministry for Economic Co-operation and Development** (1998),  
 “Preliminary Report on the evaluation of the Indonesian-German Programme -- Regional Development and Project Management in the Decentralization Process”. 10 pp. Referat 310. BMZ, Bonn, Germany.
- Mohan Rao, J.** (1997),  
 “Ranking Foreign Donors: An Index Combining the Scale and Equity of Aid Giving”. *World Development* 25 (6) pp. 947-961.
- Moore, M. et al.** (1994),  
 “Institution Building as a Development Assistance Method -- A Review of Literature and Ideas”. 109 pp. Sida Evaluation Report, Swedish International Development Authority, Stockholm, Sweden.
- Morgan, P.** (1993),  
 “Capacity Building -- An Overview”. 17 pp. Paper presented at the Institute of Governance Capacity Development Workshop, 22-24 November 1993. Ottawa, Canada.
- Morgan, P.** (1994),  
 “Institutional Development in Peru. A case study of the Peru -- Canada Fund”. 21 pp.
- Morgan, P.** (1997),  
 “The design and use of capacity development indicators”. Prepared for CIDA, December 1997. Cited in Boesen and Lafontaine (1998).
- Morgan, P. and Carlan, V.** eds. (1993),  
*Emerging Issues in Capacity Development*. Proceedings of a Workshop. Institute on Governance, Ottawa, Canada.
- Msambichaka, L.A. and Moshi, H.P.B.** (eds) (1994),  
 Development Challenges and Strategies for Tanzania. An Agenda for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century. Dar es Salaam University Press, Dar es Salaam.

- Mukandala, R.S.** (1994),  
“Pilot Study of Capacity Building -- Tanzania”. Harvard Institute for International Development, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts, USA.
- Multi-donor agency** (1998),  
Support to capacity development for *Environmental Impact Assessment*, Tanzania. The Performance of EIA in Tanzania: an assessment.
- Multi-donor support** to the *National Watershed Development Programme for Rainfed Areas*, Ministry of Agriculture, India.
- Mwalyosi, R. and Hughes, R.** (1998),  
“The Performance of EIA in Tanzania: an assessment”. 95 pp. IRA Research Paper No. 41, IRA, University of Dar-es-Salaam and IIED Environmental Planning Issues No. 14, IIED, London, United Kingdom.
- Myers, C.N.** (1997),  
“Policy Research Institutes in Developing Countries”. In Grindle (1997b).
- Naim, M.** (1995),  
Latin America’s Journey to the Market: from macroeconomic shocks to institutional therapy. ICEG Occasional Paper 62. International Centre for Economic Growth. ICS Press, San Francisco.
- National Development Planning Commission** (1996),  
Stakeholder Forum on the Renewable Natural Resources Sector Strategy (1996-2000). 12-13 September 1996. National Development Planning Commission, Accra.
- Nature Conservancy/Ecofondo** (1996a),  
“Regional Consultation on National Environmental Funds (NEFs) in Latin America and the Caribbean”. Vol 1 (Final Report, Profiles of the National Environmental Funds, 11-14 June 1996, Cartagena, Colombia.
- Nature Conservancy/Ecofondo** (1996b),  
“Regional Consultation on National Environmental Funds (NEFs) in Latin America and the Caribbean”. Vol 2 (Case Studies on In-country Resource Mobilization), 11-14 June 1996, Cartagena, Colombia.
- Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs** (1988),  
Final Report on Institutional Development. Van Reenen, G-J and Waisfisz, B. Netherlands Development Assistance, The Hague.
- Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs** (1994),  
Support to the *National Wetland Steering Committee*, Sri Lanka. Joint Evaluation (Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Ministry of Environment and Parliamentary Affairs).
- Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs** (1994a),  
“Environment and Development Cooperation. Evaluation of Netherlands Aid Policy with regard to the Environment, with special reference to Burkina Faso, Indonesia and Kenya”. 156 pp. Operations Review Unit (IOV), The Hague, The Netherlands.
- Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs** (1994b),  
“Rural Water Supplies”. Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs, The Hague, The Netherlands.
- Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs-Technology Development Group** (University of Twente) (1996),

- Support to the SADC *Rural Energy Planning and Environmental Management*, Eastern and Southern African Management Institute, Tanzania. Mid-term Review.
- Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs-UNDP** (1996),  
Support to the *Ministry for the Coordination of Environmental Affairs*, Mozambique.  
Programme Support Document 0007601.
- Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs** (1998),  
“Bangladesh. Evaluation of the Netherlands Development Programme with Bangladesh, 1972-1996”. Policy and Operations Evaluation Department (IOB), The Hague, the Netherlands.
- Niang, A.M.** (1995),  
“Concilier les logiques de rentabilité économique avec l’intérêt public en matière de suivi des ressources naturelles : utopie ou passage obligé ?”. Session 7 : Privatisation des Activités SIE en Afrique. Paper presented at *AFRICAGIS ’95*, 3-9 March 1995, Abidjan. Centre de Suivi Ecologique, Dakar, Sénégal.
- Noman, O.** (1994),  
“Why Environmental Strategies are not Implemented”. *FSG Review* No. 2, Vol. II, March/April 1994. International Development Centre, Queen Elizabeth House, University of Oxford, Oxford, United Kingdom.
- NORAD** (1989),  
“Environmental Study of Sri Lanka. Status Assessment and Programme for Environmental Cooperation”. Main Report, 207 pp. + 8 appendices. Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Oslo, Norway.
- North, H.W.** (1992),  
“Capacity building and technical co-operation — managing the connection”. Paper prepared for NATCAP, United Nations Development Programme, New York, USA.
- North, H.W.** (1997a),  
“Principles for Evaluation of Development Assistance -- Phase II (Executive Summary)”. OECD-DAC, Paris, France (internal document).
- North, H.W.** (1997b),  
“Results of the Review of the DAC Principles for Evaluation of Development Assistance”. OECD-DAC, Paris, France, (internal document).
- North, H.W.** (1997c),  
“Synthesis of Surveys of Users of Evaluation”. Background Document, OECD-DAC, Paris, France.
- Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs** (1991),  
“The Special Grant for Environment and Development”. 118 pp. + 3 annexes. Evaluation Report 5.91. Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Oslo, Norway.
- Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs** (1992),  
“Evaluation of the Sahel-Sudan-Ethiopia Programme”. 140 pp. + 1 annex. Evaluation Report 2.92. MFA, Oslo, Norway.
- Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs** (1995),  
“Integration of Environmental Concerns into Norwegian Bilateral Development Assistance: Policies and Performance”. 107 pp. + 2 annexes. Evaluation Report 5.95, MFA, Oslo, Norway.

- Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs** (1997),  
Evaluation of Decentralisation and Development Evaluation Report 3.97. 50 pp. + 2 annexes.  
MFA, Oslo, Norway.
- Nunberg, B.** (1990),  
Bolivia: a review of public pay and employment issues. Country Economics Department. The  
World Bank, Washington.
- Nzapayeke, A.** (1994),  
“Pilot Study of Capacity Building -- Central African Republic”. Harvard Institute for  
International Development, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts, USA.
- OECD-DAC** (1989),  
“The Environmental Impact of Development Projects. Selected Issues in Aid Evaluation-2”.  
15 pp. W.5499e/Arch.1411D. OECD, Paris, France.
- OECD-DAC** (1991a),  
*Principles for New Orientations in Technical Co-operation*. OECD, Paris, France.
- OECD-DAC** (1991b),  
“Policy Statement of the Meeting of OECD Ministers on Environment and Development”. 2-3  
December 1991, Paris. SC/PRESS(91)71. OECD, Paris, France.
- OECD-DAC** (1992a),  
“The Need for Coherent Policy Approaches to Development Co-operation and Meeting Global  
Challenges”. *Development Co-operation Efforts and Policies of the Members of the  
Development Assistance Committee*. 1992 Report. OECD, Paris, France. Chapter II.
- OECD-DAC** (1992b),  
*Development Assistance Manual: DAC Principles for Effective Aid*. OECD, Paris, France.
- OECD-DAC** (1992c),  
“Good Practices for Environmental Impact Assessment of Development Projects”. Guidelines  
on Environment and Aid, No. 1. 15 pp. OECD, Paris, France.
- OECD-DAC** (1992d),  
“Good Practices for Country Environmental Surveys and Strategies”. Guidelines on  
Environment and Aid, No. 2. 15 pp. OECD, Paris, France.
- OECD-DAC** (1992e),  
“Guidelines for Aid Agencies in Involuntary Displacement and Resettlement Projects”.  
Guidelines on Environment and Aid, No. 3. 12 pp. OECD, Paris, France.
- OECD-DAC** (1992f),  
“Guidelines for Aid Agencies on Global Environmental Problems”. Guidelines on Environment  
and Aid, No. 4. 61 pp. OECD, Paris, France.
- OECD-DAC** (1993a),  
*Economic Instruments for Environmental Management in Developing Countries*. OECD  
Document Series. OECD, Paris, France.
- OECD-DAC** (1993b),  
“Guidelines for Aid Agencies on Chemicals Management”. Guidelines on Environment and  
Aid, No. 5. 36 pp. OECD, Paris, France.
- OECD-DAC** (1993c),  
“Core Set of Indicators for Environmental Policy Reviews: A Synthesis Report of the Group on  
the State of the Environment”. OECD, Paris, France, (internal document).

- OECD-DAC (1993d),**  
 “Group on state of the environment workshop on indicators for the use of environmental performance reviews”. Draft synthesis report. OECD, Paris, France.
- OECD-DAC (1994),**  
*Capacity Development in Environment*. Proceedings of a Workshop held in Costa Rica, 9-11 November 1993. 89 pp. OECD, Paris, France.
- OECD-DAC (1995a),**  
*Developing Environmental Capacity. A Framework for Donor Involvement*. 57 pp. OECD, Paris, France.
- OECD-DAC (1995b),**  
 “Donor Assistance to Capacity Development in Environment”. 12 pp. Development Co-operation Guidelines Series. OECD, Paris, France.
- OECD-DAC (1995c),**  
*The Economic Appraisal of Environmental Projects and Policies. A Practical Guide*. 171 pp. OECD, Paris, France.
- OECD-DAC (1995d),**  
 “Trade, Environment and Development Co-operation”. 27 pp. OECD, Paris, France, (internal document).
- OECD-DAC (1995e),**  
 OECD Workshop on Trade, Environment and Development Co-operation, 28 October 1994. “Summary Report”. 18 pp. OECD, Paris, France, (internal document).
- OECD-DAC (1995f),**  
 “Environmental Funds: The First Five Years. Issues to Address in Designing and Supporting Green Funds”. A Preliminary Analysis for the OECD-DAC Working Party on Development Assistance and Environment. 21 pp. OECD, Paris, France.
- OECD-DAC (1996a),**  
*Shaping the 21st Century: The Contribution of Development Co-operation*. 18 pp. + 1 annex. OECD, Paris, France.
- OECD-DAC (1996b),**  
*Coherence in Environmental Assessment. Practical Guidelines on Development Co-operation Projects*. 106 pp. OECD, Paris, France.
- OECD-DAC (1996c),**  
 “Updated Survey of DAC Members’ Activities in Support of Environmental Goals”. Working Party on Development Assistance and Environment, 15th Meeting, 28-29 October 1996. OECD, Paris, France, (internal document).
- OECD-DAC (1996d),**  
 “Guidelines for Aid Agencies for Improved Conservation and Sustainable Use of Tropical and Sub-Tropical Wetlands”. Guidelines on Aid and Environment, No. 9. 69 pp. OECD, Paris, France.
- OECD-DAC (1997a),**  
 “Final Report of the DAC *Ad Hoc* Working Group on Participatory Development and Good Governance”. Part I, 25 pp. OECD, Paris, France.

- OECD-DAC (1997b),**  
 “Lessons from Experience in Selected Areas of Support for Participatory Development and Good Governance”. Part II, 26 pp., of OECD-DAC (1997a). Paris, France.
- OECD-DAC (1997c),**  
*Evaluation of Programmes Promoting Participatory Development and Good Governance. Synthesis Report.* 106 pp. + 7 annexes. DAC Expert Group on Aid Evaluation, OECD, Paris, France.
- OECD-DAC (1997d),**  
 “Criteria for Donor Agencies’ Self-Assessment in Capacity Development”. Background Document for the Forum for Development Partners and Senior Level Meeting, 19 and 20 January 1997, OECD, Paris, France, (internal document).
- OECD-DAC (1997e),**  
*Capacity Development in Environment.* Proceedings of a Workshop held in Rome, Italy, 4-6 December 1996. 301 pp + 6 diskettes. OECD, Paris, France.
- OECD-DAC (1997f),**  
*Capacity Development in Environment, Principles in Practice.* 24 pp. OECD, Paris, France.
- OECD-DAC (1997g),**  
*Indicators for Environment and Development.* OECD, Paris.
- OECD-DAC (1997h),**  
 “DAC Members’ Activities in Support of Environmental Goals”. Working Party on Development Assistance and Environment. 50 pp. OECD, Paris, France.
- OECD-DAC (1998a),**  
 Compendium of Donors’ Operational Practices in support of Environmental Goals. Working Party on Development Co-operation and Environment. DCD/DAC/ENV(98)3/REV 1. OECD-DAC, Paris.
- OECD (1995),**  
*OECD Newsletter* No. 22. Special Issue. OECD, Tokyo, Japan.
- Ohiorhenuan, J.F.E. and Wunker, S.M. (1995),**  
 Capacity Building Requirements for Global Environmental Protection. Global Environment Facility Working Paper No. 12. GEF, Washington.
- Ohta, M. (1996),**  
 Implementation of an integrated approach to strengthen the Indonesian environmental authority. Case Study presented to Working Group 2 at the OECD-DAC Workshop on Capacity Development in Environment. pp. 251-262. Proceedings of the CDE Workshop held in Rome, Italy, 4-6 December 1996. OECD-DAC, Paris.
- Olsen, G.R. (1995),**  
 “NGO and the International Environment in the 1990s”. Centre for Development Studies Working Paper 95.4, 13 pp. Centre for Development Studies, Copenhagen, Denmark.
- Overseas Development Administration (ODA) (1992a),**  
 Manual of Environmental Appraisal. 1<sup>st</sup> Edn. HMSO, London.
- Overseas Development Administration (1992),**  
 “Environmental Synopsis of Ghana”. ODA/IIED, London, United Kingdom.



- Overseas Development Administration** (1993),  
Evaluation of the Ghana Civil Service Reform Project. Evaluation Report EV 546. ODA, London.
- Overseas Development Administration** (1994),  
“The Process of Change: A Synthesis Study of Institutional Strengthening Projects and Experiences”. Evaluation Report EV 559. 36 pp. + 5 annexes. Department for International Development, London, United Kingdom.
- Overseas Development Administration** (1995),  
“Evaluations of Non-Government Organisations Development Projects. Synthesis Report”. Evaluation Report EV 554. 38 pp. + 3 annexes. Department for International Development, London, United Kingdom.
- Overseas Development Administration** (1995),  
Evaluations of Non-Government Organisations Development Projects. Synthesis Report. Evaluation Report EV 554. 38 pp. + 3 annexes. Department for International Development, London, United Kingdom.
- Overseas Development Institute (ODI)** (1998),  
“The UK White Paper on International Development -- and Beyond”. ODI Briefing Paper 1998(2) May. 4 pp. ODI, London, United Kingdom.
- ODI-European Commission** (1997),  
“Understanding European Community Aid -- Aid Policies, Management and Distribution Explained”. 111 pp. + 3 appendixes. Overseas Development Institute, London, and European Commission, Brussels, Belgium.
- Panayotou, T.** (1997a),  
“Environment and Natural Resources in Emerging Asia”. International Environment Program. 206 pp. HIID, Cambridge, Massachusetts, USA.
- Panayotou, T.** (1997b),  
Taking Stock of Trends in Sustainable Development Financing since Rio. In United Nations (1997), pp. 35-73.
- Paul, S.** (1987),  
Community Participation in Development projects: The World Bank Experience. The World Bank, Washington.
- Paul, S.** (1991),  
Accountability in Public Services: Exit, Voice and Capture. The World Bank, Washington.
- Pearce, D.** (1995),  
“Sustainable Development: The Political and Institutional Challenge”. In Kirkby, J. *et al.* (1995), *Sustainable Development*. Earthscan Publications Ltd., London, United Kingdom.
- PEMconsult A/S** (1997),  
Inception Report. Desk Study “Lessons of Donor Support for Institutional Capacity Development in Environment”. 26 pp. + 4 appendices. PEMconsult A/S, Copenhagen, Denmark.
- Peters, T. and Waterman, R.** (1982),  
*In search of Excellence: Lessons from America's Best-Run Companies*. Harper and Row, New York, USA.

- Peterson, S.B.** (1998),  
 “Saints, Demons, Wizards and Systems: Why Information Technology Reforms Fails or Underperform in Public Bureaucracies in Africa”. *Public Administration and Development* 18, pp. 37-60.
- Phillips, H.** (1969),  
 Guide for Development. Institution Building and Reform. Praeger, London.
- Porter, G. et al.** (1998),  
 “Study of GEF’s Overall Performance”. Draft, 172 pp. The World Bank, Washington, D.C., USA.
- Pretty, J. and Sandbrook, R.** (1991),  
 “Operationalising sustainable development at the community level: Primary Environmental Care”. Paper for the Members of the DAC Working Party on Development Assistance and Environment, October 1991. IIED, London, United Kingdom.
- Quesada, C.A.** (1994),  
 “Capacity Development in Environment as seen from the experience of the Costa Rican Sustainable Development Strategy”. In OECD-DAC (1994). pp. 28-30. OECD, Paris, France.
- Rao, J.M.** (1994),  
 Judging givers: Equity and scale in aid allocation. *World Development* 22, 1579-1584.
- Rao, J.M.** (1997),  
 Ranking Foreign Donors: an index combining the scale and equity of aid giving. *World Development* 25 (6), 947-961.
- Rasmussen, K. et al.** (1998),  
 Establishment of a National Environmental Monitoring Capacity in Sénégal – the case of the collaboration between the Institute of Geography, University of Copenhagen and the Centre de Suivi Écologique, Dakar. Case Study in: Workshop Proceedings. International Workshop on Danish Assistance to Capacity Development in Environment, Snekkersten, Denmark 12-14 May 1998. Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Copenhagen.
- Redclift, M.** (1992),  
 The meaning of sustainable development. In: *Sustainable Development in Peru: A Review of a Document from the Pachamama Society*. IIED, London.
- Reed, D.** ed. (1992),  
*Structural Adjustment and the Environment*. Earthscan, London, United Kingdom.
- Reilly, C.A.** (ed) (1995),  
 New Paths to Democratic Development in Latin America. The Rise of NGO-Municipal Collaboration. Lynne Rienner, London.
- Republic of Bolivia** (1996),  
*Agenda Bolivia 21*. 98 pp. Ministry of Sustainable Development and Environment. National Secretariat of Planning, La Paz, Bolivia.
- Revilla, G.P.** (1994),  
 “Pilot Study of Capacity Building - Bolivia”. Harvard Institute for International Development, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts, USA.
- Rich, B.** (1994),  
*Mortgaging the Earth: The World Bank, environmental impoverishment and the crisis of development*. Beacon Press, Boston, Massachusetts, USA.

- Riddell, R.C. et al.** (1993),  
Discerning the Way Together. Christian Aid, London.
- Roe, D., Dallal-Clayton, B. and Hughes, R.** (1995),  
“A Directory of Impact Assessment Guidelines”. IIED, London, United Kingdom.
- Roethlisberger, F.J. and Dickson, W.J.** (1939) Management and the Worker. Harvard University Press. Cambridge, MA.
- Rogers, P.P. et al.** (1997),  
*Measuring Environmental Quality in Asia*. 386 pp. Harvard University Press, USA.
- Rowell, A.** (1996),  
*Green Backlash*. Routledge, London, United Kingdom.
- SADC-Sida** (1996),  
Support to *Environment and Land Management Sector Activities*, ELMS, Lesotho. Sida Evaluation 97/4.
- Samad, A.** (1993),  
Governance, economic policy and reform in Pakistan: essays in political economy. Vanguard Books, Lahore.
- Sanderatne, N.** (1994),  
“Pilot Study of Capacity Building - Sri Lanka”. Harvard Institute for International Development, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts, USA.
- SASDA** (1994),  
The macroeconomics of aid: case studies of four countries. Secretariat for Analysis of Swedish Development Assistance. Ds 1994:115 Report 7. Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Stockholm.
- Sawadogo, J., Hassane, A., Lindskog, P. and Ørum, T.** (1991),  
“Local Water Management in Rural Areas and Small Towns. Case Study: Banfora, Burkina Faso”. Paper prepared for the Freshwater Resources - Nordic Initiative (August 1991).
- Schabel, H.G.**,  
“Tanganyika Forestry under German Colonial Administration 1891-1919”. *Forest and Conservation History* pp. 130-141. July 1990.
- Sekhran, N.** (1996),  
“Pursuing the “D” in ICAD Projects: Issues and Challenges for Papua New Guinea”. Network Paper No. 19e. Overseas Development Institute. Rural Development Forestry Network. ODI, London, United Kingdom.
- Selznick, P.** (1957),  
Leadership in Administration: a sociological interpretation. University of California Press. Berkeley, CA.
- Seth, S.L.** (1993),  
“Orientation - policy, strategy, technology and organisational structure”. pp. 52-86. In Part II: Indo-Danish Workshop on Comprehensive Watershed Development, 19-23 April 1993, Belgaum, Karnataka. Royal Danish Embassy, New Delhi, India.
- Seth, S.L.** (1996),  
“The National Watershed Development programme for Rainfed Areas: Retrospect and prospects”. In Danida (1995c). pp. 9-38.

- Shafie, H.B.** (1996),  
 “Malaysia’s experience in implementing the new performance appraisal system”. *Public Administration and Development* 16. pp. 341-352.
- Shepherd, A.** (1995),  
 Participatory environmental management: contradiction of process, project and bureaucracy in the Himalayan foothills. *Public Administration and Development* 15, 465-479.
- Sida** (1994),  
 “Competence Development in Swedish Development Cooperation. The Sida Perspective -- A Question of Roles and Relations between Actors”. 9 pp. Paper prepared for DAC/UNDP/World Bank High-Level Seminar on Technical Assistance (June 1994) and presented at the International Round Table *Potential and Use of National Capacities and the Role of the Foreign Expert in Future Development Cooperation*. 16-19 May 1995. German Foundation for International Development (DSE). Berlin, Germany.
- Sida** (1996a),  
 “The Environment and Sida’s Evaluations”. 33 pp. + 4 appendices. Department for Evaluation and Internal Audit, Sida, Stockholm, Sweden.
- Sida** (1996b),  
 “Policy for Sida’s Assistance to a Sustainable Energy Sector”. 15 pp. Infrastructure and Economic Cooperation, Stockholm, Sweden.
- Sida** (1996c),  
 “National Soil and Water Conservation Programme. Kenya”. Sida Evaluation 96/25, 74 pp. + 7 annexes. Sida, Stockholm, Sweden.
- Sida** (1996d),  
 “Soil and Water Conservation Research Project at Kari, Muguga - Kenya”. Sida Evaluation 96/26, 23 pp. + 2 annexes. Sida, Stockholm, Sweden.
- Sida** (1996e),  
 “UNICEF’s Programme for Water and Sanitation in Central America”. Sida Evaluation 96/11, 76 pp. + 3 annexes. Department for Natural Resources and the Environment. Sida, Stockholm, Sweden.
- Sida** (1996f),  
 “Water Supply System in Dodota, Ethiopia”. Sida Evaluation 96/23, 53 pp. + 2 annexes. Department for Natural Resources and the Environment. Sida, Stockholm, Sweden.
- Sida** (1996),  
 Support to the *Soil and Water Conservation Branch*, Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock Development and Marketing, Kenya. Sida Evaluation 96/25.
- Sida** (1996),  
 Support to the *Asian Institute of Technology*, Thailand. End-of-term Evaluation of the Cooperative Environment Programme. Sida Evaluation 1996/12.
- Sida** (1997a),  
 “The Montreal Protocol”. Guidelines for the Swedish Bilateral Programme. Sida, Stockholm, Sweden.
- Sida** (1997b),  
 “Sida’s Assistance to the Environment Protection Training and Research Institute, EPTRI. India”. Sida Evaluation 97/3, 38 pp. + 6 annexes. Sida, Stockholm, Sweden.

- Sida** (1997c),  
 “Sida Support to Dissemination Division at Instituto Nacional de Biodiversidad, INBio Costa Rica. Evaluation of Phase I and Appraisal of Phase II”. Sida Evaluation 97/9, 47 pp. + 3 annexes. Sida. Stockholm, Sweden.
- Sida** (1997d),  
 “Sida’s Support to the Centre for Science and Environment, CSE, India”. Sida Evaluation 97/11, 24 pp. + 4 annexes. Sida, Stockholm, Sweden.
- Sida** (1997e),  
 “Pahal Project -- India. Participatory Approach to Human and Land Resource Development”. Sida Evaluation 97/7, 58 pp. + 6 annexes. Sida, Stockholm, Sweden.
- Sida** (1997f),  
 “HESAWA, Health through Sanitation and Water. Side-supported programme in Tanzania”. Sida Evaluation 97/12, 76 pp. + 11 annexes. Department for Natural Resources and the Environment. Sida, Stockholm, Sweden.
- Sida** (1997g),  
 “Swedish Support to Tanzania’s Power Sector”. Sida Evaluation 97/24. 74 pp. + 8 appendixes. Department for Infrastructure and Economic Cooperation, Stockholm, Sweden.
- Sida** (1997h)  
 “Swedish Support to the Energy Sector in Eritrea”. Sida Evaluation 97/34, 24 pp. + 11 appendixes. Department for Infrastructure and Economic Cooperation, Stockholm, Sweden.
- Sida/UNDP** (1997),  
 “Measuring and Managing Results. Lessons for Development Cooperation”. 132 pp. Department of Evaluation and Internal Audit, Sida, Stockholm, Sweden, and Office of Evaluation and Strategic Planning, UNDP, New York, USA.
- Smith, B.C.** (1998),  
 “Local Government and the Transition to Democracy: A Review Article”. *Public Administration and Development* 18, pp. 85-92.
- SNV** (1995),  
 Support to the *Institute for Sustainable Agriculture*, Nepal. Mid-term Review.
- Southton, E.J.** (1981),  
 “Notes on a journey through Northern Ugogo in East Central Africa”. *Proceedings of the Royal Geographical Society*, Vol. 3, pp. 547-553.
- Speke, J.H.** (1963),  
*Journal of the discovery of the source of the Nile*. Blackwood, London, United Kingdom.
- Stanley, H.M.** (1972),  
*How I found Livingstone*. 736 pp. Sampson Low, London, United Kingdom.
- Staples, R.R.** (1942),  
 Combating soil erosion in the Central Province of Tanganyika territory. *East African Agricultural Journal* 7, 156-163 and 189-195.
- Steer, A.** (1996),  
 “Ten Principles of the New Environmentalism”. *Finance and Development* 33 (4), pp. 4-7.
- Stuhlmann, F.** (1991),  
 “Beobachtungen über Geologie und Flora auf der Route Bagamoyo-Tabora”. Mitt. A.d. Deutsch. Schutzgeb. 5, Berlin, Germany. pp. 191-203.

- Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation** (1996),  
Support for the *Sarhad Provincial Conservation Strategy*, North West Frontier Province, Pakistan. Case study prepared for the OECD-DAC Workshop on CDE, Rome, 4-6 December.
- Tantuico, F.S. Jr.** (1994),  
Performance and accountability: central pillars of democracy. Fiscal Administration Foundation, Mandaluyong, The Phillipines.
- Thailand Development Research Institute/HIID** (1995),  
“The Economics of Watershed Management: A Case Study of Mae Teng”. TDRI, Bangkok, Thailand.
- Therkildsen, O.** (1988),  
*Watering White Elephants? Lessons from donor funded planning and implementation of rural water supplies in Tanzania*. 224 pp. Centre for Development Research Publications No. 7. Centre for Development Research, Copenhagen, Denmark.
- Thomas, V. and Belt, T.** (1997),  
“Growth and the Environment: Allies or Foes?”. *Finance and Development*. June 1997, pp. 22-24.
- Thomson, K.** (1998),  
“State of the Art in Thinking in Capacity Development in Environment. Key Issues, Newest Developments and Challenges”. 17 pp. Paper presented at the International Workshop on Danish Assistance to Capacity Development in Environment, 12-14 May 1998, Snekersten, Denmark.
- Thrupp, L.A. et al.** (1994),  
Participatory methods in planning and political processes: linking the grassroots and policies for sustainable development. *Agriculture and Human Values* 2, 77-84.
- Triantafillou, P.** (1995),  
“Environmental Politics in Asia -- Framing the Environmental Policy Process”. Centre for Development Studies Working Paper 95.3, 26 pp. Centre for Development Studies, Copenhagen, Denmark.
- Trostle, J.A. et al.** (1997),  
“Strengthening Human Resource Capacity in Developing Countries: Who Are the Actors? What Are Their Actions?”. In Grindle (1997b), pp. 63-93.
- UNCSD** (1996),  
Report of the Third Meeting of the Expert Group on Indicators of Sustainable Development, Geneva, Switzerland, 23 September 1996.
- UNDP** (1994),  
“Capacity Development: Lessons of Experience and Guiding Principles”. 29 pp. Paper presented at the International Round Table *Potential and Use of National Capacities and the Role of the Foreign Expert in Future Development Cooperation*. 16-19 May 1995. German Foundation for International Development (DSE).
- UNDP** (1995),  
“Report of the UNDP Capacity Development Retreat”. 6-8 February 1995. 16 pp. + 6 annexes. Office of Evaluation and Strategic Planning. UNDP, New York, USA.
- UNDP** (1996),  
Building Sustainable Capacity: Challenges for the Public Sector. Office of Evaluation and Strategic Planning. UNDP, New York.

- UNDP** (1997a),  
 “Capacity Development. Management Development and Governance Division”. Technical Advisory Paper 2, 34 pp. UNDP, New York, USA.
- UNDP** (1997b),  
*Results-oriented Monitoring and Evaluation. A Handbook for Programme Managers*. 120 pp. Office of Evaluation and Strategic Planning, UNDP, New York, USA.
- UNDP** (1997c),  
 “Energy After Rio -- Prospects and Challenges”. Executive Summary, 35 pp. UNDP, New York, USA.
- UNDP** (1997d),  
 “Environmental Programmes in Latin America and the Caribbean: An Assessment of UNDP Experience”. 81 pp. Office of Evaluation and Strategic Planning. UNDP, New York, USA.
- UNDP** (1997e),  
*Synergies in National Implementation. The Rio Agreements*. 69 pp. Proceedings of the Expert Meeting on Synergies among the Conventions on Climate Change, Biological Diversity, Desertification and the Forest Principles, 17-20 March 1997. Sede Boqer Israel. Sustainable Energy and Environment Division. UNDP, New York, USA.
- UNDP** (1997f),  
 “UNDP Assistance to the Energy Sector - An Ex-post Evaluation Study”. 33 pp. + 1 annex. OESP Series on Lessons Learned. UNDP, New York, USA.
- UNDP** (1997g),  
 Environmental Programmes in Latin America and the Caribbean. An Assessment of UNDP Experience. Office of Evaluation and Strategic Planning, UNDP, New York.
- UNDP** (1998),  
 “Capacity Assessment and Development in a Systems and Strategic Management Context”. Draft Technical Advisory Paper No. 3. 57 pp. + 5 annexes. Management Development and Governance Division, Bureau for Development Policy. UNDP, New York, USA.
- UNDP-HIID** (1996),  
 “Building Sustainable Capacity. Challenges for the Public Sector. A Study for the Bureau for Policy and Programme Support”. 163 pp. Office of Evaluation and Strategic Planning. UNDP, New York, USA.
- UNDP/UNEP/World Bank** (1994),  
 “Global Environment Facility. Independent Evaluation of the Pilot Phase”. 192 pp. The World Bank, Washington, D.C., USA.
- UNDP/UNEP/World Bank** (1997),  
 “Project Implementation Review of the Global Environment Facility 1996”. 25 pp. + 3 appendices. The World Bank, Washington, D.C., USA.
- UNDP/UNSO** (1997),  
 “Mobilizing Resources for National Desertification Funds through Debt-for-Nature Swaps”. 51 pp. UNSO, SEED, UNDP, New York, USA.
- UNDP-SEED** (1997),  
 Synergies in National Implementation. The Rio Agreements. Expert Meeting on Synergies among the Conventions on Climate Change, Biological Diversity, Desertification and the Forest Principles. Sede Boqor, Israel, 17-20 March 1997. Sustainable Energy and Environment Division. UNDP, New York.

- UNEP** (1998),  
“Environmental Impact Assessment -- Basic Procedures for Developing Countries”. UNEP, Nairobi, Kenya.
- UNEP** (1994),  
Sustainable Development Indicators. UNEP/EAP/BN.94-01, December. UNEP, Nairobi, Kenya.
- UNIDO-Danida** (1996),  
Support to the *Ecotoxicology Institute*, Pakistan. Danida Evaluation Report 1996/110.
- United Nations** (1997),  
*Finance for Sustainable Development. The Road Ahead*. 503 pp. Proceedings of the Fourth Group Meeting on Financial Issues of *Agenda 21*, Santiago, Chile. United Nations Secretariat, New York, USA.
- USAID** (1993),  
“A.I.D. Evaluation Highlights No. 19. Washington, D.C., USA.
- USAID** (1993),  
“Assessment of A.I.D. Environmental Programs, Energy Conservation in Pakistan”. 8 pp. A.I.D. technical report No. 11. Washington, D.C., USA.
- USAID** (1994),  
“Strategies for Sustainable Development”. USAID, Washington, D.C., USA.
- USAID** (1995a),  
“The Agency’s Strategic Framework and Indicators 1995-96”. USAID, Washington, D.C., USA.
- USAID** (1995b),  
“Energy Conservation Jamaica”, 14 pp. Impact Evaluation Number 2. Washington, D.C., USA.
- USAID** (1996a),  
*Managing USAID’s environmental portfolio for results*. Proceedings of the March 1995 Environmental Workshop on Performance Measurement. Working Paper No. 9. Center for Development Information and Evaluation.
- USAID** (1996b),  
*Forestry and the Environment. An Assessment of USAID Support for Forest Stewardship*. USAID Program and Operations Assessment Report No. 14. 40 pp. + 2 appendices. Center for Development Information and Evaluation, USAID, Arlington, Virginia, USA.
- USAID** (1996c),  
“Energy Conservation in the Philippines”. 16 pp. Impact Evaluation Number 4. Washington, D.C., USA.
- USAID** (1996d),  
“Saving Energy in Guatemala”. 16 pp. Impact Evaluation Number 8. Washington, D.C., USA.
- USAID** (1996e),  
“Shining the Light on Energy Conservation: A Synthesis of Findings From Six Country Studies”. 24 pp. USAID Program and Operations Assessment Report No. 19. Washington, D.C., USA.
- USAID** (1997),  
“Environmental Policy Dialogue: Lessons Learned”. (Initial Draft for Workshop Presentation



- and Discussion, HIID, 14 October 1997). 66 pp. Environmental Policy and Institutional Strengthening Indefinite Quantity Contract (EPIQ). HIID, Cambridge, Massachusetts, USA.
- USAID/WRI** (1995),  
 “Global Environmental Agreements and African National Priorities. Issues for Discussion and Possible Action”. Natural Resources Policy Consultative Group. Policy Brief No. 1, September 1995. WRI, Washington, D.C., USA.
- van Rooy, A.** (1997),  
 The Frontiers of Influence: NGO Lobbying at the 1974 World Food Conference, the 1992 Earth Summit and Beyond. *World Development* 25 (1), 93-114.
- VKI-Seatec International** (1988),  
 “Institutional Support for the Ministry of Science, Technology and Environment, Thailand. Completion Report, 45 pp. + 9 annexes. Water Quality Institute-VKI, Denmark.
- Wade, R.** (1988),  
 Village Republics: Economic conditions for collective action in South India. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Wade, R.** (1987),  
 “The management of common property resources: finding a cooperative solution”. *World Bank Research Observer* 2.
- Wapenhans, W.A. et al.** (1992),  
 “Report of the Portfolio Management Task Force”. Internal World Bank document. Cited in Rich (1994) pp. 255-256.
- Wardell, D.A.** (1997),  
 “Danida’s Support to the Energy Sector: Issues and Contradictions with Particular Reference to Burkina Faso”. In *The Sahel -- Natural Resource Management Projects -- Energy Provision -- Decentralisation, Empowerment and Capacity Building*. Proceedings of the 9th Danish Sahel Workshop 6-9 January 1997. pp. 81-104. SEREIN -- Occasional Paper No. 5. Copenhagen, Denmark.
- Warner, M.** (1997),  
 “ ‘Consensus’ Participation: An Example for Protected Areas Planning”. *Public Administration and Development* 17, pp. 413-432.
- Warner, M. and Robb, C.** (1996),  
 Community participation planning: a strategic development approach. *Community Development Journal* 31 (4), 330-342.
- WCED** (1987),  
 Our Common Future. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Werksman, J.** (1995),  
 “Greening Bretton Woods”. In Kirkby, J. et al. eds., (1995), *Sustainable Development*. Earthscan Publications Ltd., London, United Kingdom. pp. 274-286.
- White, H.** (1992),  
 The macroeconomic impact of development aid: a critical survey. *Journal of Development Studies* 28, 163-240.
- World Bank** (1991),  
 Strengthening Local Capabilities and Institutions. World Bank Technical Paper No. 139. Vol. I. pp. 155-176. The World Bank, Washington, D.C., USA.

- World Bank** (1991a),  
“Policies and Procedures and Cross Sectoral Issues. Environmental Assessment Sourcebook”.  
Vol. I. World Bank Technical Paper No. 139. The World Bank, Washington, D.C., USA.
- World Bank** (1991b),  
Sectoral Guidelines. Environmental Assessment Sourcebook. Vol. II. World Bank Technical  
Paper No. 139. The World Bank, Washington, D.C., USA.
- World Bank** (1991c),  
“Guidelines for Environmental Assessment of Energy and Industry Projects. Environmental  
Assessment Sourcebook”. Vol. III. World Bank Technical Paper No. 139. The World Bank,  
Washington, D.C., USA.
- World Bank** (1991d),  
“Operational Directive. OD 4.01. 3 October 1991”. *The World Bank Operational Manual*. 6 pp.  
+ 6 annexes + Manual Transmittal Memorandum. The World Bank, Washington, D.C., USA.
- World Bank** (1991e),  
“Strengthening Local Capabilities and Institutions”. World Bank Technical Paper No. 139.  
Vol. I. pp. 155-176. The World Bank, Washington, D.C., USA.
- World Bank** (1991f),  
“Managing Technical Assistance in the 1990s: Report of the Technical Assistance Review Task  
Force”. The World Bank, Washington, D.C., USA.
- World Bank** (1991g),  
The Bank’s Work on Institutional Development in Sectors: Emerging Tasks and Challenges.  
Paper presented by the Public Sector Management and Private Sectors Development Division.  
The World Bank, Washington.
- World Bank** (1992a),  
“Natural Resource Management in Nepal”. OED Précis No. 24, 4 pp. Operations Evaluation  
Department, The World Bank, Washington, D.C., USA.
- World Bank** (1992b),  
“World Bank Approaches to the Environment in Brazil”. OED Précis No. 28, 4 pp. Operations  
Evaluation Department, The World Bank, Washington, D.C., USA.
- World Bank** (1992c),  
“Environmental Action Plans”. Operational Directive 4.02. The World Bank, Washington, D.C.,  
USA.
- World Bank** (1993a),  
*Handbook on Technical Assistance*. Operations Policy Department. The World Bank,  
Washington, D.C., USA.
- World Bank** (1993b),  
*Strengthening Local Capabilities and Institutions*. In Environmental Assessment Sourcebook,  
Vol. I. pp. 155-176. World Bank Technical Paper 139. The World Bank, Washington, D.C.,  
USA.
- World Bank** (1993c),  
“World Bank Approaches to the Environment in Brazil. A Review of Selected Projects”.  
Operations Evaluation Study Report No. 10039. 84 pp. + 2 annexes. Operations Evaluation  
Department. The World Bank, Washington, D.C., USA.

- World Bank** (1993d),  
 “Environmental Issues in World Bank Projects”. OED Précis No. 41, 4 pp. Operations Evaluation Department. The World Bank, Washington, D.C., USA.
- World Bank** (1993e),  
 “Natural Resource Management in Bolivia”. OED Précis No. 44, 4 pp. Operations Evaluation Department. The World Bank, Washington, D.C., USA.
- World Bank** (1993f),  
 “Public Involvement in Environmental Assessments: Requirements, Opportunities and Issues”. Environmental Assessment Sourcebook Update No. 5. 8 pp. Environment Department. The World Bank, Washington, D.C., USA.
- World Bank** (1994a),  
 “Economywide Policies and the Environment”. Draft. 5 April 1994. 38 pp. + 2 appendices. Environment Department. The World Bank, Washington, D.C., USA.
- World Bank** (1994b),  
*Water Supply, Sanitation and Environmental Sustainability. The Financing Challenge.* 35 pp. The World Bank, Washington, D.C., USA.
- World Bank** (1995a),  
 Mainstreaming the Environment. Bank Group and the Environment since the Rio Earth Summit. Fiscal 1995. 59 pp. Environment Department, The World Bank, Washington, D.C., USA.
- World Bank** (1995b),  
 “Monitoring Environmental Progress. A Report on Work in Progress”. 82 pp. *Environmentally Sustainable Development*, The World Bank, Washington, D.C., USA.
- World Bank** (1995c),  
 “National Environmental Strategies: Learning from Experience”. Environment Department Dissemination Notes No. 30. August 1995. 4 pp. The World Bank, Washington, D.C., USA.
- World Bank** (1995d),  
 “Institutional Structures for Environmentally Sustainable Development”. Building Blocks for Africa 2025 Paper No. 3. 19 pp. Africa Technical Department. The World Bank, Washington, D.C., USA.
- World Bank** (1995e),  
 “Managing the Environment Locally in Sub-Saharan Africa (MELISSA)”. Building Blocks for Africa 2025 Paper No. 8. 14 pp. Africa Technical Department. The World Bank, Washington, D.C., USA.
- World Bank** (1995f),  
*World Bank Participation Source Book.* Environment Department. The World Bank, Washington, D.C., USA.
- World Bank** (1996a),  
 “Towards a Sustainable Economy. Can we Survive Green Advice?”. Environment Department Paper No. 036. 17 pp. *Environmentally Sustainable Development.* The World Bank, Washington, D.C., USA.
- World Bank** (1996b),  
 “Green National Accounts: Policy Uses and Empirical Experience”. Environment Department Paper No. 039. 48 pp. *Environmentally Sustainable Development.* The World Bank, Washington, D.C., USA.

- World Bank** (1996c),  
*Environmental Performance Indicators. A first edition note.* The World Bank, Washington, D.C., USA.
- World Bank** (1996d),  
“Partnership for Capacity Building in Africa”. 25 pp. Office of the Vice President, Africa Region. The World Bank, Washington, D.C., USA.
- World Bank** (1996e),  
*Effectiveness of Environmental Assessments and National Environmental Action Plans: A Process Study.* Report No. 15835. 158 pp. Operations Evaluation Department. The World Bank, Washington, D.C., USA.
- World Bank** (1996f),  
“Environmental Assessments and National Action Plans”. OED Précis No. 130, 4 pp. Operations Evaluation Department. The World Bank, Washington, D.C., USA.
- World Bank** (1997a),  
“Grassroots Organizations for Resource Management in the Philippines”. OED Précis No. 153. 2 pp. Operations Evaluation Department. The World Bank, Washington, D.C., USA.
- World Bank** (1997b),  
“Environmental Management and Institutions in OECD Countries: Lessons from Experience”. Environment Department Paper No. 46, 54 pp. The World Bank, Washington, D.C., USA.
- World Bank** (1997),  
Support to the *Central Visayas Regional Project*, the Philippines. Performance Audit Report and Operations Evaluation Department Précis No. 153.
- World Bank** (1998),  
“Learning and Institutional Capacity Building in South Asia”. The Economic Development Institute and South Asia Region of the World Bank. The World Bank, Washington, D.C., USA.
- World Bank/Ministère des Finances et du Plan** (1994),  
*Stratégie du Plan d’Action National pour l’Environnement.* Ministère de l’Environnement et de l’Eau, Ouagadougou.
- World Resources Institute** (1991),  
*Accounts Overdue: Natural Resource Depreciation in Costa Rica.* WRI, Washington, D.C., USA.
- World Resources Institute** (1995),  
“National and Local Policies and Institutions”. In *World Resources 1994-95*. WRI, Washington, D.C., USA. Chapter 14.
- Zartman, I.** ed. (1995),  
*Collapsed States: The Disintegration and Restoration of Legitimate Authority.* CO: Lynn Rienner, Boulder.

**ANNEX 8  
DATASHEETS**

**LESSONS OF DONOR SUPPORT FOR CDE: DATASHEET A**

**1. Key characteristics of the aid administration**

<b>No.</b>	<b>QUESTION</b>	<b>RESPONSE</b>
1	Name of aid administration	
2	Is the aid administration part of a Ministry of Foreign Affairs? (year)	
3	Nature and year of last major restructuring?	
4	Estimated total staff strength of the aid administration (year)	
5	Estimated total annual ODA funding (m US\$) (year)	
6	Estimated aid budget administered per person (m US\$)	
7	Has the UN target of 0.7% of GNP for ODA been reached?	
8	Title of overall ODA policy document (year)	
9	Has the aid policy framework shifted from “project assistance” to “sector programme support”? (year)	
10	Has annual ODA funding increased as a % of GNP after 1992? (year)	
11	Has ODA funding for the “environment” increased as a proportion of total ODA since 1992? (year)	
12	Has the aid administration established special “environment” funds and/or earmarked funds to assist recipient countries to implement the post-UNCED conventions? (year)	
13	Estimated proportion of total ODA used in support of the “environment” (year)	
14	Has new or additional funding for the “environment” been approved after 1992? (year)	
15	Is ODA governed by a national “development cooperation” law?	
16	Is environmentally sustainable development explicitly included as an objective in overall ODA policy statements? (year included)	
17	Does the aid administration have a policy commitment to “mainstream” environment into all ODA?	
18	Are environmental considerations systematically integrated in programme country strategies?	
19	Are environmental considerations systematically integrated in sectoral policy papers?	
20	Does the aid administration have its own environment sector policy? (year)	

## 2. Organisational arrangements for “environment”

No	QUESTION	RESPONSE
21	Is the aid administration accountable to an independent board?	
22	Are environmental specialists represented on the board?	
23	Has the Board rejected project or programme proposals on environmental grounds?	
24	Is the aid administration subject to periodic audits by a national audit office?	
25	To what extent has the aid administration decentralised?	
26	What is the indicative budgetary authority delegated to embassies in ODA recipient countries?	
27	Is the aid administration characterised by an institutional culture of (periodic) “pressure to spend”?	
28	Is there an overall policy monitoring unit within the aid administration? (year established)	
29	Does the policy unit include environmental specialists or an environmental “window”?	
30	Has the aid administration established a policy performance monitoring system? (year established)	
31	Is there a separate environment policy unit within the aid administration? (year established)	
32	Is there a separate environment technical unit within the aid administration? (year established)	
33	In which year was the first environmental specialist appointed within the aid administration?	
34	What is the estimated total no. of environmental specialists within the aid administration? (year)	
35	Are environmental issues included in induction training courses for newly recruited generalist aid administrators?	
36	Has follow-up on-the-job environmental training been provided by the aid administration for generalist staff?	
37	Have environmental training courses been organised for aid administration personnel at the embassies in recipient countries?	
38	Are environmental specialists attached to, or available for, other organisational units within the aid administration ?	
39	Does the evaluation department include environmental specialists?	
40	Has the aid administration deployed environmental specialists at the embassies in recipient countries?	

### 3. Environmental guidelines and procedures

No	QUESTION	RESPONSE
41	Does the aid administration have its own overall natural resources and environmental management strategy paper(s)? (year and year revised)	
42	Has the aid administration produced sectoral environmental guidelines? (year)	
43	Has the aid administration produced regional, country or sub-national environmental profiles? (types and years)	
44	Has the aid administration produced its own guidelines for internalising long-term environmental costs and benefits? (year)	
45	Has the aid administration produced its own guidelines for assessing existing institutional capacities? (year)	
46	Has the aid administration produced its own CDE guidelines? (year)	
47	To what extent are the different guidelines used by generalist staff within the aid administration?	
48	Does the aid administration consult with and/or use other institutions with specific NREM expertise?	
49	In which year was there the first formalised requirement to undertake an environmental assessment (EA) during project preparation stages? (year)	
50	Does the aid administration have its own EA or EIA guidelines? (year/year revised)	
51	Were the EA/EIA guidelines prepared for use in the preparation of projects?	
52	Have the EA/EIA guidelines been revised or updated to reflect the shift towards sector programmes?	
53	Is EA/EIA an optional or mandatory operational procedure?	
54	Are the same EA/EIA guidelines routinely used for all aid forms and funding mechanisms?	
55	How many formal EIAs have been commissioned by the aid administration after 1992?	
56	Which sector or sectors have attempted to mainstream the use of EA/EIA in project and programme preparation?	
57	Is there a formalised requirement to document how and to what extent environmental issues have been addressed in project and programme preparation as part of funding requests submitted to the board of the aid administration? (year introduced)	
58	Are environmental issues systematically addressed in evaluation reports?	

#### 4. Summarised assessment

No	QUESTION	RESPONSE
59	Overall quality of the thematic evaluation report	
60	Does the evaluation include a discussion of broader lessons learned of relevance to the current aid form i.e. sector programming?	
61	To what extent has the aid administration's capacity improved to set goals, evaluate options and take decisions to fund programmes which promote environmentally sustainable development?	
62	To what extent has the aid administration's capacity improved to formulate and implement coherent NREM programmes making effective use of its own and other institutional resources?	
63	To what extent has the aid administration's capacity improved to monitor and evaluate its own environmental performance?	
64	To what extent has the aid administration's capacity improved to interact inter-institutionally and co-ordinate plans and programmes?	
65	To what extent has the aid administration's capacity improved to facilitate public participation and public access to information?	
66	To what extent has the aid administration's capacity improved to adapt to changing national circumstances and recipient country demands, to learn from mistakes and to undertake internal organisational reforms?	
67	To what extent has the aid administration's capacity improved to mobilise additional sources of financing in support of environmental activities?	
68	Additional comments:	



## LESSONS OF DONOR SUPPORT FOR CDE: DATASHEET B

### 1. Background Information

Aid (Funding) Agency	
Implementing Partner	
Key National Institution	
Other Institutions	
Title of Document	
Report No. or Designation	
Report Date	
Type of Report	
Evaluation Team Leader	
Institution of the Team Leader	
Beneficiary Country Representative(s)	
Additional Comments:	

### 2. Characteristics of the Evaluation/Review/Study Object

<b>TYPE</b> (Donor Perspective)	Project	Sector/ Programme	Organisation	Country	Other
<b>REGION</b>	Africa	Asia	Latin America	Middle East	Other
<b>COUNTRY</b>					
Total Budget (m US\$)	Less than 0.5	0.5 – 5.0	5.0 – 10.0	10.0+	Unknown
Duration	Less 2 years	2 –5 years	5 – 10 years	10+ years	Unknown
Evaluated Earlier	Several times	Once	No	Reviewed	Unknown
Output (Beneficiary Perspective)	Water	Energy	Transport	Agriculture (Specify)	
	Public Administration	Environment	Other (Specify)		
Aid Channel	Bilateral	Multilateral	Embassy Grant	NGO	Commercial
Recipient Institution(s)	Regional	Public Sector (National)	Public Sector (Local)	University	Private Sector
	NGO	CBO	Other (Specify)		

### 3. Evaluation Report

1	What type of project according to anticipated environmental impacts?	Black	Grey	White
2	Was an EIA conducted before project start?	Yes	No	Unknown
3	What type of project according to objectives?	+ Environmental Objective(s)	+ Environmental Component(s)	• Environmental Objectives or Components
4	Project Code(s) (1-8)			
5	Degree of “specificity”	High	Medium	Low
6	Is there a methodological discussion of evaluating environmental aspects?	Adequate	Limited	No
7	Are institutional aspects addressed in the report?	Adequate	Limited	No
8	Are linkages between the project’s activities and national economic and planning institutions described or assessed?	Adequate	Limited	No
9	Are environmental aspects addressed in the report?	Adequate	Limited	No
10	Are linkages between the project’s activities and national environmental institutions described or assessed?	Adequate	Limited	No
11	Is a financial analysis included?	Yes	No	
12	Is an economic analysis included?	Yes	No	
13	Are environmental costs and/or benefits considered in the economic analysis?	Yes	No	
14	Are long-term “downstream” environmental impacts assessed?	Adequate	Limited	No
15	Did the project establish a monitoring system?	Yes	No	
16	Did this include monitoring of environmental parameters?	Yes	No	
17	Are sustainability issues addressed?	Adequate	Limited	No
18	Is environmental sustainability included?	Yes	No	
19	Is institutional sustainability included?	Yes	No	
20	Is financial sustainability included?	Yes	No	
Additional Comments:				

#### 4. Evaluation Process

21	Was there a formal agreement as a basis for conducting the evaluation?	Yes	No	Unknown
22	Are ToR included?	Yes	No	
23	Was the recipient country involved in preparing the evaluation ToR?	Yes	No	Unknown
24	Do the ToR include the need to address environmental issues?	Adequate	Limited	No
25	Was there professional environmental expertise in the evaluation team?	Yes	No	Unknown
26	Were recipient country/institution environmental specialists included in the evaluation team?	Yes	No	Unknown
27	How many recipient country environmental institutions were consulted during the evaluation?	None	1 to 3	4+
28	Did the evaluation team use participatory consultative techniques among stakeholders?	Yes	No	Not specified
29	Does the evaluation assess the relevance of the project in relation to national environmental policies?	Adequate	Limited	No
30	Does the evaluation include recommendations regarding environmental issues?	Yes	No	Unknown
31	Do the recommendations distinguish between donor and recipient country responsibilities for follow-up action?	Yes	No	Unknown

#### 5. Institutional Capacity Assessment

32	Does the evaluation include a clear diagnosis of earlier and existing institutional capacity (-ies)?	Adequate	Limited	No
33	Does the evaluation identify and discuss key institutional gaps and shortcomings and/or specify opportunities?	Adequate	Limited	No
34	Does the evaluation analyse and compare the importance of the different inputs used and their relative contributions to improving capacity?	Adequate	Limited	No
35	Does the evaluation discuss and analyse institutional capacity(-ies) to resolve actual or potential conflicts?	Adequate	Limited	No
36	Does the evaluation discuss and analyse the institutional capacity to implement environmental and natural resource management plans and programmes?	Adequate	Limited	No
37	Does the evaluation discuss and analyse the institutional capacity(-ies) to monitor environmental change?	Adequate	Limited	No
38	Does the evaluation discuss and analyse the institutional capacity(-ies) to mobilise funding?	Adequate	Limited	No

## 6. Summarised Assessment

39	Overall quality of the report	Excellent	Adequate	Inadequate
40	Does the evaluation include a discussion of lessons learned?	Adequate	Limited	No
41	To what extent has the project improved capacity to set goals, evaluate options and take decisions which promote environmentally sustainable development?	Significant	Adequate	Inadequate
42	To what extent has the project improved capacity to formulate, implement and monitor coherent NREM plans and programmes making effective use of human and financial resources?	Significant	Adequate	Inadequate
43	To what extent has the project improved capacity to provide reliable environmental information and useful experiences in support of national goal, policy, plan and programme formulation processes?	Significant	Adequate	Inadequate
44	To what extent has the project improved capacity to interact inter-institutionally and co-ordinate plans and programmes?	Significant	Adequate	Inadequate
45	To what extent has the project improved capacity to facilitate public participation and public access to environmental information?	Significant	Adequate	Inadequate
46	To what extent has the project improved capacity to adapt to changing national circumstances and client demands, to learn from mistakes and to undertake internal organisational reforms?	Significant	Adequate	Inadequate
47	To what extent has the project improved capacity to mobilise sustainable sources of funding?	Significant	Adequate	Inadequate

## 7. Key Lessons Learned

No	Key Lesson Learned
48	Project Ownership
49	Project Design
50	Integration of Environment and Development
51	Project Implementation
52	Institutional Pluralism
53	Monitoring
54	Resource Mobilization
55	Environmental Economic Valuation
56	Institutional Strengthening
57	Sustainability
58	Additional comments:

## LESSONS OF DONOR SUPPORT FOR CDE: DATASHEET C

### 1. Background Information

Aid (Funding) Agency	
Implementing Partner(s)	
Key Recipient Institution	
Other Recipient Institutions	
Title of Document	
Report No. or Designation	
Report Date	
Type of Report	
Evaluation Team Leader	
Institution of the Team Leader	
Beneficiary Country Representative(s)	
Additional Comments:	

### 2. Characteristics of the Evaluation/Review/Study Object

Institution Type (Donor Perspective) + Year Established	Regional	National Ministry of Environment	Other National Line Ministry (specify)	Decentralised Government Structure (specify)	University
	Parastatal	Private Sector	NGO	CBO	Other (specify)
Main Functions					
Region	Africa	Asia	Latin America	Middle East	Other
Country (-ies)					
Total Budget (m US \$)	Less than 0.5	0.5 – 5.0	5.0 – 10.0	10.0+	Unknown
Cofinanced	Yes	No	Whom?	Amount (m US\$)	
Duration	Less 2 years	2 – 5 years	5 – 10 years	10+ years	Unknown
Evaluated Earlier	Several times	Once	No	Reviewed	Unknown
Output(s) (Beneficiary Perspective)					
Aid Channel	Bilateral	Multilateral	Embassy Grant	NGO	Commercial

### 3. Evaluation Report (contd.)

No	QUESTION	RESPONSE		
1	Is institutional capacity development an explicit objective in the support to the institution?	Yes	No	
2	Is CDE an explicit objective in the project/programme?	Yes	No	
3	Project code (1-8)			
4	Degree of “specificity”	High	Medium	Low
5	Is there a methodological discussion of evaluating institutional capacity development or CDE?	Adequate	Limited	No
6	Does the evaluation include a detailed analysis and assessment of the country’s institutional context and “culture”?	Adequate	Limited	No
7	Does the evaluation include a detailed analysis and assessment of the institution’s existing and, if appropriate, future mandate and functions?	Adequate	Limited	No
8	Does the evaluation include a detailed analysis and assessment of the institution’s existing human resource capacity?	Adequate	Limited	No
9	Does the evaluation include a detailed analysis and assessment of the institution’s existing recurrent and developmental funding ?	Adequate	Limited	No
10	Does the evaluation include a detailed analysis and assessment of other donor-supported projects and programmes within the same institution?	Adequate	Limited	No
11	Are linkages between the institution and national economic and planning institutions described and assessed in the evaluation?	Adequate	Limited	No
12	Are linkages between the institution and other environmental institutions described and assessed in the evaluation?	Adequate	Limited	No
13	Which type(s) of institutions? (specify)			
14	Does the evaluation identify key institutional gaps and shortcomings?	Adequate	Limited	No
15	Does the evaluation identify and specify key institutional opportunities?	Adequate	Limited	No

### 3. Evaluation Report (continued)

No	QUESTION “Does the evaluation...”	RESPONSE		
16	Specify contributions from the recipient government or institution?	Yes	No	Unknown
17	Analyse and assess actual contribution(s) from the recipient institution?	Adequate	Limited	No
18	Specify the total estimated contribution of the recipient institution/government as a proportion of the funding agency budget?			
19	Analyse and compare the importance of the different inputs provided by the funding agency and their relative contributions to improving capacity?	Adequate	Limited	No
20	Estimate the proportion of external TA as a proportion of the total donor budget?			
21	Estimate the training budget as a proportion of the total donor budget?			
22	Estimate the capital/equipment budget as a proportion of the total donor budget?			
23	Estimate the recurrent budget (i.e. operational costs) as a proportion of the total donor budget?			
24	Discuss and analyse the institutional capacity(-ies) to resolve actual/potential environmental conflicts?	Adequate	Limited	No
25	Discuss, analyse and assess the relevance of the institutional capacity(-ies) to implement NREM plans and programmes?	Adequate	Limited	No
26	Discuss and analyse the institutional capacity(-ies) to monitor performance?	Adequate	Limited	No
27	Discuss and analyse the institutional capacity(-ies) to promote public participation?	Adequate	Limited	No
28	Discuss and analyse the institutional capacity(-ies) to mobilise funding?	Adequate	Limited	No
29	Additional Comments:			

#### 4. Evaluation Process

30	Was there a formal agreement as a basis for conducting the evaluation?	Yes	No	Unknown
31	Are ToR included?	Yes	No	
32	Was the recipient country involved in preparing the evaluation ToR?	Yes	No	Unknown
33	Do the ToR include the need to address institutional issues?	Adequate	Limited	No
34	Was there professional institutional expertise in the evaluation team?	Yes	No	Unknown
35	Were recipient country institutional specialists included in the evaluation team?	Yes	No	Unknown
36	How many recipient country environmental institutions were consulted during the evaluation?	1-2	3-4	5+
37	Did the evaluation team use participatory consultative techniques among stakeholders?	Yes	No	Not specified
38	Does the evaluation assess the relevance of the project in relation to national policies?	Adequate	Limited	No
39	Does the evaluation include recommendations regarding institutional issues?	Yes	No	Unknown
40	Do recommendations distinguish between donor and recipient responsibilities for follow-up action?	Yes	No	Unknown

#### 5. Summarised Assessment

41	Overall quality of the evaluation report	Excellent	Adequate	Inadequate
42	Does the evaluation include a discussion of broader lessons learned?	Adequate	Limited	No
43	To what extent has the project improved (or influenced) capacity to set goals, evaluate options and take decisions which promote environmentally sustainable development?	Significant	Adequate	Inadequate
44	To what extent has the project improved capacity to formulate, implement and monitor coherent NREM plans and programmes making effective use of human and financial resources?	Significant	Adequate	Inadequate
45	To what extent has the project improved capacity to provide reliable environmental information and useful experiences in support of national goal, policy, plan/programme formulation processes?	Significant	Adequate	Inadequate
46	To what extent has the project improved capacity to interact inter-institutionally and co-ordinate plans and programmes?	Significant	Adequate	Inadequate
47	To what extent has the project improved capacity to facilitate public access to information and/or public participation in decision-making processes?	Significant	Adequate	Inadequate
48	To what extent has the project improved capacity to adapt to changing national circumstances and client demands, to learn from mistakes and to undertake internal organisational reforms?	Significant	Adequate	Inadequate
49	To what extent has the project improved capacity to mobilise sustainable sources of funding?	Significant	Adequate	Inadequate



## 6. Key Lessons Learned

No.	Key Lesson Learned
1	Project Ownership:
2	Project Design:
3	Project Implementation:
4	Institutional Pluralism:
5	Monitoring:
6	Resource Mobilisation:
7	Environmental Economic Valuation:
8	Institutional strengthening:
9	Sustainability:
Additional Comments:	

## 7. Typology of CDE Projects and Programmes by Key Objectives of Intervention

No.	MAJOR OBJECTIVE
1.	Design and implementation of macro-economic policy and programmes to promote environmentally sustainable development
2.	Development of environmental strategies, policies and plans of action
3.	Establishment or enhancement of specific natural resources and environmental management capabilities
4.	Promotion of scientific and/or applied natural resources and environmental research
5.	Modification and adaptation of legal and normative frameworks
6.	Facilitation of dialogue and consensus-building within government and among different interest groups
7.	Promoting the transfer of environmentally sound technologies
8.	Promoting outreach and enhancing public awareness about environmental issues

## ANNEX 9

### SUMMARISED OVERVIEW OF GENERIC CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT: LESSONS LEARNED

**Table A9.1 Characteristics of Political, Economic and Social Settings that Facilitate Performance**

- ◆ Sustained economic growth, with rising wage levels and low inflation
- ◆ Reasonable parity between public sector and private sector salaries; or lack of opportunities in the private sector
- ◆ Legitimate and stable political system
- ◆ Open and participatory government
- ◆ Leadership commitment to a vision of national development
- ◆ History of strong investment in human resource development
- ◆ Social consensus; or lack of deep social conflict

**Table A9.2 Characteristics of Public Sector Institutional Settings that Facilitate Performance**

- ◆ Clear rules that facilitate action and encourage problem-solving and innovation by organisation and officials
- ◆ Public service systems for recruitment and promotion that reward merit and performance, not patronage and seniority
- ◆ Sufficient budgetary resources to support a reasonable level of public sector activities
- ◆ Salaries that are attractive to highly motivated people
- ◆ Reform programmes that emphasise:
  - Adequate salaries linked to level and performance
  - Improvements in organisational management
  - Problem-solving orientations of the public sector
  - Development of key skills for development tasks
  - Incentives for superior performance of organisations and individuals
  - Elimination of ineffective workers and unnecessary tasks
  - Demand creation among clients

**Table A9.3 Characteristics of Task Networks that Facilitate Performance**

- ◆ Effective capacity across multiple organisations that must collaborate to accomplish a given task
- ◆ Policy frameworks that define goals for co-ordinated action
- ◆ Specific mechanisms for frequent interaction across organisational boundaries
- ◆ Horizontal interaction across organisations at policy, operational and field levels
- ◆ Vertical interaction within levels of government involved in performing a common task
- ◆ Common training institutes or programmes that bring together staff assigned to different organisations but involved in the same task
- ◆ Clarity of organisational responsibilities

**Table A9.4 Characteristics of Organisations that Facilitate Performance**

- ◆ Strong mission mystique held widely within the organisation
- ◆ Rising salary levels and competitiveness with private sector salaries
- ◆ Strong sense of professional identity within an organisation
- ◆ High prestige of organisation and links to high prestige domestic and international reference groups or organisations
- ◆ Equity, participation, and flexibility in work assignments
- ◆ Participation in organisational decision-making
- ◆ Managers focused on performance, incentives, participation and problem-solving
- ◆ Extensive use of non-monetary incentives
- ◆ Promotion based on performance
- ◆ Ability to demote and fire unproductive or unprofessional staff
- ◆ Adequate physical environment and equipment

**Table A9.5 Characteristics of Human Resources that Facilitate Performance**

- ◆ Links between training institutions and task-oriented organisations
- ◆ Induction training linked to organisational mission and specific task
- ◆ Training in management
- ◆ Training opportunities linked to commitment to the organisation
- ◆ Open and competitive recruitment procedures
- ◆ Recruitment managed by the organisation (rather than by the civil service)
- ◆ Meaningful jobs assigned to those with appropriate skills and levels of training
- ◆ Job satisfaction
- ◆ Professional identification among staff, reinforced by professional associations outside the organisation
- ◆ Contract of limited duration with clear link to performance criteria

**Source:** *Building Sustainable Capacity. Challenges for the Public Sector* (UNDP/HIID, 1996, pp. 33, 39, 42, 48, 49).

**ANNEX 10**  
**LESSONS LEARNED FROM DEVELOPING AND IMPLEMENTING AN “INTEGRATED  
 CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT” (ICAD) APPROACH**

N.B. The various lessons learned are not ranked in order of importance; what is important is their combined effect.

No	KEY LESSONS LEARNED	CONSTRAINTS
1	<p><b>SITE SELECTION</b></p> <p>Though biological criteria may be drawn upon to identify broad areas of interest for conservation, socio-economic criteria must dictate the actual choice of project site. Before a commitment is made, projects must collect information on local institutions, community history, social and political structures and opportunities for, and constraints to, development. In some areas, the combination of social, economic, institutional and political factors may make conservation simply unworkable.</p>	<p>Political criteria and motivation.</p> <p>Limited understanding of landowners' motives for collaborating in ICAD initiatives.</p> <p>Stakeholders heavily influenced by expectations of rent rather than genuine concern about environmentally sustainable development.</p> <p>Lack of information on political economies of natural resources use.</p> <p>Lessons from other projects (IRDPs) and the private sector (e.g. mining companies which have invested in community development programmes) inadequately explored.</p>
2	<p><b>COMMUNITY ENTRY</b></p> <p>The style and substance of an ICAD project's initial contact with local communities will have implications for its subsequent ability to deal with the issue of "dependency". Many communities equate projects with opportunities for gaining rent; projects that obviously display wealth are likely to reinforce these ideas. The ICAD approach must challenge these notions. Dependency attitudes need to be confronted and self-help ones encouraged. A careful strategy will need to be framed and accepted by project management and staff before field operations begin with the aim of facilitating a process of engagement, of trust building, information gathering, awareness raising and education to establish durable relationships with community stakeholders.</p>	<p>ICAD projects can never compete with large developers in terms of providing opportunities for gaining short-term rent.</p> <p>Weaknesses in orthodox project design processes.</p> <p>Biodiversity surveys with eminent expatriate scientists reinforce the notion that an ICADP is wealthy.</p> <p>Frequent emphasis on the delivery of goods and services rather than on building local capacity for community development.</p>
3	<p><b>PROBLEMS WITH PROVIDING MATERIAL INCENTIVES</b></p> <p>ICADPs are based on the notion that by providing local communities with support for development, a direct link between conservation goals and community welfare objectives can be made. There are many problems with providing material incentives within an ICAD framework. Successful community-based income-generating activities require a wide range of ingredients: many of these may be absent locally and particularly acute in remote areas with little infrastructure or social capital. Many of the "alternatives" provide modest returns for considerable work effort.</p> <p>Reduced government expenditure on basic services can lead to ICADPs trying to broker social services as part of a conservation deal but which often has little political support at local, national or international levels.</p>	<p>"Quick-fix" expectations of development among local communities and their ability to obtain it (e.g. by charging resource rents to logging companies) may preclude the search for solutions. Extractive resource management may destroy the very resource base required by the alternatives – making them simply unworkable.</p> <p>Key impediments to the successful establishment of micro-enterprises are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Weak infrastructural coverage</li> <li>Market fragmentation</li> <li>Low skills base</li> <li>High labour investment needs</li> </ul> <p><i>Cf. Sekhran (1996) and Brooks (1996).</i></p>

No	KEY LESSONS LEARNED	CONSTRAINTS
4	<p><b>TRANSFORMING COMMUNITY ATTITUDES TOWARDS DEVELOPMENT</b></p> <p>Material incentives will be insufficient to provide for conservation. Communities must come to reassess the meaning of development, the long-term consequences of their present land-use actions and the conservation value of their resources. They must rethink the processes by which they seek development. ICADPs need to invest heavily in education to establish a social environment for achieving conservation. Education should give power to communities by providing them more choices and information upon which to base decisions. An education programme alone, however, will be insufficient. Material incentives will also be required. However, there is little point in developing these if community attitudes are not supportive of self-help. “Saturation” environmental education using different media to try and build a conservation constituency. Work with local communities to define their problems, assess the values of their resources and examine the advantages and disadvantages of resource depletion.</p>	<p>Rural communities see ICAD as implying “development through conservation” whereas donors [and senior government officials in ministries of environment (MoEs)] see such projects as “securing conservation through development” i.e. differences in the relative emphasis different stakeholders place on D &amp; E activities respectively.</p> <p>The connection between resource depletion and (long-term) welfare is still not being made by local communities. ICADPs frequently do not support local communities in identifying non-material values that were traditionally important to them and consider or assess why they might have been discarded – the reasons for the change in value systems – and the benefits and costs of current value systems.</p>
5	<p><b>CO-OPERATIVE ENDEAVOUR AT THE COMMUNITY LEVEL</b></p> <p>ICADPs require that recipient stakeholder communities already have a high level of social cohesion and co-operative endeavour. Although the communities’ spirit of co-operation can be strengthened through targeted project activities, without an inherent minimum level present during the formative years, project survival is unlikely. Local communities will often knowingly accept the <i>status quo</i> due to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Lack of a central leader strong enough to stand in opposition against existing power brokers</li> <li>- Existence of social ties and economic relationships which “purchase” loyalty to leaders</li> <li>- Confusion and loss of power stemming from the transition from a traditional power hierarchy to one ruled by a cash economy and modern systems of governance</li> <li>- Confusion as to the role/interests of private sector companies</li> <li>- Intimidation arising from ignorance of Western business systems (cf. <i>Toarbusai cited in McCallum and Sekhran, 1997</i>)</li> </ul>	<p>Frequent lack of a thorough site-specific social feasibility study.</p> <p>Changing nature of leadership in traditional societies.</p> <p>Key individuals often act against the local public good owing to a lack of common unifying ambitions and social control mechanisms.</p>
6	<p><b>BUILDING STAKEHOLDER PARTNERSHIPS</b></p> <p>Environmentalists need to establish a broad network of partnership arrangements with different stakeholders which need to be actively fostered and strengthened, and to watch for opportunities to extend this network. ICADPs are required to operate in partnership with agencies that typically lack planning and management capacities and must make adequate allowances for this during project planning. The Lak ICADP (Papua New Guinea) developed the use of “Special Service Agreements”, a contractual arrangement whereby an organisation is paid to implement an identified component of the overall project. NGOs that have an investment in project design will be more committed to project philosophies, activities and outcomes. Frequent shortfalls in government funding agreements. NGOs vary widely in capacity: those with proven ability are usually overcommitted; others lack resources, internal political instability, limited technical and managerial capacity and fragmented infrastructure.</p>	<p>National MoEs are frequently hampered by several factors, including low morale and poor staff motivation, the lack of successful conservation models, financial mismanagement, a poor skills capacity and base work productivity and an ineffective infrastructure – these provide the standard operational backdrop for many NREM projects. Delays in appointing counterparts, high levels of staff absenteeism through over-commitment to other activities and lack of continuity of senior management.</p>

No	KEY LESSONS LEARNED	CONSTRAINTS
7	<p><b>COMMUNICATIONS</b></p> <p>Communications between stakeholders can become difficult as a result of poor infrastructure, remoteness, functional illiteracy and language barriers. These difficulties can only partially be compensated for by training, preparedness and technology and will involve patience and commitment from all parties.</p> <p>Careful consideration needs to be given regarding how to assess the impact of messages on the target population.</p> <p>Clear advantages in having a local person, or person with extensive local experience, as the project co-ordinator.</p> <p>Use of non-verbal communication is of great importance (audio-visual, film, booklets, theatre, etc.).</p>	<p>Communications are constrained by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the complexity of the subject material (e.g. the concept of biodiversity)</li> <li>- culture (notably access to and involvement of women)</li> <li>- difficulties in accurately assessing feedback</li> </ul>
8	<p><b>LANDOWNER AWARENESS</b></p> <p>Awareness programmes are unlikely to be successful where significant anti-conservation attitudes exist. In areas where communities lack a basic conservation philosophy and environmental awareness, an intensive and long-term education programme will be necessary. Education programmes are unlikely to be effective in the timeframe required to compete with exploitative development activities.</p> <p>“I think the ICAD has some really good ideas. I am happy they are considering our children’s future. Why can’t we have the logging now and then have the ICAD later?”</p> <p>Villager, Weitin Valley, New Ireland Province, Bismarck Archipelago, Papua New Guinea (ICADP within the GEF-UNDP supported <i>Biodiversity Conservation and Resource Management Programme</i>, 1993-96)</p>	<p>Conservation values are driven by the utility that communities derive from the natural environment. In many countries, these values have been eroded due to <i>i.a.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- forced relocation of villages by colonial administrators and post-independence governments</li> <li>- education</li> <li>- the introduction of health services</li> <li>- conversion to Christianity</li> <li>- entry into a cash economy</li> </ul> <p>Anti-ICAD campaigns by other interest groups</p> <p>Lack of specialist staff</p>
9	<p><b>STAFF ON STRENGTH</b></p> <p>ICADPs are frequently understaffed. ICADPs need a core element of dedicated specialist staff. Possible distractions and diversions need to be identified and factored into staff requirements during project design. Logistical needs caused by expanded staff levels also need attention during project design.</p> <p>Staffing needs are highest in the earlier years.</p>	<p>Budget restrictions often prevent substantial reinforcing of staff numbers.</p>
10	<p><b>TARGET FIXATION</b></p> <p>ICADPs involve an immense investment of personal time, energy and emotion by project proponents. These commitments can result in staff becoming “fixated” on achieving project objectives and outputs which can affect their objectivity when reviewing or evaluating project progress.</p> <p>Potential use of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- organisational auditing techniques especially with regard to staffing shortages, communication difficulties and performance measuring</li> <li>- team building exercises</li> <li>- annual retreats</li> <li>- study tours</li> </ul>	<p>Many projects continue to be characterised by being over-ambitious and of low specificity.</p> <p>ICADPs require a strong third party to assess project progress, comparing planned progress with actual progress before making firm recommendations on changes to project design, e.g. Project Review Missions.</p> <p>Poor and irregular communication between project personnel and the donor HQ.</p>

No	KEY LESSONS LEARNED	CONSTRAINTS
11	<p><b>ESTABLISHING A SITE PRESENCE</b></p> <p>The level of a project's physical presence on site should match community commitment. Adjustments in the level of presence need to be preceded by careful consideration of the flow-on and long-term effects.</p> <p>Until a sign of firm commitment is given, fixed costs and capital expenditure should be kept to low levels in order to preserve project flexibility.</p> <p>Continuous contact with stakeholders to build trust and durable relationships.</p>	<p>Projects can create or shift villagers' expectations regarding the delivery of rent. Start small and build up.</p> <p>Project presence often ephemeral.</p> <p>Lessons could be learned from private sector organisations with a permanent presence as to how they have been able to mould their strategies to suit community needs and priorities.</p>
12	<p><b>CONFLICTS BETWEEN LAND USE, MANAGEMENT ZONATION AND CUSTOMARY LAND TENURE SYSTEMS</b></p> <p>The land management requirements of biodiversity protection mechanisms are as yet incompatible with traditional land tenure systems. Suitable interface mechanisms are in the early stages of development but are unlikely to offer anything other than long-term solutions.</p> <p>During development of the Lak Conservation Area Sustainable Forestry Project 4, key problems exposed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• land owned by individual clans is rarely uniform in type and topography</li> <li>• land ownership is not fixed and it changes when land exchanges are made during birth, death, marriage, commercial trade and customary exchange</li> <li>• landowners are always unhappy about absorbing the opportunity cost of land protection particularly when benefits are shared with other clans and outside communities</li> <li>• Formal surveying systems do not readily interface with customary mapping techniques</li> </ul>	<p>Establishing a large conservation area requires dealing with a large number of ownership entities (<i>cf. Theory of Island Biogeography MacArthur and Wilson, 1967</i>)</p> <p>Need to distinguish between:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• core area for protection</li> <li>• buffer or transition zone</li> <li>• sustainable development or controlled use zone</li> </ul>
13	<p><b>MAINTAINING POLITICAL NEUTRALITY</b></p> <p>Despite the temptation to ally with political leaders, ICADPs must remain politically neutral. The highly charged political environment surrounding ICADP implementation makes this difficult, requiring care and vigilance by project proponents.</p>	<p>Politicians and power brokers inevitably fill key roles in the establishment and implementation of large local-level projects. This can result in splitting the community along political lines. Political careers at all levels of government are notoriously short-lived.</p>
14	<p><b>OPERATIONAL NEEDS</b></p> <p>The nature of the project's operating environment is not always fully understood by project designers and the senior management of parent agencies. Operational difficulties are inevitable and should be planned for.</p> <p>Difficulties are often amplified because the lack of infrastructure prevents the formulation and adoption of contingency plans, place a high additional load on project resources and often lead to significant delays in project implementation.</p>	<p>Lines of communication between field staff and senior management/ administration must be shortened and streamlined.</p>



No	KEY LESSONS LEARNED	CONSTRAINTS
15	<p><b>ENTERING INTO LOCAL SOCIAL RELATIONS</b></p> <p>The quality of the social relationships developed between conservation workers and local stakeholders are likely to determine the viability of the project, particularly when the surrounding cultural environment is built on customary exchange. Sound policies are required by ICADP proponents both to maximise returns from these relationships and to guard against them being over-exploited.</p>	<p>Many community cultures are based on customary exchange and reciprocal obligation.</p> <p>Risks of projects becoming the <i>de facto</i> government.</p> <p>Logging company wanted access to logs which had little intrinsic value to the local community and for which there were generous and tangible benefits.</p> <p>The ICADP, however, wanted to discuss land management and protection of natural resources and was not prepared to make substantial payments freely.</p>
16	<p><b>CONSERVATION INITIATIVES ARE DISADVANTAGED IN THE PRESENT POLITICAL ENVIRONMENT</b></p> <p>ICADPs drawing on donor funds are required to be politically accountable, financially transparent and culturally sensitive in its operations. Private sector companies, on the other hand, have few of these obligations and enjoy greater levels of flexibility and autonomy. ICADPs may claim the moral high ground but are inherently powerless because they have to play by strict administrative rules.</p> <p>“The (logging) company has, in almost every sense, blatantly flaunted the requirements of the laws of Papua New Guinea, has not complied with as much as 80% of the Environmental Plan approval conditions and has totally disregarded the provisions of the Environmental Planning Act, 1978”. (See Source below.)</p> <p>Projects are compelled to behave “properly”. ICADPs are often marginal prospects at best in that they face a huge number of socio-political barriers to their success.</p> <p>“Enabling environments” are those that are prepared to provide conservation incentives, to assess development initiatives over long timeframes and that do not tolerate industries that misuse and unnecessarily damage the environment.</p>	<p>Projects are required to work within restrictive financial management guidelines often at the expense of flexibility and autonomy, to fulfil the obligations of donor accountability.</p> <p>Several managerial/ administrative constraints in terms of time available, financial freedom and operational dexterity which affect:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- project design</li> <li>- project implementation</li> </ul> <p>Many other actors do not necessarily have to “play by the rules”.</p> <p>Inefficiencies in enforcement, extensive patron-client relationship network reaching the highest administrative levels, and developers focusing on maximising short-term benefits.</p>
17	<p><b>PARTICIPATION</b></p> <p>Participation is a “buzzword” often used by conservation planners but there are difficulties in implementing this concept to the fullest extent.</p> <p>The invitation to participate in a process often assumes that the participants support the process or at least are receptive to it. This is often not the case.</p> <p>Without participation, there will be little local ownership of the project and without ownership, there can be little belief in project objectives and activities.</p> <p>Need to clarify relationship between the State and the civil society.</p>	<p>Many of the innovative and ambitious solutions developed during implementation of ICADPs require extensive technical assistance.</p> <p>Trade-offs need to be recognised more explicitly between supporting participatory approaches which will take several years and the increasing donor pressure to see tangible results.</p> <p>Potential of local community collaboration in project design and execution frequently not assessed.</p>

**Source:** McCallum and Sekhran (1997) *Race for the Rainforest. Evaluating Lessons from an Integrated Conservation and Development "Experiment" in New Ireland, Papua New Guinea*, 82pp. Department of Environment and Conservation/ UNDP/GEF (UNOPS-PNG/93/G31).